Community Advisory Workgroup Meeting

Meeting Summary

Tuesday, June 4, 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, Rachel Hastings, Matthew Landers, MacKenzie McCall, Kim Piper, Shannon Sipher and Lauren Tamboer

CAW Members Absent: Juan Haeckerman, Candace Penn and Jolie Song (unexcused)

Staff Present: Pamela Braff, Linsey Fields, Alysa Jones Wood, Dan Dickerman (ISC) and Rafiqa Shabazz Brinkley (ISC)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Agenda Item** | **Notes** |
| CAW Announcements | No Announcements were made |
| 1. CAW Agenda Item Requests | Q. For today’s agenda; did any attachments go out related to 2 items we didn’t reach consensus on?  A. We only heard back from 2 CAW members who just gave commentary but no additional info went out because it wasn’t requested by anyone.  C. A CAW member suggested adding an agenda item on concept of Community Assembly and having presentation on this from People’s Economy Lab to learn more.  C. A CAW member shared out further info on People’s Economy lab via below link  <https://peopleseconomylab.org/wins-for-collaborative-governance-in-washington-state-piloting-community-assemblies/>  **The CAW called a vote on adding the agenda item for Community Assembly and People’s Economy Lab doing a presentation. There was consensus and agenda item was approved** |
| 1. Housekeeping   A.  Comprehensive Plan Survey for Thurston County and Olympia | Updates shared by Dr. Pamela Braff for Olympia climate element for Comprehensive Plan. Several links were shared out in the meeting chat  Q. A Caw member asked on where to find these things on the county socials and websites?  A. <https://www.surveymonkey.com/r/RLB63K9>  olympiawa.gov/climate2045  <https://www.ci.tumwater.wa.us/departments/community-development-department/tumwater-comprehensive-plan/2025-comprehensive-plan-update>  The city has a kind of main city page on Facebook, Instagram, and Twitter. So if you follow the city of Olympia and I'm sure kind of similarly with Lacey, you'll see similar things popping up throughout the comp plan update process and other things where you'll be able to learn more about what's going on and share some share some ideas.  Q. I it possible to have an email a link to it because  some of us don't do much in social media.  A. The survey is not posted on social media.  The survey is on the city's engage Olympia page.  We’ve also shared it through our climate newsletter which I can also put a link in if you'd like to sign up for that.  A. Go to each one of the 3 cities and the counties, website and just do a keyword search and comp plan.  There are so many opportunities to find the survey as well as see when there are public forums.  So if you go to each one of those sites, you can sign up and they can automatically push everything to you and then you can share it for the 3 cities in the county. |
| 1. Subcommittee Report Out | Open Letter  CAW member Tom Crawford along with subcommittee reported out and shared a copy of open letter to Thurston Climate Mitigation Collaborative.  **Copy of open letter** [**https://docs.google.com/document/d/178uCGP3wUazE1y6A5QKroamDHMvSu-QI2tAz-TzC2fY/edit**](https://docs.google.com/document/d/178uCGP3wUazE1y6A5QKroamDHMvSu-QI2tAz-TzC2fY/edit)  C. I think the goal, we kind of talked about what this letter needed to say and what was trying to communicate which is basically we're not meeting our goals and we're not going to meet our goals unless we make certain changes.  And it was kind of an appeal to the executive board to seek out greater funding sources, be it federally, locally, or creating new revenue streams and also looking to create more partnerships  Every municipality impressively is working on different plans and it what can we copy from them?  What can we coordinate with them on and every federal agency has plans so it's just kind of like greater coordination but like the the main crux of the letter was just arguing like we need more workers and we need more resources and funding to do all the work that needs to be done. How do we coordinate everything?  C. 2 big picture things. One is I was at the board of county commissioners last week I think it was to support the adoption of the updated ordinance on conversions. For, for us to development conversions. My one substantive comment to the county commissioners is they needed a professional forester. On staff to properly implement the new ordinance and the comment I got back.  “Well, it's county government”. So I, the meaning. It was unlikely any additional resources would be put towards actually updating this ordinance. This whole climate thing I think there's an issue of timing and whether all the municipalities really knew what they were buying off. One they adopted this plan because for example, I mean, we need to make sure that they are going to include all this stuff from the mitigation plan in the comp plans. And that they're going to you know, generate energy so we can meet these goals. My concern is that the city of Lacey this year approved a new gas station out in a residential area. So how do you figure that out in the context climate change and the fact that new internal combustion engines are going to be sold in another 7 to 10 years in this state. We need to make sure people are all on the same page with the mitigation plan. It needs to be made real in some way across the departments in each of the jurisdictions so that we actually see some effect on the ground.  