

MINUTES FOR THE CLIMATE & ENERGY ACTION PLAN ad hoc COMMITTEE
Wednesday, February 15, 2017
Siskiyou Room, 51 Winburn Way

1. Call to Order

Councilor Rich Rosenthal called the meeting to order at 5:30 p.m.

Committee members Bryan Sohl, Isaac Bevers, Cindy Bernard, Louise Shawkat, Stuart Green, James McGinnis, Roxane Beigel-Coryell, Jim Hartman, Claire Prior, Greg Jones, and Marni Koopman were present. Staff member Adam Hanks was present. Committee member Claudia Alick was absent.

Rosenthal thanked the group for their many meetings of work.

2. Public Input

Carson Berry – thanked the group for their work. Stated that he has been working with others in support of the ordinance and he thanked the group for their support of the ordinance. He encouraged the group to push the ordinance forward fast and stated that there is no time to lose.

Allie Rosenbluth – thanked the group for holding such a thoughtful process. She stated that we live in a creative community and she is grateful to be in such a thoughtful space. She knows that this process would not have been done without the work of this group and understands that the actions of the plan can't be completed without the creative community we live in.

Robert Block-Brown – stated that he is extremely proud to be a citizen of Ashland. He has attended state-wide climate action meetings and folks there are blown away by the depth and breadth of the Ashland plan and the community's commitment to support the plan. He stated that other groups are still talking about carbon but this group is clearly talking about all polluting gases, which makes us multiple steps ahead of most other communities. Ashland should be a leader in the State but we need to recognize that real change isn't possible without the entire state making an effort.

James Stephens – stated that he echoes the thanks for a job well done. He stated that the group has done this process with scientific thought and a good step by step process. The group has made it clear that it's not just concerned with carbon but with all greenhouse gases and has worked hard to understand and make changes. He stated that at last Thursday's Transportation Commission meeting one of the commissioners offered to be the transportation commission liaison to any group wanting to work on sustainable transit in Ashland. He stated that on Monday, February 20th there will be a citizen's transit group meeting at Washington Federal Bank on Lithia Way.

Huelz Gutchen – stated that the ozone hole at the North Pole is coming back due to climate change. He stated that carbon is really the most talked about greenhouse gas. He stated that the best thing we can do is to put up solar panels, buy electric cars, and install LED lightbulbs. It is hard to fix up homes to make them energy efficient so all new homes should be required to be highly efficient which means they should be autonomous. He stated this requirement is hard to

do at the state level, but here we can require energy modeling. He informed the group that energy modeling is different than energy auditing.

Susan Rust – stated that it has been a particular pleasure to watch the approach that this group has used to create this plan. She thinks it is well-grounded, thorough, and amazingly beautiful. She knows it will be adopted and well supported. She stated that the group should be justifiably proud of the plan and the process and thanked them for their work.

Ray Mollett – stated that he too echoes the comments regarding this being a good plan. He stated that it is a great framework for Ashland and for Jackson County. It's a good education tool for building. He stated he's still concerned with the Thought Experiment section. Even though it's a hypothetical it does show how challenging our goal is. He wondered if the actions listed under Quarter 1 are still feasible, as we're already partway through that quarter.

Hanks stated that Quarter 1 refers to the fiscal year quarter, which doesn't start until July 1. Mr. Mollett thanked him for the clarification.

3. Future Vision Draft Document

Hanks gave an overview of the intention of the section, including the Thought Experiment pages. It is intended to give scale to the goal and recognition that none of the actions 100% achieve the goal. This is particularly true because many things are outside of our scope of influence or control. That doesn't, however, mean that the plan and the goal aren't either necessary or good.

Group discussed ways to edit the Thought Experiment section to make it more effective. Group expressed frustration with a lack of clarity in the section, a lack of connection to the goal, and unreasonably difficult action requirements (such as 50% reduction in transportation). Group discussed some possible additions to the section, such as graphs or alternate actions.

