

TCMC 2025 ANNUAL RETREAT SUMMARY

Friday 9/19/2025, 1 – 5 PM

Agenda and meeting presentations can be found here:

https://thurstonclimatecollaborative.org/tcmc-annual-retreat-meetings/

Agend	a Item	Notes
1.	Welcome	Retreat attendees were welcomed to the event and shown the agenda while they got their lunch.
2.	Lunch & Relationship Building Activity	Retreat participants participated in a relationship- building exercise over lunch
3.	TCMC Status and Implementation Update	Pamela Braff from the TCMC Staff Team gave a presentation outlining the progress made towards TCMP goals, as well as the costs associated with administering the TCMC. This presentation served as a primer for the discussion that followed, which asked retreat participants to consider the following questions: 1. What are the pros and cons of regional collaboration for climate change? 2. Which TCMC administrative, monitoring and reporting tasks are critical for implementation? Can any be eliminated? Can the frequency or scope of any tasks be reduced? 3. How should the role of the TCMC evolve to address changing needs and recent learnings? Retreat attendees had an opportunity to ask some clarifying questions before moving onto this guided discussion.
	Activity: Guided Discussion	1. What are the pros and cons of regional collaboration for climate change? Pros: Shared resources Accessibility Collective impact – breaks out of silos to address cross-cutting climate issues Assistance across jurisdictions

- Increased efficiency + impact
- The landscape is continuous, ignores humancreated borders
- Consolidate action and info in place
 - Accessibility
 - Decreases confusion, makes for a clearer and more consistent message
- Leverage funding, planning, sharing knowledge
- Representatives hear from a broader crosssection, and are able to amplify the different voices in their jurisdictions
- Cost savings

Cons:

- Time-intensive process
 - Slower to align processes
 - Harder to get consensus with more parties involved
 - o Need to ensure consistent messaging
- Accountability issues
- Clarity needed over who does what
- Difficult to maintain consistency over time
 - How do you maintain goals, priorities across legislative terms, changes in staffing, etc.?
 - Time consuming to get new staff, elected officials up to speed
- Each jurisdiction has a unique constituency with different priorities and needs, different levels of climate education and awareness
- Need to maintain funding from more than one governing body
- Competing priorities of jurisdiction vs. TCMC can spread staff too thin
- Teasing out local issues
- There are actions that TCMC still has no control over (e.g. Intercity Transit)
- Departments in each jurisdiction are approaching action differently

2. Which TCMC administrative, monitoring and reporting tasks are critical for implementation? Can any be eliminated? Can the frequency or scope of any tasks be reduced?

Participants identified several activities that could be reduced or eliminated:

- Eliminate staff team meeting summaries.
- Eliminate 2025 administrative update.
- <u>Reduce</u> frequency of the comprehensive and formatted annual report, likely to align with the frequency of full greenhouse gas inventories (GHGIs), which are completed every three years. Continue to produce scaled-down updates on progress in other years.
- <u>Reduce</u> frequency of CAW meetings to either every other month or quarterly meetings. If the number of CAW meetings is reduced, meetings may be longer and/or offered in a hybrid format.
- <u>Reduce</u> EC meetings to 3 times per year.

3. How should the role of the TCMC evolve to address changing needs and recent learnings?

Retreat participants focused on improving and expanding collaboration moving forward, both with existing partners and by forging new relationships. They also discussed relying on volunteer-led efforts to advance climate action to get more work accomplished with limited resources.

4. Break

5. Community
Implementation of
Climate Actions

Eleanor Garrett, one of the TCMC facilitators, gave a brief presentation discussing community-led climate initiatives, sharing some examples of community and partner-led climate action both in the region and across the country. This presentation served as a primer for the activity that followed.

Activity: What, How, Who?

Retreat participants again broke into two groups and reviewed select actions from the TCMP that could feasibly be implemented at the community level. Each group discussed the steps that would be needed in order to begin implementing some of these actions. Both groups agreed that a good starting point for community-led climate action would be Action G 1.7:

	Social research and behavior change campaigns — Work with higher education institutions to research effective behavior change through marketing and education. Use this information in developing campaigns to reduce high emissions greenhouse gases.
	One group suggested incorporating climate change into school curriculums, or establishing pilot programs through schools. The other group mocked up a potential pilot program for altering waste management behaviors utilizing university-led research to guide the direction of the program. Overall, both groups agreed that the actions laid out on the table during this activity would be possible to implement, at least in part, without dedicated staff time or jurisdiction funding.
6. Final Reflection & Next Steps	The TCMC facilitators and Staff Team thanked participants for attending and engaging in the
	conversations and activities.

Meeting summary was prepared by the consultant (EXP) and TCMC Staff Team. This summary is not verbatim.