

# Snohomish County Ad Hoc Climate Action Advisory Committee (CAAC)

## Meeting 6: Draft Meeting Summary

Tuesday September 22, 2020

5pm-7pm

- Committee members present: Tom Campbell, Suzy Oversvee, Pat Sisneros, Jeanine San Clemente, Ian McCluskey, Yolimar Rivera-Vazquez, Margaret Seaney, Jon Witte, Linda Lyshall, Stan Gent, Anthony Gromko
- Committee members not in attendance: Ryan Miller, Jake Salvador
- County Staff: Lisa Dulude, Kevin Ruuhela

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

**1. Roll Call** (5 min)

**2. Updates** (5 min)

- a. SnoPUD has EV rebates available for residential level 2 available now.

**3. Plan Scan Report Out** (45 min)

- a. Report of findings/key-takeaways from members that reviewed a local government climate action plan

### **CAAC Members Plan Scan Findings:**

- King County (2015) plan was good – key takeaways: clear baseline & targets – (25% 2020, 50% by 2030, 80% by 2050), focus on local agriculture & food systems
- City of Seattle – focus on EVs
- King County (2020 plan) – status updates at 2 & 4 year intervals, new section on resilient communities, added Climate Equity task force, 3 primary sections: Reducing GHG emissions, Sustainable & Frontline Communities, Preparing for Climate Change; emphasis on collaboration
- City of Everett – well developed plan w/ aspirational goals, adopted by City Council, clear targets, strong focus on EVs; con: not a lot of detail on implementation, not a lot of quantification
- City of Oakland – “Equitable Climate Action Plan”, format & structure was excellent; centered equity in all aspects (similar to King County), realistic

- goals, lead agency identified for each goal along with the climate benefit(s), strong community involvement and support -> lead to quick substantive changes; specific goals categorized by 'ease of implementation'; includes info on funding strategies
- City of Bellingham – met goals initially but population growth prevented further goal achievement; no climate change adaptation focus, no focus on equity; encourages pilot projects, uses gamification to encourage employee/resident ideas, employees are educated on GHG implications of actions
  - City of Vancouver (CA) – very comprehensive, interval progress reports, stays at a high level – more policy focused than specific actions, internal carbon pricing (\$150/ton of CO<sub>2</sub>e initially & increases by 1.06 annually), used LCCA and includes carbon costs
  - City of Edmonds – adopted a specific target re: global warming (1.5 degrees C), did not implement a specific “tax” for carbon offsets but rather just include offsets as a budget line item,

**Member Question:** Has any community achieved their community goals? Are there studies on the ROI (\$ and Environmental) on conversion to govt EV fleet? What are funding strategies that have been used?

- b. 'Plan Scan' findings and climate action planning
  - i. Draft timeline for SOAP 2020 and community CAP process (Lisa)

#### 4. County Government GHG Reduction Targets (20 min)

- a. Review of reduction target proposals from August meeting & recommended target (Lisa)
- b. Committee discussion
- c. Vote on gov't operations reduction target
  - Tom proposes Motion to approve Proposal A (proposals listed below) for county operations goal, seconded by Jeanine. Motion passed unanimously.
  - Interest in including additional clarification in final goals (Scope 3 inclusion, etc.) as well as interim goals (**Interim goals have been planned by OES staff; will present to CAAC when recommendations are developed**)

#### 5. County's Comprehensive Plan & Climate Change Update – (Tom, 20 min)

- Tom & Lisa met w/ County PDS department and had a discussion on the general approach for including climate & environmental issues into the County's next Comprehensive Plan. Committee recommendations on planning policies will be helpful & appreciated.

## **6. Equity and Engaging Frontline Communities – (20 min)**

- a. Start developing a list of community groups, members, stakeholders to engage, particularly BIPOC and frontline groups (with contacts, if feasible)
  - i. City of Portland developed a case study on the various aspects of community engagement and equity in developing the city's climate action plan. Similar approach with King County (2020) and City of Oakland plans.
  - ii. Need to balance the national/global circumstances with committee's expectations for community group involvement and timing on goal setting.