C.I think that what needs to be done is, you know, a coordinated regulatory agency to guide this like the Labor Department where everybody has to adhere to certain laws  to make sure that you are reaching these goals and certain rights are being maintained but we don't have any leadership on the federal level and I do think that there's a lot of opportunity on the hyper local level and like a lot of power can be gained through coordination with other cities and what you're seeing now with this collaborative but like reaching out potentially all across the Pacific Northwest down to the West Coast  C.I'll just say one more thing about the process that we envision going forward once we have agreement on this letter you know, that hopefully we'll all agree to move forward with this shortly.  Then the idea would be to present it to the next meeting of the executive committee. As an agenda item, not just as a public comment, as get on the agenda for the next meeting of the executive committee. And likewise to get on the agenda perhaps at a work session for each of the elected bodies. So the city councils of Olympia, Tumwater and the board of county commissioners.  That's the sort of the vision for how this would be communicated to those various bodies.  C.I was just going to say that with everything previousely said, like for the rest of the committee to kind of keep in mind as like we open up for questions and like this is this is a letter from all of us.So I just want to really state that. We want to make sure that this letter really does feel like it's encompassing what we as the CAW believe and want to put out there. So please please make comments.  C.  Hey, thanks. Yeah, thank you all so much for drafting that letter. That was really strong and I would support it. One thing on my mind, I'm just curious if you talked about this when we were at the retreat.  I feel like it was Rebecca who, I could be wrong. I apologize for I'm getting around person, but somebody stood up and said, you know, there's this kind of famous article from a couple of years ago about all the local jurisdictions that are trying to meet climate goals and they're all failing. Like it's just like massive failure everywhere in terms of like being so far and part of the reason for that is we're kind of working on the wrong scale for some of the things like some of them are actually kind of impossible to address. Which is not to say that I don't want to send the letter or like actually work on a addressing them but I think that really speaks to the collaborative part of what I saw in the sort of the need to really be on the same page with, you know a whole bunch of counties, let's say, or the whole state that, on certain things to make progress.  QC.There were just some things that I'm not sure if we're in a position where it's like, yes, we're voting, or we're just more running yes or no, but if we're taking things like additions, there are some things I'd really love to consider adding. I think that some of the things that I find a lot of like agencies at various levels struggle with it's really trying to identify the difference between like a structural issue versus like an individual issue or like a structural problem versus an individual problem and like what's the appropriate mechanism for meeting and I think that the local level has this wonderful ability to be a little bit closer to the individual level but with our limited resources I'd really like to prioritize different types of structural changes. And then that I was going to put into the chat that I think would be really wonderful editions, but I wanted to make sure with this team that that's the conversation that we're having right now and not just voting yes or no?  A.Yeah, it will be a consensus vote. And so, full like 0 to 5 scale. And so if we do get it back.  C.So I did want to thank the subcommittee for drafting this. It was good work. As you all know I'm supposed to be representing builders, investors, developers and realtors. And have seen where funding does come from to allocate or find new resources. I think this is going to be really difficult even though I believe we're in a climate emergency and I believe we're not addressing so many bigger issues at a bigger level than where we're at you know, with additional unidentified funding. Just saying that's where we're going to go get the money and I just see the reduction in Real estate sales. Reduction in all types of taxation currently. So I don't even know if the budgets are going to grow in the 3 cities in the county.  So to me, there's an impossibility. And, of this even though yes this is aspirational and we've got it we have an emergency.  It's always vague when like, where's the money going to come from to do this and where and I don't know if anybody in an elected position has the courage and the guts to reallocate the amount of funds that need to go to be redirected, you know, and when there's when they're so caught up to budgets are already have dedicated funds. I don't know, it's just so systematically it's so much bigger than this. It's always the funding, you know, and if you are a you know, property owner and then builder and developer, why most most of them feel very strongly that they're already paying their fair share or more of these costs in taxation.    C.Staff  I think the 1st thing is so it would be a consensus vote.  And so we're not able to reach consensus, then the vote wouldn't pass. And so the goal would be to get the whole call on to consensus. The second thing that's coming up, I think that we might be in a place where there's enough like further thinking or ideas that people have that it would make sense to continue to have this conversation for a bit here and then kind of have folks be able to go in and like make comments edits and things like that to push an actual consensus vote to the next meetings. I think that their folks might have enough questions. That that could be wise to hold off on for today.  