

Community Advisory Workgroup Meeting

Meeting Summary

Tuesday, May 7, 2024, 4 – 6 P.M.

Link to packet and presentations: <https://www.thurstoncountywa.gov/departments/board-county-commissioners/climate-change-response/thurston-climate-mitigation-collaborative-meetings>

CAW Members Present: Stephen Bernath, Tierra Bonds, Courtney Cecale, Tom Crawford, Amita Devarajan, Juan Haeckerman, Rachel Hastings, Matthew Landers, Mackenzie McCall, Kim Piper, Shannon Sipher and Lauren Tamboer,

CAW Members Absent: Candace Penn, Wendy Moudy, and Jolie Song

Staff Present: Linsey Fields, Rebecca Harvey, and Alyssa Jones Wood

ISC Staff: Dan Dickerman Rafiq Shabazz Brinkley

Agenda Item	Notes
1. Welcome and agenda review	
2. CAW Announcements	No announcements were made
3. CAW Agenda Item Requests	<p>A CAW member proposed that in the next CAW meeting we vote on a statement to send to the Executive Committee expressing concerns about not being on track to accomplish goals set forth on the TCMP.</p> <p>The CAW member suggested that we form a subcommittee to draft said statement and interested CAW members dropped their name in the meeting chat. They will have a draft statement ready for the CAW during the June meeting. The subcommittee will plan to meet in-between the May and June CAW meetings.</p> <p>The CAW approved the formation of the subcommittee.</p> <p>CAW members Tom, Stephen, Shannon, Juan and Amita expressed interest in joining the subcommittee</p>
4. Housekeeping Items	CAW Facilitator Dan Dickerman brought up the use of mass emails related to the CAW. We will send official CAW emails regarding meetings and also send climate adjacent items to CAW members. If anyone wants to opt out of the climate adjacent emails, they will let the CAW facilitator know.

<p>5. Annual Retreat Follow-up</p> <p>a. Short Review and Feedback Session led by staff and fellow CAW members.</p> <p>i. <i>Attachment 1 2024 TCMC Annual Retreat Meeting Notes</i></p>	<p>Rebecca Harvey gave an overview of the Annual Retreat agenda and requested that CAW members who attended give their perspective of how the retreat went.</p> <p>CAW members enjoyed the event, appreciated being able to see people in person, and appreciated everyone’s passion. CAW members expressed wanting more time to discuss and reach consensus at future retreats. CAW members expressed starting the meeting earlier so if the meeting goes over time there is a chance to stay late.</p> <p>Regional initiatives will go out by the next meeting for discussion and consensus.</p>
<p>6. Home Energy Score Engagement</p> <p>a. Presentation by Alyssa Jones Wood and Linsey Fields, Staff Team</p>	<p>Staff member Alyssa Jones Wood gave overview of the HES model ordinance memo. The HES ordinance is one part of the 2024 regional initiative. Alyssa reminded the group of 0 to 5 consensus process and that the CAW will be given a chance to reach consensus on each of the staff recommendations in the HES memo. Alyssa then went through each staff recommendation and gave CAW members space to ask questions or provide commentary for each recommendation before voting using the consensus process.</p> <p>The CAW called a vote on the regional coordination recommendation. The recommendation was: to provide consistent standards across jurisdictions and ensure that energy performance information is easily comparable across the Thurston region, partner jurisdictions should prioritize the development of a regionally coordinated home energy score policy and program. Consensus was reached</p> <p>The CAW called a vote on Assessment Type. The recommendation was: to provide consistent and objective energy performance information that can be easily compared across multiple homes, energy performance information should be disclosed in the form of asset ratings. Consensus was reached.</p> <p>The CAW called a vote on the type of Asset Rating Tool Options. The recommendation was: utilize the US DOE HES rating tool. Consensus was reached.</p>

The CAW called a vote on Energy Performance Report. The recommendation was: the TCMC develop a report template unique to Thurston County which includes a carbon footprint calculation and incentive/rebate information in addition to all required US DOE information. Incentive/rebate information would include national, utility, and local incentives.

Staff also recommends that the Energy Performance Reports would expire after 8 years unless a remodel or alteration has taken place on any elements that would impact the HES score. **Consensus was reached.**

CAW Member Comment: Inaccurate assumption on how data is disclosed on multiple listing service and what a seller can legally share or disclose. MLS can be tool to voluntarily assist with this but we can't mandate that. CAW member offered their help on this as they work on policy issues in connection with buyer's rights.