James moved to amend the second sentence to read, “Our target is a reduction of 8% per year (95% reduction by 2050), but we do not know how to achieve these reductions targets at this time. What kinds of changes would need to happen in Ashland to really move the needle on emissions by 38% by 2022” and change all other references to 46% by 2050 to 38% by 2022 in the section. Motion failed for lack of second.

Biegel-Coryell/Green m/s to keep the Thought Experiment section in the plan and reflect the newly modeled 38% (from Cascadia) and have a sentence added which makes it clear that we can't achieve the goal with our currently known actions. Discussion: Biegel-Coryell stated that there is no way to make it clear what we're asking the community and accelerating the dates with the new model makes it clearer. Green stated that we have a goal and lots of ideas, all of which will only get us part of the way. He would rather that this be explicit for the reader.

Bernard stated that she is supportive of the motion as it is upfront and honest about the need to achieve actions, not just an un-achievable lofty goal.

Hartman stated that he would rather have it shown in a 20-year timeframe.

Hartman moved to amend the motion to a 20-year timeframe. Motion failed for lack of a second.

Hartman/Koopman m/s to amend the assumptions to reflect 100% renewable energy by 2050. Discussion of the amendment: Biegel-Coryell asked if that change to the assumptions would be easy to plug into the model. Hanks stated yes, though this does make the assumption that the regional grid would be 100% renewable, as that's what we take our calculations from. He stated that this isn't realistic but that as this is a thought experiment it doesn't have to be realistic. **Voice Vote on the amendment to the motion: 5 Ayes, 3 Nays. Amendment Passes.**

Discussion of amended motion continued: Sohl stated that he likes that this is now a focus on here are some things we can do to get us to 38% reduction, but there are many more things to be done. **Voice Vote: All Ayes. Motion as Amended Passes.**

Hartman/Shawkat m/s to summarize and reference page 10 of the appendices regarding carbon off-sets and include that in the Thought Experiment. Discussion: Hartman stated that it's likely that the use of offsets is the only way to achieve the goal. He understands that people do not like to think about offsets because the use of them might not force people to move forward with other actions. Biegel-Coryell stated that this isn't the space to talk about off-sets and it would just add to the confusion. Koopman stated that if they are added so should other options especially as this section is still missing really positive examples of actions.

Koopman/McGinnis m/s to amend motion to add in a suggestion that there will be new innovations and technology in addition to the possibility of offsets to the Thought Experiment. Discussion of amendment to the motion: Green stated that this section cannot be all things. He suggested adding in the words, "living document" to reflect that the plan and the actions might change. **Voice Vote on amendment to the motion: 5 Ayes, 3 Nays. Amendment Passes.**

Discussion of amended motion continued: Rosenthal stated that he will be voting against the motion because he doesn't think that offsets or other suggestions need to be in the Thought Experiment. Those references are in lots of other parts of the plan. Additionally any consideration of options would be a decision of the Council and/or the Citizens Budget Committee. **Voice Vote on amended motion: 1 Aye, 7 Nays. Motion Fails.**

Rosenthal thanked Bevers for submitting his, "A Summer Day in 2050," for inclusion in the Future Vision section. Bevers gave an overview of what he was hoping to achieve with the statement and how he went about creating it. Group agreed to include it in the plan and thanked Bevers for his work.

4. Updated Draft Plan

Group discussed some edits they would like to see in the plan, such as a wider variety of pictures, reducing the size of the ampersand on the cover, matching the graph and words on page 21, and consistency with the citation formatting throughout the document.

Group thanked Rosenthal for his leadership and staff for their work and the community who have advocated for this plan, many of whom have done so for years.

McGinnis/Koopman m/s to recommend to the City Council approval of the plan as amended in tonight's discussions. Discussion: None. Voice Vote: All Ayes. Motion Passes.

5. Adjournment

Meeting adjourned at 7:30 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Diana Shiplet, Executive Assistant