C.Thank you so much to everyone that worked on this. This is really incredible. I think it was a great idea and so I think it's a great idea to write a letter, asking for more staff resources since that seems to be the limiting factor in pursuing these initiatives.  I do have some edits I would add to the letter, but I could do that another time. I think that the things that I might change are just like keeping, like, acknowledging that since this isn't a letter to the Thurston climate mitigation collaborative executive committee, like they're already committed to climate change and ever mitigating climate change. So, just like keeping that in mind and, sort of like, I would even like throw some accolades out there to the work they've already done and the incredible work like that the 3 staff from each of the cities has done and then like I would focus on. I'm not sure about the expanding beyond like different connecting with other local governments. I think if it was me, I would, I would prefer just like focusing on getting the staff more resources, more time and additional stuff to be able to work on the specific initiatives that have already been laid out for Thurston County and then bringing attention specifically to those initiatives rather than like the big daunting issue of, you know, climate change in the in the global context.  [Mackenzie McCall TCFB] 19:36:43  Those are my comments. I think you guys did a great job. And I, yeah, I, I would be interested in sharing further.  C.Staff  I think that we'll set up a structure for folks to suggest edits and make comments. Also if you have any further comments or edits, please drop them in the chat. We'll collect all of those as well. And then we'll push, the actual vote to the next committee meeting and, and Alyssa mentioned, there's a couple more EC meetings coming up, so there's opportunity, more opportunities than present this to them.  C.Thanks for everybody's kind words. I just wanted to address what was said about funding. I really do think that there's a lot of federal money that's like there, but it requires a lot of and kind of creating those relationships with those agencies to get at that money. And I think that is where our site should be set. I don't think that it should be at the expense of additional taxation on homeowners or renters or you know through Goods and services. At this point, I do think that it should be on the backs of industry and our billionaires.  C. I'll 1st address a, process proposal that I'd like to put forward.  All of the jurisdictions are now just starting their budget process for next year and I think we have an opportunity to affect that. In a significant way. Maybe not to get to the kind of funding levels that. That are really needed. But certainly to increase the funding levels and if nothing else protect current funding. I would like to ask or suggest an alternate approach and that is we take online edits that that presumably I think mostly will be friendly, you know, seen by the committee, the subcommittee has friendly amendments and, go ahead and incorporate those and trying to keep it down to a page if possible.Then with the permission of the of the CAW  Once we've reached, you know, a week out or something, we've incorporated all the edits. I do think funding is both a critical and very difficult issue to solve. And I don't think it serves us to not address that. I think it's a very key structural issue in the way not only our cities and county operate but cities and counties throughout the state of Washington and a big part of that is because we have a very aggressive tax structure. The sources of additional revenue both stay wide and, local level. Become very limited and can seem very onerous to certain sectors of our communities. I think it's a fundamental problem, it needs to be addressed and so I hope that we wouldn't shy away from that. And, other than that, I completely, I completely agree with. Pretty much all of the other suggestions that have been made including acknowledging the really good work that the climate collaborative both elected officials and staff have been engaged in and there. In many ways heroic efforts to move this forward.  [Tom Crawford] 19:41:42  What we're just asking is. You know where we'll got your back and let's get a little more heroic and creative and, you know, stand up for what's really needed.  C. Staff  Alright, thank you, I'll touch base with the staff team. We'll talk about timelines. Can I suggest something for the closing of the letter though? If everyone can do their best to try to get to the Google Doc and make your edits by a certain date and then maybe respond to an email with your name if you can send to having your name  comma, CAW member, that way. You all can decide outside of a meeting and it's still prepared and available in the timing. Because I get the previous point. I have to turn in my budget in 2 weeks. That that might be a way to do it like by the end of next week make your edits  C.I would suggest by Friday make it and then we can work on what has been done next week. So I would say this Friday.  **Staff requested there be deadline for any additional feedback or edits to the open letter. The CAW agreed to submit all suggestions and edit via the google doc by Friday 6/7**  <https://cityscale.org/wp-content/uploads/2021/05/State-of-Local-Climate-Planning.pdf> |