## **7. Wrap-Up (5 min)**

- **Tasks for next meeting**
  - CAAC members encouraged to pursue research into policy, strategies, programs, etc (ex. Carbon pricing) for inclusion in SOAP or Community climate plan.
  - CAAC members encouraged to pursue research and propose any ideas for funding that can be used to support climate planning process, in particular community engagement (ex. compensation/reimbursement for community participation)

## Discussion Guide for Agenda Item #4a

### Review GHG reduction targets from August meeting:

- Proposal A: Carbon Neutrality by 2050
- Proposal B: 80% reduction by 2050
- 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 below.*

#### *Notes on Target Setting:*

1. In PSRC's VISION 2050, the climate change goal references the Puget Sound Clean Air Agency's GHG goals (50% below 1990 levels by 2030 and 80% below 1990 levels by 2050).
2. Many communities do not have GHG inventory data for 1990. Getting this data and/or modeling may be challenging. Unclear how GHG reduction outcomes match-up as IPCC chart uses a 2010 baseline and PSRC uses a 1990 baseline.

**Recommended GHG reduction goal for government operations:** OES staff is recommending Proposal A – carbon neutrality by 2050 for County government operations. This recommendation was developed by looking at both the global best available science (i.e. IPCC latest reports) to identify an appropriate goal, and the global direction/consensus on target setting via a temperature cap (i.e. Paris Climate Agreement). This proposed recommendation also evaluated the feasibility of carbon neutrality by 2050 based on the preliminary results of the 2018 GHG Inventory for Snohomish County government operations. As such, staff believes that this GHG reduction target is both feasible and meaningful with a focus on direct reduction in local GHGs.

**Approach<sup>1</sup>:** OES staff is researching best practices for an approach to achieve a carbon neutrality goal:

- Scope 1 and 2 GHGs, and limited set of Scope 3 GHGs (anticipated SnoCo baseline year 2000)
- Focus on direct emissions reduction, as opposed to an accounting or off-set approach
- Establish interim GHG emissions targets

---

<sup>1</sup> Research reference: The Climate Registry LGO Protocol, Carbon Neutral Certification protocol, [KC's Carbon Neutrality Plan for government operations](#).

## County GHG Reduction Target

1. **Paris Climate Agreement<sup>2</sup>** (December 12, 2015)
  - 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)
  - 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<sup>a</sup>. (Table 3.1)

CO <sub>2</sub> -eq Concentrations in 2100 (ppm CO <sub>2</sub> -eq) <sup>f</sup> Category label (conc. range)	Subcategories	Relative position of the RCPs <sup>d</sup>	Change in CO <sub>2</sub> -eq emissions compared to 2010 (in %) <sup>e</sup>		Likelihood of staying below a specific temperature level over the 21st century (relative to 1850–1900) <sup>g,h</sup>			
			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 <sub>2</sub> -eq <sup>i</sup>							
450 (430 to 480)	Total range <sup>a,9</sup>	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 <sub>2</sub> -eq		-57 to -42	-107 to -73	Unlikely	More likely than not		
	Overshoot of 530 ppm CO <sub>2</sub> -eq		-55 to -25	-114 to -90		About as likely as not		
550 (530 to 580)	No overshoot of 580 ppm CO <sub>2</sub> -eq		-47 to -19	-81 to -59	Unlikely	More unlikely than likely <sup>j</sup>	Likely	
	Overshoot of 580 ppm CO <sub>2</sub> -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	Likely	
(650 to 720)	Total range		-11 to 17	-54 to -21		Unlikely		
(720 to 1000) <sup>b</sup>	Total range	RCP6.0	18 to 54	-7 to 72	Unlikely <sup>k</sup>	More unlikely than likely	Likely	
>1000 <sup>b</sup>	Total range	RCP8.5	52 to 95	74 to 178	Unlikely <sup>k</sup>	Unlikely		More unlikely than likely

### 3. 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
- b. For reports released prior to Paris Agreement, the Kyoto Protocol targets<sup>3</sup> and/or the UN and EU's extension of the Kyoto Protocol (i.e. 20% below 2000 levels by 2020), are more common.

### 4. Target Setting Discussion

- a. Proposal A: Carbon Neutrality by 2050
- b. Proposal B: 80% reduction by 2050 (~2010 baseline)
- c. Proposal C: PSSCA/PSRC Vision 2050 target: 50% below 1990 levels by 2030 and 80% below 1990 levels by 2050. *See notes below.*

<sup>2</sup> 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>

<sup>3</sup> Kyoto Protocol: [5 per cent emission reduction compared to 1990 levels over the five year period 2008–2012 \(the first commitment period\).](#)

*Notes on Target Setting:*

- i. In PSRC's VISION 2050, the climate change goal references the Puget Sound Clean Air Agency's GHG goals (50% below 1990 levels by 2030 and 80% below 1990 levels by 2050).
  - o Many communities do not have GHG inventory data for 1990. Getting this data and/or modeling may be challenging. Unclear how GHG reduction outcomes match-up as IPCC chart uses a 2010 baseline and PSRC uses a 1990 baseline.