

Snohomish County Ad Hoc Climate Action Advisory Committee (CAAC)

Meeting 5: Meeting Summary

Wednesday August 26, 2020
5pm-7pm

- CAAC Member Attendees: Tom Campbell, Stan Gent, Anthony Gromko, Linda Lyshall, Ian McCluskey, Suzy Oversvee, Jake Salvador, Jeanine SanClemente, Margaret Seaney, Patrick Sisneros, Jon Witte.
- CAAC Members not present: Ryan Miller, Yolimar Rivera Vazquez
- Special Guest: Garrison Marr (Snohomish PUD, co-presenter)
- County Staff: Lisa Dulude, Kevin Ruuhela

(Underlined Italics indicate action items/decisions; follow-up items in bold italics)

Agenda

1. **Roll-call** (5 min)
2. **Updates** (5 min)
3. **'Energy 101'** – Snohomish PUD, Suzy Oversvee and Garrison Marr (40 min)
 - **Presentation Question:** What actions should the County take to reduce the greatest amount of greenhouse gas emissions?
 - Linda Lyshall – electric vehicles is a key area
 - Tom Campbell - Incentives around reducing GHG emissions
 - **Member Question (Pat):** What does the last 6 months mean in terms of energy for Snohomish County?
 - Response from Suzy Oversee: drop in commercial sales, shift to residential customers.
 - Response from Garrison Marr: On an annual average basis – PUD load is 720-730 avg. megawatts. The estimated impact of COVID-19 is a change in 10-12 avg. megawatts.
 - Secondary impact – aerospace industry – changes in this industry can have an impact due to it being their largest customer.
 - As a percentage of the total electricity that PUD provides, its almost all (98%) carbon free. Snohomish PUD is uniquely different than peers in the region and especially across the country. PUD energy mix (2018) purchased from Bonneville Power Administration (BPA):
 - ~80% hydropower
 - ~10% Nuclear

- ~Wind - 3 wind farms in Columbia Gorge region
 - ~2% Market Purchases – If/when PUD does not have enough generating resources to meet demand, PUD purchases excess supply in advance to account for demand forecasting. Market purchases potentially contain carbon, and PUD does not account for these as “carbon free”
- **Member Question (Jeanine):** Is there reason for concern that PUD is overly reliant on Bonneville Power Association (BPA)? Member expressed concern that as we see a big shift towards green energy, that PUD may be in competition with other utilities to get clean energy in the future.
 - Response from Garrison Marr (PUD): We expect more demand for BPA resources from other utilities in the future. The Clean Energy Transformation Act (CETA) created most of this demand. However, BPA is required by Federal government to give us this energy at a set cost.
- **Member Question (Tom):** It seems as though we need to be as aggressive in providing incentives for green and renewable energy as financially possible. How aggressive can we be?
 - Response from PUD: PUD has an existing solar program.
 - Member Response: As a builder, Tom Campbell has found it difficult to make the solar and some new construction efficiency measures pencil out for high performing homes – even with PUD incentives.
- **Member Question (Jon):** How do we navigate the fine line for pushing for a cleaner use of energy?
 - Response from PUD: Our team quantifies the electrification risk for many variables well into the future, as well as electricity demand (i.e. times of day and seasons is electricity use at its peak). Solar costs continue to come down, and conservation defers needs for investments by flattening the load curve. The PUD is also working to find controllable and flexible loads. Lastly, the Clean Energy Transformation Act (CETA) requires utilities to use 100% lean electric resources by 2030.
- **Member Question (Stan):** The PUD fuel mix is 80% hydroelectric (fixed energy amount) with winter peak demands, how will PUD generate new energy for this demand.
 - Response from PUD: Conservation has historically been able to keep us within the BPA contractual rights. The ‘ceiling’ for hydropower under our BPA contract can go up, and BPA has a contractual obligation to provide PUD with additional power in the future.