| 1. Home Energy Score Model Ordinance Vote out | Staff shared out presentations on items that didn’t reach consensus from the Home Energy Score Model Ordinance presented in the last CAW meeting followed with open discussion from CAW members and 0 to 5 vote to reach Consensus.  **Compliance**  C.I wanted to make sure we thought this through. Well, on whether it's mandatory or voluntary because my assumption is the goal is to get everybody to update their Houses so that they are more energy efficient. So the question then is the energy score really where the emphasis needs to be? Or is it in actually getting something done? Secondly, if we're going to find somebody can we just make sure the fine is at the level necessary to make sure they fill out the energy score as opposed to making it costly that as if they had done it voluntarily. I'm not trying to block this I'm just, you know, it's really easy always to make something. Regulatory and I and I guess what I would like to hear from a realtor standpoint if this is going to happen when somebody list a house or a condo or whatever. What do you think is the best mechanism? For the real estate and the industry to encourage Landowners or to get on a stick with this.  C. I did share some additional information with Staff offline because there's just some process things about our AGS, proposal at this point that just wouldn't work with the current Northwest MLS.  There are a number of disclosures required when you're selling a property specifically through Washington state.  So I did make a request on behalf of this group to Northwest MLS to add a field to the listing data to include the fact that there would be in that there was an HS available and the date of the HS and then the score because currently in the green building disclosure information on the listing which is voluntary by the seller. This is not mandatory anywhere but voluntary is you can. Include an HERS score, which is a lot more detailed, but they don't have that data field, but it is all voluntary. It really, it can be mandatory in our areas, but our MLS is not going to enforce it. They'll be helpful hopefully to providing the data and then we talked a little bit about the timing of the fine and you know, I can go all over the, you know, my fellow realtors aren't gonna be happy if I say yes, fine homeowners. We’re just going to hit a lot of opposition, but to me, I keep trying to educate people that this score is a path towards the resources to improve the efficiency in homes which reduces greenhouse gas emissions and just that simple sentence. So it's going to be problematic, but I still think we should move forward and I do. Nothing voluntary works so, I think it needs to be mandatory and I've always felt that the, I actually feel the fine should be more, because it has to be a serious enough fine and also to fund the staffing support to implement this you know this is that's a funding source is a penalty but that's not going to be  popular. So it's not going to be mandatory in our MLS. And MLS may work with us to add this data field so that it's available for buyers and sellers in the 3 cities in the county. Hopefully it's a data field. And buyers and sellers see the benefits of having a home energy score and a path towards improving the built environment.  C.When I was sort of looking into this, I was thinking about how much money a program like this would generate. This program might in a year raise around $705,000. One of the reasons why I found this interesting is that most of these sales happen in the summer and I was thinking about like the jobs that would be required to do a program like this, not just in terms of enforcement and compliance.  Enforcement compliance staff jobs and those pieces can be very expensive. Then the other thing I was thinking about is like, how do we build in accommodations for that type of really intensive flux?  Homes happen to be sold in the summer when everyone's like sunny and hopeful and then like in the winter like it's relatively dead and what do we do about like the need and that type of like I don't know, increase that will happen and I'm thinking about this just in terms of like I am someone on the call that doesn't own a home currently and I know that this will likely be something that I end up paying for downstream. It's a really unique position here as someone who's not a homeowner who is aware that this is something that I will probably end up paying for but I'm also in agreement that if we're going to have a non-compliance fee like I'm happy to pump it up. I don't want all of the money to go into paying for the program itself. I would really want to be sure that the money that's being generated is enough to take care of all of the staff that are required. All the enforcement compliance, all the different pieces, the communications, all the things that cost a bunch of money.  C. I just have to wonder again, this is why I think there's a greater need to see what is already what already exists in other municipalities. I know that Seattle has talked about this in the past. There has to be some kind of plan on the state level where they've talked about doing this. So that you would see wider adoption by realtor corporations accepting this as like a line item, also making sure that this is like a funded agency that we aren't having to create whole cloth for the smaller, municipalities.  A.Staff  So in terms of the state working on this, there was a bill last legislative session to try and make home energy score the standard for any sort of program like this that any local government could do.  There was a brief time where there were amendments to that to create licensing requirements for whoever would be the inspector.  