



GENERAL GOVERNMENT & PUBLIC SAFETY COMMITTEE

TUESDAY, JUNE 23, 2020

9:30 A.M.

REMOTE ATTENDANCE

To comply with Governor Inslee's Proclamation 20-28, the General Government & Public Safety Committee Meeting will be conducted remotely, not in-person. However, you may view the meeting by watching live through Zoom:

Link:

<https://us02web.zoom.us/j/83469876421?pwd=ZDJubWVpTVRCTHRPQ1BYL3FESml4dz09>

Password: 912249

The public may also listen to the meeting via telephone by dialing toll-free:

(888) 788-0099 or (877) 853-5247 - when prompted enter Webinar ID **834 6987 6421**
press # (participant ID not required)

THURSTON REGIONAL CLIMATE ACTION PLAN STATUS BRIEFING

JESSICA BRANDT, ASSOCIATE PLANNER
(STAFF REPORT)

COMMUNITY BASED COMMITTEE ON HOMELESSNESS STATUS UPDATE

RICK WALK, DIRECTOR OF COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT
(BRIEFING)



GENERAL GOVERNMENT & PUBLIC SAFETY COMMITTEE

June 23, 2020

SUBJECT: Thurston Regional Climate Mitigation Plan Update

RECOMMENDATION: Briefing on the progress of the Thurston Climate Mitigation Plan. No action needed.

STAFF CONTACT: Scott Spence, City Manager *SS*
Rick Walk, Community and Economic Development Director *RW*
Ryan Andrews, Planning Manager *RA*
Jessica Brandt, Associate Planner *JB*

ORIGINATED BY: Community and Economic Development Department

ATTACHMENTS: None

FISCAL NOTE: Phase 2 cost totaled \$43,750
Phase 1 cost totaled \$5,000.

PRIOR REVIEW: December 12, 2019 City Council Worksession
October 1, 2019 Planning Commission
October 11, 2018 City Council Meeting
September 20, 2018, City Council Worksession
June 21, 2018, City Council Worksession
April 12, 2018 City Council Meeting
March 15, 2018 City Council Worksession

BACKGROUND:

The Council signed an interlocal agreement with Thurston County, Olympia, and Tumwater in April 2018 to complete Phase 1 of a Regional Climate Mitigation Plan. Phase 1 focused on assessing existing policies and targets of each jurisdiction for gaps and consistencies, recommending a regional emissions target, identifying each jurisdiction's implemented mitigations actions to date, and recommend a regional emissions reduction targets.

The recommended targets were adopted July 12, 2019. The targets are:

- Achieve a 45% reduction of 2015 greenhouse gas levels by 2030.
- Achieve an 85% reduction of 2015 greenhouse gas levels by 2050.

Phase 1 produced a recommended scope of work for Phase 2, which included a public-engagement strategy, assessment of actions sufficient to reach shared emissions targets, and implementation strategies. On October 11, 2018, the Council approved the ILA for Phase 2. In February 2019, TRPC hired a consultant team, Cascadia Consulting, to assist with Phase 2.

The Phase 2 Planning Process:

1. Develop steering committee and charter (January 2019)
2. Develop stakeholder advisory committee (February – March 2019)
3. Engage the general public and develop potential actions list (July – Sept 2019)
4. Assess potential actions and develop scenarios (September – June, iterative)
5. Develop plan and strategies (March-June 2020)
6. Engage the general public (July-August 2020)
7. Adopt plan and strategies (October 2020)

The early public engagement went very well. The goal was to ask the community what actions they think the cities and County should take to reduce carbon emissions. Through dozens of geographically spread out community events such as fairs and festivals early in the planning process, we reached a large number of Thurston County Residents. The online survey received over 1200 responses while open for 5 weeks during August and September. The early community engagement efforts focused on the typically hard to reach audiences, which the steering committee has identified as youth, lower income families and rural residents.

The Climate Advisory Workgroup used the community list and added to it. They developed the list of actions and prioritized them based on agreed upon criteria. The Steering Committee approved the list of the top 70 or so recommended actions for further analysis using a scenario modeling tool.

The scenario modeling tool is meant to answer “Will these actions get us to our targets?” The actions are categorized by sector for the analysis. The sectors are: buildings and energy, transportation, agriculture and forestry, waste, and cross cutting. The short answer is yes for the 2030 targets but not quite for the 2050 targets. This just highlights the needs to update and review the plan periodically to incorporate new science, technology, and information.

Some key takeaways from the scenario tool:

- State actions play a large role.
- Cleaning the electric grid through implementation of state legislation (Clean Energy Transformation Act) will be important.
- Shifting gas-powered cars and equipment to electric will need to follow.
- Land use and building code changes will take a longer time to show results.
- Heavy investment in sequestration is needed.

With this information, the jurisdictions has begun developing an implementation plan. The project team is working on noting what actions would be best at the city level, regional level, and where state action is necessary to move forward.

The original schedule would have brought the analyzed action list back to the general public for discussion and review this spring. At this point, additional discussions need to occur with the jurisdictions about implementation—specifically gaining better understanding of what actions can be implemented. In addition to jurisdictional needs, a discussion needs to occur with the public to help prioritize actions. This outreach is scheduled for later this summer with a combination of online open houses, surveys, and potential events (pending restrictions). Following public engagement and further conversations at each jurisdiction, the plan will be ready for adoption this fall.

ADVANTAGES:

1. Long range targets, based on the most current science and methodology for emissions reductions, keep the City on a path to mitigating climate change for future generations.
2. Regional and local approaches are key to achieving a coordinated and collaborative response to climate mitigation.

DISADVANTAGES:

1. None identified.