Alyssa gave examples of systems used by both Portland area and City of Berkeley for MLS.

CAW Member Comment: There are many off market sales that occur now are not recorded via MLS; the HES program will need to consider how to handle these sales.

The CAW called a vote on Trigger Event: The recommendation was: to ensure prospective buyers can compare the energy efficiency of all homes and integrate energy efficiency upgrades within home financing, staff recommend that home energy information should be disclosed at the time of listing. **Consensus was reached.**

The CAW called a vote on Compliance part 1. The recommendations was: to ensure widespread adoption of the home energy score, staff recommend adopting a mandatory disclosure policy, with a non-compliance fine of \$500. **Consensus was NOT reached.**

Q: For scalability and accessibility do we have a plan in mind that allows for sellers to get this in a timely manner more easily

A: Exceptions or allowances that will go into the draft will be that this is required and a subsidized program to allow assistance for lower and moderate income to get their scores. There will probably be a 2 year rolling with period to build out workforce to help mandate this and it will have a delayed effective date for enforcement.

Q: Wants to know more on how we'll let people know that this is going on? Will there be any mitigation for county for good faith efforts?

A: We will have approved allowances for city and county managers for good faith efforts. Next step is for Staff team to design a program and allocate the budget needed for a program.

Q: Can someone share the measurable benefit for something that will cost someone hundreds of dollars (either buyer, seller, etc.)?

A: Measurable benefit for HES is community benefits for homebuyers to know their potential Energy costs and aware of what appliances are in the home, what will need replacement down the road and installation etc. \$500 compliance fees are to push sellers to spend \$150 to do HES assessments.

Q: Would it be possible to create a sliding non-compliance fine based on income? Fines are really only punishment for certain communities.

A: Each jurisdiction has ways to assert fines. It won't be consistent across each jurisdiction but we can ask code enforcement to assess fine based on income or cost of home.

Q: Are banks that make residential loans going to be part of this? What happens if someone decides \$500 is the cost of doing business?

Q: At what point will there be discussion to have the scope of this program include renters?

A: This will come later when we can apply HES on multifamily stacked homes and we do intend to include renters.

CAW Member Comment: Is there an easy way to help with mitigation for buyers

A: Staff is also looking at budgets and funding attached to E3 program. The goal isn't to just mandate but to also subsidize the most amount HES for low to moderate income folks as we don't want them excluded.

CAW Member Comment: Cost of administration, collecting and informing can far exceed cost of fine and we may need to raise the cost of the fine.

Staff proposed for sake of time we treat this poll as a voluntary vs. mandatory fine and we make the compliance fine a topic for further conversation at next meeting.

CAW Member Comment: I wish these details were laid out in writing somewhere in a document so I could see what is actually planned. I also wish we had access to what policies the County would have to follow during development of this policy so we could review this and collect our thoughts before further discussion.

A: At this time it's not feasible to have a fleshed out program for review because it takes stakeholders in the community telling us what they'd like to see in this mandate. This is the first step; getting feedback from the CAW. By October the staff team will have a more developed program to present to the CAW.

The CAW called a vote on Compliance part 2. The recommendations were: to ensure that all homes disclose a home energy score before being purchased by a new buyer, warning letters for non-compliant listing should be sent as soon as possible after listing. The timeline to trigger non-compliance penalties should be no longer than 30 days.

Discretion be given to the jurisdiction's Authorizing Official (such as City/County Manager or Planning Director) to adjust the penalty in the event of extenuating circumstances. **Consensus was NOT reached.**

CAW Member Comment: For me at least, I'm not necessarily looking for 25 pages of quotes, but if there are equity considerations you've already explored, it would help to inform my vote.

A: Staff will send an email with the equity considerations.

CAW Member Comment: Hoping for discussion on each recommendation so folks are fully aware of what they're voting for.

The CAW called a vote on Applicability and Exemptions. The recommendations were:

- Exemptions for stacked homes, mobile, manufactured, and floating homes.
- Exemptions for homes already certified to high-efficiency standards.
- Exemptions for new construction homes.
- Exemptions due to distressed sale situations
- Staff recommend that the HES Policy apply to all suitable building types
- Staff recommend that homes already certified to a high-efficiency standard may be exempt, but these standards will need to be explicitly defined.
- Staff recommend that newly constructed homes will also be required to disclose a HES
- Staff recommend that certain distressed sale situations should be exempt
- Staff recommend that rather than exempting low-income households, jurisdictions should subsidize the cost of obtaining a HES for low-income sellers.

Consensus was NOT reached.