Tumwater was trying to apply for funds to support the, work that we're doing on the other campaign, we were talking to some workforce development folks in the area who are really stoked about this model being something that could not only be enacted in Thurston County, but Statewide to grow a workforce, especially for where there's a low barrier to become a home energy score assessor and creating pathways for people without four-year degrees or single mothers or different aspects of society that might want to do this kind of work with flexible work schedules having consistent reliable pay. Workforce folks in this community are really excited about this model ordinance being applied statewide. And there has been some State legislative discussion but no action on using home energy scores across the state.  A.Staff  In terms of how compliance and most accessor programs are set up especially at smaller municipalities, counties a lot of the QA QC and training and all of that is not necessarily done at the county or at the city. So we would work in partnership with a service provider who's going to QA QC up to 5% on their standards, for home energy score that they set at the federal level that we have to go back. We score just to make sure that, you know, scores across the border, so, QA, QMC and those and some of that is paid also through the assessors.  for like licensing and things like that, they're paying a QA QC fee.  So that's not necessarily all coming from the funding is not just one pool of funding coming from folks paying to have it because that assessment really is going to the assessor, right? That money is going to the assessor they're going to pay the assessor and then do other things like licensing and QAQC fees for each one that they're going to pay to the county or the city wherever the work's done, however we set that up. Then that pull of money would go to pay for a 3rd party of national partners that do this work. A big one is Earth Advantage. So there's some, there's ways to take the lift off of Staffing requirements because we're always talking about how we're low staffed, right.  Q. From Chat: In Thurston County, 3,527 homes were sold in 2023, most sales happen in the summer months (3527 x $200 = $705,400). Meaning that at certain times of the year there will be increased demand. What types of protections are going to be built in that accommodate that flux? Are we subsidizing getting people trained to be these types of inspectors or just hoping the market will take care of it? If so, how do we prevent the types of market manipulation that will increase the costs of these inspections since they’re required?Enforcement and compliance can be expensive and often requires staffing. How much of the money generated will go back into actually just funding the program itself? For something that does not lead to direct reduction in GHGs or emissions, I’m not sure why this was a priority.  A.There's a comment in the chat just to address it because I think it was mentioned a couple times and just for history as well, this is actually a specific action called out in the Thurston climate mitigation plan that will have a home energy score model ordnance and so at last year's retreat it was decided that this would be our regional initiative one part of it because it's a specific action under our strategies, energy, residential, energy use, I think is the sector. And so that's kind of how we came to where we are now and trying to get this through.  C.Thurston climate action team actually conducted I think it was in 2019 a series of workshop for community stakeholders and partners about this very proposal and got consensus among a variety of stakeholders including some of the realtors and financial institutions and other folks that this was a direction to go. So there's a pre-existing history of consensus and support for this kind of proposal.  Q.In terms of, I just want to get clarity. The QAQC that you were talking about does that include making sure that each and every or that a percentage of homes that listed actually have this score?  A.Staff  No, so it's to make sure that the scoring is continued to be legitimate and good that there's not people scoring against the methods that DOE has put in; it's to make sure that we have quality control for the scoring process itself. It's not necessarily for enforcement, it's to make sure that we're actually staying in compliance with the partner agreement with Department of Energy to use their product.  Like in Portland and the surrounding suburbs, when someone gets a home energy score, a portion of what they pay goes towards funding that QAQC so that doesn't come out of the jurisdictions budget that pays for that particular work that needs to be done to keep update with compliance with DOE.  Q.So how is it envisioned? Remind me how would that enforcement would take place? Who would who would pay the cost for that? How does that work?  A.Staff  The jurisdictions would do the staffing and to my understanding is that the national partners could potentially help in identifying properties that are not in compliance and then it would be up to the jurisdiction staff to go and write the notice of violation and do the steps after that. We could also do that in house, but it would be ideal with the different capacities that we all have, which are all limited, to have a national partner help with that aspect of identifying the properties that are not in compliance. That we can then use our compliance staff to reach out so that’s some additional staff time.  A.Staff  So just I'll say 2 things 1st is a lot of this some of this is starting to get into the finer details of program implementation which we really wouldn't be developing until an ornament is approved. We need to get the policy approved and then we go through this whole process of developing kind of like the finer details of how it gets implemented,  At this point we're just going through this process of developing concepts, coming up with kind of general cost estimates of what it's going to do, how it's going to be structured. There's a lot of different ways that enforcement could take place. I do think some of the jurisdictions that have adopted this and work with the national partner with those folks for part of the enforcement and just for the kind of scraping of Zillow and Redfin and that type of thing. So the partners will what they'll do is they'll keep an eye on that they'll do low run weekly reports that type of thing they'll notify the jurisdictions.  