4. **Plan Scan Report Out (30 min)** – *This agenda item was moved to the September agenda.*

5. **County Government GHGs and Reduction Targets** – Lisa & Kevin (20 min)

a. Update/snap-shot of GHG trends from County gov’t operations (see slides)

- **Staff Comment:** OES staff is still working on this 2018 Inventory Report and filling-in data gaps. We are also trying to use publicly available tools to estimate GHGs from purchased goods and services (scope 3), and research has shown that Scope 3 can be one of the largest emissions for government operations and the community. We are also trying to estimate GHGs from refrigerants in County HVAC equipment.

b. GHG reduction target discussion (see discussion guides below)

- **Staff Comments on finding appropriate GHG reduction targets:**

- i. Recent climate action plans have looked at the Paris Agreement for a temperature cap, and the IPCC reports for reduction targets.
- ii. If our cap is 1.5 degrees (i.e. Paris Agreement) and have a 2010 baseline, the IPCC chart shows that with a 41% - 72% reduction in GHGs, it is more unlikely than likely to stay under the 1.5 degree temperature cap.
- iii. Staff proposals for a target A-C (see Discussion Guide).
- iv. PSRC/PSCAA's reduction targets use a 1990 baseline. Snohomish County (along with many other communities) does not have emissions data from 1990. If agencies do not have data from 1990, it seems like a meaningless target for the region to adopt.
- **Member comments on finding appropriate GHG reduction targets:**
 - Tom-We may need different baselines for different action plans
 - Linda-Like 'Proposal A' and should include an incremental goal rather than just "by 2050".
- **Additional Member comments:**
 - Tom-Oakland's Action Plan has emphasis on equity
 - Stan – Will send info on the carbon drawdown program and community tasks to be taken to maximize reduction every time.
 - Jon – Can we capture methane/GHGs at Cathcart landfill and use it?
 - Staff comment: The landfill has been closed for sometime and the GHGs/methane is on a downward trend/doesn't pencil out. County did build the seed crusher dryer facility to use landfill emissions, but did not get interest from farmers.
- **Member comments in 'Chat':**
 - Jeanine - The Climate Impact Tool that Public Works has purchased may be useful for people to see.
 - Jeanine - How much will the 100% clean electricity pledge affect our ability to meet a lowered GHG goal?
 - Jeanine - A point of interest—if counties do not meet the PSRC goals, they can lose federal transportation funding.
 - Suzy - WA Solar Summit, 10/16, \$75. Also, Clean Energy Leadership summit in I think November. I agree with Linda's comment about having a benchmark prior to 2050.

6. Comprehensive Plan Update – Tom (15 min)

- a. GMA and climate change
- b. [Project fact sheet](#)
- c. [Get email updates](#)

7. Other Discussion Items (5 min)

AGENDA ITEM #5: County GHG Reduction Target – Discussion Guide

1. **Paris Climate Agreement¹** (December 12, 2015)
 - a. The Paris Agreement central aim is to strengthen the global response to the threat of climate change by keeping a global temperature rise this century well below 2 degrees Celsius above pre-industrial levels and to pursue efforts to limit the temperature increase even further to 1.5 degrees Celsius
2. **IPCC – 5th Assessment** (Climate Change 2014 - Synthesis Report Summary For Policymakers)
 - a. More unlikely than likely that a 41-72% reduction by 2050 will result in staying under 1.5 degrees C temperature increase

Table SPM.1 | Key characteristics of the scenarios collected and assessed for WGIII AR5. For all parameters the 10th to 90th percentile of the scenarios is shown*. (Table 3.1)