CAW Member Comment: Just getting a score won't ensure you'll move toward a high efficiency standard home. 1st and 2nd recommendation don't really line up.

A: Staff team is fine with exploring other options or re-writing this recommendation.

CAW Member Comment: Staff should rethink newly constructed homes being included as it will create barriers.

A: In Austin TX their HES program only requires a HES for home that are 10 years or older. Well add this as another topic of conversation.

Q: Have we considered establishing either with this ordinance or another some standard over time that homes be required to meet?

A: None of the local jurisdictions have funding to assist number of homes sold to make improvements. We could make it a requirement, but it could cause an equity issue for those who can't afford those

	<p>improvements and we would have to develop allowances for that. We are in the process with the E3 campaign to connect people to resources and incentives but agree it would be a great next step.</p> <p>CAW Member Comment: Inspector could be paid out of closing funds if there is no cash viable up front A: Another regional program that is managed by a utility has an option to defer doing a HES to the buyer within 24 months</p> <p>CAW Member Comment: I think that it could also be good because the presumption would be that a high efficiency standard home should score high on an HES which shows market value.</p> <p>The CAW called a vote on Low-Income Subsidies. The recommendation was: to ensure performance assessments are not overly burdensome to low-income sellers, staff recommend contracting with a community partner to provide free home energy assessments for income-qualified sellers. Consensus was reached.</p>
<p>7. Next steps and adjourn a. Future Agenda Review i. <i>Attachment 2 CAW Schedule</i></p>	<p>For June CAW meeting, members will look at the statement the CAW subcommittee drafted for Executive Committee Meeting The CAW will have a chance to reach consensus on the 2025 Regional Initiatives. Have further discussion and vote on HES recommendations that didn't reach immediate consensus. Staff team will bring more information on items that <u>did not reach consensus</u> for further discussion in June and July mtgs. They will give deadline for CAW members to address their specific concerns to the staff team via email before the June meeting.</p> <p>The meeting was adjourned at 6:03 P.M.</p>

Appendix: Vote Results

Recommendation: Regional Coordination	Vote Totals
0 - Block	
1 – Major Issues	
2 – Minor Issues (Resolve Now)	
3 – Minor Issues (Resolve Later)	2
4 – Fine As Is	5

5 – I Love This	5
-----------------	---

Recommendation: Assessment Type	Vote Totals
0 - Block	
1 – Major Issues	
2 – Minor Issues (Resolve Now)	
3 – Minor Issues (Resolve Later)	3
4 – Fine As Is	8
5 – I Love This	1

Recommendation: Asset Rating Tool	Vote Totals
0 - Block	
1 – Major Issues	1
2 – Minor Issues (Resolve Now)	
3 – Minor Issues (Resolve Later)	2
4 – Fine As Is	7
5 – I Love This	2

Recommendation: Energy Performance Report	Vote Totals
0 - Block	
1 – Major Issues	
2 – Minor Issues (Resolve Now)	
3 – Minor Issues (Resolve Later)	3
4 – Fine As Is	9
5 – I Love This	

Recommendation: Trigger Event	Vote Totals
0 - Block	
1 – Major Issues	
2 – Minor Issues (Resolve Now)	
3 – Minor Issues (Resolve Later)	
4 – Fine As Is	7
5 – I Love This	5

Recommendation: Assessment Type	Vote Totals
0 - Block	

1 – Major Issues	
2 – Minor Issues (Resolve Now)	
3 – Minor Issues (Resolve Later)	3
4 – Fine As Is	8
5 – I Love This	1

Recommendation: Compliance I	Vote Totals
0 - Block	
1 – Major Issues	1
2 – Minor Issues (Resolve Now)	
3 – Minor Issues (Resolve Later)	6
4 – Fine As Is	3
5 – I Love This	2

Recommendation: Compliance II	Vote Totals
0 - Block	
1 – Major Issues	1
2 – Minor Issues (Resolve Now)	
3 – Minor Issues (Resolve Later)	4
4 – Fine As Is	6
5 – I Love This	1

Recommendation: Exemptions	Vote Totals
0 - Block	
1 – Major Issues	1
2 – Minor Issues (Resolve Now)	
3 – Minor Issues (Resolve Later)	7
4 – Fine As Is	3
5 – I Love This	1

Recommendation: Low-income Subsidies	Vote Totals
0 - Block	
1 – Major Issues	
2 – Minor Issues (Resolve Now)	
3 – Minor Issues (Resolve Later)	3
4 – Fine As Is	4
5 – I Love This	4