Ultimately it's the responsibility of the jurisdictions to do any actual enforcement of any kind of noticing or penalties or fines that would be associated with an ordinance. Part of what we'll be considering as a part of our, once we reach consensus on all of these different pieces of what it looks like has been estimating what is the staff need in order to meet this? We can't really estimate staffing needs until we get a sense of what the structure of the program is going to look like.  So there are lots of ways to structure this. We're just we're just not really there yet.I understand everyone wants to get into the details, but, it's kind of hard to answer those questions until we make some other decisions.  C.So let me make it really my comment really short then. I support a higher fine compliance fine as it’s more likely to get compliance.  Also just to comment on previous comments. I don't think we should count on the proceeds of the compliance lines to help pay for the program because ideally what we want is 0 noncompliance, 100% compliance in which case there would be no compliance Incompliance finds. I guess my main point is, you know, I'm ready to vote in favor of this and with the only comment that if other folks seem to be supporting a higher compliance fee and I'd support that as well.  **The CAW called a vote to pass the Compliance portion of the Home Energy Score Ordinance. There was consensus.**  **Applicability and Exemptions**  Q..My only comment is I've got an energy audit on my home, is it necessary to go through this or is there a Conversion type thing that would make it exempt?  A.Staff  I think we would need to talk about what methods were used for that, how long ago they were used and kind of figure out those details of what would be acceptable and what would not and flush out those details.  Q.So is that something that we would work out on implementation to consider that?  A.Staff  Yes.  QC. So, my biggest question was probably about the suitable building types. I understand more recent communications that, the HTS, there's new approaches being developed so the HTS can be applied to these, some of these other building types. So with the provision that that would be applicable as soon as that technology is available. Then I'm comfortable with moving forward.  C.. I'm very skeptical of new building standards and how long they're going to last and I don't think there should be any exemptions because I think that a lot of new construction. We just don't know. how long it's going to last and I know that like federal standards have changed and actually been lowered for how long materials are supposed to last for so I don't think exceptions should be made at all.  A.Staff  Just to clarify, we're not proposing any exemptions for new construction just because it's new construction. It would be if it's new construction or really any other building that already is certified to some sort of energy standard so there's no new construction exemption in the staff proposal.  **The CAW called a vote to pass the Applicability and Exemptions portion of the Home Energy Score Ordinance. There was consensus.** |
| 1. 2025 Regional Initiative Selection | Staff shared out a presentation on Regional Initiatives selection and criteria for advancing proposed initiatives  Staff also shared out 2025 regional initiatives options table. CAW members asked questions and gave comments, recommendations and feedback for the next Executive Committee meeting. CAW members then voted on which Regional Initiative they wanted to move forward.  **CAW Discussion**  C. In order to support mass transit and other multimodal infrastructure you have to have density. So I'm assuming that would get all covered including what needs to happen in each of the municipalities or how many to make a successful initiative, to move forward and provide alternatives to driving your car everywhere.  A.Staff  Yeah, those 2 are definitely connected and considered a part of the scope of work. We know that one of the most important things that supports reducing vehicle miles traveled, it's their land use patterns and what your density is underlying that. You’ll notice in the description of the deliverable, we talk about trends related to vehicle miles traveled and housing density and so looking at those as a comprehensive picture.  C.I just, I just wanted to mention, or bring up that part of the conversation around these 2 issues at the retreat where that, that T 1 and T 5 have been tried and the past and it's been hard to get, those initiatives through from executive members. Then  from the second issue that I, what was most appealing about that one to me was, the achievability of that goal.  I'm like 50 50 on both of them, but I felt like that was a really, important, point that was brought up during the retreat for people that weren't there.  A.Staff  The staff team we’ve had quite a bit of conversation and discussion about this after that executive team meeting, or sorry, the retreat and kind of how to address that issue. We know we can't reach our greenhouse gas reduction goals if we don't reduce VMT.  