CO ₂ -eq Concentrations in 2100 (ppm CO ₂ -eq) ^f Category label (conc. range)	Subcategories	Relative position of the RCPs ^d	Change in CO ₂ -eq emissions compared to 2010 (in %) ^e		Likelihood of staying below a specific temperature level over the 21st century (relative to 1850–1900) ^{4,*}			
			2050	2100	1.5°C	2°C	3°C	4°C
<430	Only a limited number of individual model studies have explored levels below 430 ppm CO ₂ -eq ¹							
450 (430 to 480)	Total range ^{a,*}	RCP2.6	-72 to -41	-118 to -78	More unlikely than likely	Likely	Likely	Likely
500 (480 to 530)	No overshoot of 530 ppm CO ₂ -eq		-57 to -42	-107 to -73	Unlikely	More likely than not		
	Overshoot of 530 ppm CO ₂ -eq		-55 to -25	-114 to -90		About as likely as not		
550 (530 to 580)	No overshoot of 580 ppm CO ₂ -eq		-47 to -19	-81 to -59		More unlikely than likely ^f		
	Overshoot of 580 ppm CO ₂ -eq		-16 to 7	-183 to -86				
(580 to 650)	Total range	RCP4.5	-38 to 24	-134 to -50	Unlikely	More likely than not		
(650 to 720)	Total range		-11 to 17	-54 to -21		Unlikely	More unlikely than likely	
(720 to 1000) ^b	Total range	RCP6.0	18 to 54	-7 to 72	Unlikely ^h	Unlikely	Unlikely	More unlikely than likely
>1000 ^b	Total range	RCP8.5	52 to 95	74 to 178	Unlikely ^h	Unlikely	Unlikely	More unlikely than likely

3. **Establishing a County GHG Reduction Target**
 - a. Important for moving forward with our climate action plans.
 - b. Selection of a GHG reduction target and overlap with MPPs, CPPs, GPPs
 - c. Develop recommendation for and/or dialogue with County elected officials
4. **Local government GHG targets - Findings from Plan Scan Review**
 - a. For reports released since Paris Agreement, there are two common targets: 1) 80% reduction by 2050 (baseline ~2005-2007, 2010), or 2) Carbon Neutral by 2050

¹ Paris Agreement Resources:
<https://unfccc.int/process-and-meetings/the-paris-agreement/the-paris-agreement>
<https://unfccc.int/process-and-meetings/the-paris-agreement/what-is-the-paris-agreement>

- b. For reports released prior to Paris Agreement, the Kyoto Protocol targets² and/or the UN and EU’s extension of the Kyoto Protocol (i.e. 20% below 2000 levels by 2020), are more common.

5. Target Setting Discussion

- a. Proposal A: Carbon Neutrality by 2050
- b. Proposal B: 80% reduction by 2050 (~2010 baseline)
- c. Proposal C: PSCCA/PSRC Vision 2050 target: 50% below 1990 levels by 2030 and 80% below 1990 levels by 2050. *See Notes 1 and 2 under Comp Plan Update 1a below.*

AGENDA ITEM #6: Comp Plan Update – Discussion Guide

1. County is in the process of reviewing and conducting a ‘crosswalk’ the PSRC’s Vision 2050 multicounty planning policies (MPPs), and the countywide planning policies (CPPs), which will ultimately impact the GPPs (County’s comp plan policies). Vision 2050 has ramped up by adding a new specific climate change chapter. Opportunities for involvement and providing input on CPPs/GPPs.
 - a. **GHG reduction target setting:** Should the CPPs and/or GPPs include standards that are higher than “established state and federal standards”? In the Climate Change Goal, VISION 2050 references the Puget Sound Clean Air Agency’s GHG goals (50% below 1990 levels by 2030 and 80% below 1990 levels by 2050).
 - Note 1: Many communities do not have GHG inventory data for 1990.
 - Note 2: If goal is to keep temperature increase below 1.5 degrees C (i.e. Paris Agreement), then PSRC’s target is likely inadequate (i.e. see IPCC chart on previous page).
 - b. **Tree canopy:**
 - i. Significant community/stakeholder area of interest and with the County’s new Healthy Forest Project.
 1. Note 1: Discuss potential for setting a tree canopy coverage target(s), and corresponding considerations (e.g. timeframe, equitable distribution and benefits to underserved communities, habitat corridors and habitat preservation, etc).

² Kyoto Protocol: [5 per cent emission reduction compared to 1990 levels over the five year period 2008–2012 \(the first commitment period\).](#)