We know there's a lot that underlines that and how we get there and we know it's particularly challenging and so the question is like what's going on? Why isn't it working? We know the jurisdictions in the cities have set goals in the past but that doesn't mean that we've created policies and programs and investments necessary to achieve those goals related to The MT reduction and so it continues to be an area of it's complicated and it's hard and there's a lot of resistance to the types of policies and investments that need to happen in order to get there.  Q.I don't understand the multifamily thing.  A.  Expanding the working on a future expansion of the home energy score model, ordinance to include multi-family manufactured housing, doing a white paper to kind of show us the direction for how to do that after the initial one has ideally passed.  QC.  I guess that's the further development of the HTS, right? Okay, I'm going to vote for that.  C.Thank you. Yeah, I put a link in the chat that I think is really interesting from the US energy information administration and if you click on if you scroll down and go to consumption by sector you'll see a pie chart and it shows consumption by sector in Washington state and transportation is by and far the largest part of our energy consumption.I think that this is something that requires a government response, you know, I've said this before.  I'll say it again Olympia had better public transit a hundred years ago than it does today because it had street cars have had transportation that people wanted to take.  I think we need big bold imaginations. I think you've seen cities all across Europe with a lot less billionaires living in them who have much better public transit than we do in Washington state.  I think there's also a lot of energy consumption coming out of Washington to the state with totally unrelated, but something we have to keep our eyes on like Microsoft, all these other industries are starting to invest in AI and looking into many nuclear reactors because they're drawing so much energy. So energy consumption is only going to go up in the next couple of years because of where US funding is going towards and AI and you know, block chain and all that stuff is drawing huge amounts of energy, just things to think about. I think that connecting with other communities on ways that we can reduce our independence on cars by providing transportation that people actually want to take. So again, I just I think that this is a really exciting opportunity to build and like pitch Washington as the place where it is being built and imagine a Thurston County that is linked by a mass transit system that links to other parts of Washington because honestly it's the traffic here is ridiculous.  <https://www.eia.gov/state/?sid=WA#tabs-2>  C. So I just, I just want everybody to think of it in terms of like, What can we build? How much different can we make this community look? And this white paper is the opportunity again to learn from other communities and what they're doing and really kind of consolidate our power and influence as a lobbying block to like say okay we are just asking this is like community we are demanding this as states and link up with other states to demand like, okay, we need investments not just in electric vehicles built by Elon Musk, but in electric vehicles built by Americans that are trains, not just individual use.  C.So I just wanted to share that I'm absolutely on board with everything said and Active T 1 and T 5 are pragmatism if we continue to develop the home energy score and are able to link Property owners to solutions and funding to improve the built environment. To me we need some evidence of achieving something and to me the home energy score is part of that because then if the public or individual people in Thurston County see a benefit from these changes, then they're going to vote to have more money and more resources devoted to continuing that work, which would include T 1 and T 5.  QC. I think showing Material improvements in people's lives as quickly as possible is very important to us establishing a political base and continuing a successful program. I think, it's evident in in the pros and cons, particularly of these 2 alternatives that the extension of the home energy score to other housing types produces results much  more quickly than the other alternative. I think they're both necessary. I support them both. And I think the next thing to do is continue with our work on building energy until we can see actual meaningful, measurable results and so far we were not seeing a lot of that.  I guess the biggest question I have is can we how can we get to results as quickly as possible?I think there's a tendency, I'm not saying that the staff is proposing this at all, I think your staff is very much action oriented but from a public perspective we want to, as we go forward, have fewer studies and more action.The last thing I want to say is I want to talk a little bit about Thurston County in comparison to the rest of the state of Washington with regard to where our greenhouse gas emissions are coming from. Our actual Thurston County data for greenhouse gas inventory shows that, have significantly more emissions coming from the building energy sector than from transportation. And so I, you know, I know it's different in different parts of the state. I just want to make it clear that most of our our current inventory that we're relying on for guidance shows that the bulk of it comes from building energy and 32% of it comes from specifically from residential energy usage. I support  mass transit and rapid transit throughout the state. I saw an article just the other day that the state received an initial grant to start building toward a high speed rail system that would go from Seattle all the way down into Oregon. So I think the pieces are being put in place for that kind of system and I totally support it at a statewide level. But for our county for what we're trying to do here locally I would much prefer continuing to pursue the home energy score work and the work that will produce reduce emissions in our in our building sector.  C.I am definitely aligned with the long term view of making sure we're connected by mass transit to other communities.  I'm also a cyclist as I probably mentioned before. The 4 jurisdictions have different approaches to trails, walking trails, etc. And they're very inconsistent and it seems like the permitting process negotiates stuffvso you end up with less than ideal situations. So I would like it to be safer for cyclists to actually commute around the county in a way that doesn't mean you have to have a bike lane on every road.  If you actually expect people to use cycling to get from point A to point B for commuting you got to have dedicated lanes. If you want them to go shopping you got to have bike places at the shopping centers or a path to get to that shopping center. To support all of this and mass transit you have to make sure development goes up, not out. I'm also a big fan of making sure the counties and cities don't expand their urban growth boundaries so it  doesn't sprawl out into the rural areas.  I agree with the concept of expanding that when it's ready. Based on the information we've been given by staff it looks like we're dependent on the Department of Energy getting there first,  I do have concerns on the transportation that we can't make a difference in the compliance and that's concerning to me.  C.. Yeah, I also feel the sense of like urgency around the transportation where it's just something that you see you put in place.  As soon as possible because it's going to take so long to actually implement. So I'm very motivated by that. We need to also build like visibility and a sense of progress and the whole community. So people are noticing that something's happening with the building thing at the same time maybe I'm satisfied with okay. You know, we're already working on that to some extent.There could be some lessons learned that would actually allow the later rollout to be better.  C.I just want to start by saying I would not block anything, I support both proposals. I just really lean more towards the 1st one.  When I think about the 40% shortage that we're talking about that we're going to be short of our goals the small measurable pieces do make sense in terms of like, you know, we're feeling pretty desperate. We want to win on some of this stuff but I think that the problem of climate change is so big that it's so impossible to imagine how many individual problems or individual swaps we would need to do to make the type of like actually large scale change that we need and so for me we will always have to do this type of assessment and it's just whether or not we're kicking the can down the road and so I really love to do things from a really informed perspective from a really informed position. So for me it's really important to think about like what are all of our options on the table? What is like a best strategy here and we can keep doing these sort of like individual potential things in the hopes that maybe it will solve a very small, like, a portion of the problem that we need to solve, but I'm not sure that it will ever get us towards that 40%.So that is why I'm really adamant about supporting the 1st proposal. Thank you all.  C.  I guess I could say something. Yeah, I'm definitely in favor for the 1st one.There were a lot of good reasons, tossed around, but I think especially with like at least in Olympian the area as I am.  I think that there's a lot of young people who are able to afford less and less and it's become a problem of transportation becoming completely and accessible to a lot of people and I definitely think that at least like looking through that perspective of like students and people who are going to go you know, if we're going to enter into being like adults and stuff like that in the future, I feel like it's really important to advocate for these bigger things for them because this is a thing that will come later, but I think that it will make a huge impact if we can actually like if the county can make transportation just more widespread, more accessible. So people don't have to rely on cars and worse than climate change. That’s it, small point.  C.  Thank you. I agree with what was just said and it makes me think of the disparities in income and wealth and how cars, it's 1 of our biggest expenses. And people in, you know, in more urban areas then others really rely on it. So I don't have too much to say that's why didn't I come off but that's my opinion. Thank you.  **The CAW voted to pass Transportation as the 2025 Regional Initiative . There was majority vote 7 to 2**  C.Staff  The consideration is that we continue to work for the 2025 regional initiative but also any further TCMC work as well.  What's going to happen next is we're going to take Option 1,T 1, T 5 and we're going to include comments from folks who didn't reach consensus we're going to move that one forward to the EC.  if they approved then that's what's going to be our 2025.  Regional initiative.  <https://www.trpc.org/DocumentCenter/View/11400/2021-Thurston-GHG-Inventory-TRPC-2023-01-06pdf?bidId>=  **CAW member Shannon Sipher volunteered and will serve as CAW representative at the next Executive Committee meeting. The staff team will meet on June 7th to discuss next steps for presentation of the CAW open letter and public commentary for June 24th Executive Committee Meeting.** |
| 1. Adjourn | The meeting was adjourned at 6:06 P.M. |
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