

MINUTES FOR THE CLIMATE & ENERGY ACTION PLAN ad hoc COMMITTEE
Wednesday, June 15, 2016
Siskiyou Room, 51 Winburn Way

1. Call to Order

Committee member Roxane Beigel-Coryell called the meeting to order at 5:30 p.m.

Committee members Bryan Sohl, Greg Jones, James McGinnis, Claudia Alick, Jim Hartman, Stuart Green and Louise Shawkat were present. Staff member Adam Hanks was present. Committee member Marni Koopman arrived late. Committee members Rich Rosenthal, Isaac Bevers, Cindy Bernard and Sarah Lassoff were absent.

2. Approval of minutes

Minutes were approved as presented.

3. Around the Room

Group did an around the room team building regarding their favorite summer activity.

4. Public Input

Huelz Gutchen: Stated there was a survey of high school classes regarding how many times high school teachers mentioned climate change, and the result showed less than twenty minutes per year. Portland schools are improving this, they now require science teachers to teach climate change in their classes. Everyone should have to learn it. He stated that the senate is having hearings because everything they understand is becoming obsolete. New technologies and information mean everyone needs to be retrained every ten years. We all need to go re-learn everything quickly and frequently be updated.

James Stephens: Stated he hasn't been here in awhile. He likes that the group is doing the around the room icebreaker. He was sent information regarding electric vehicles and a chart of what country has the most electric vehicles. The United States currently leads, but China is soon to overtake in total number of electric vehicles. SOHEVA recently found a Prius set to be junked but they found the problem, fixed it and donated it to the high school auto technology program for students to learn about repairing electric vehicles. They are willing to help set up the course work for the high school. They are also hoping to get into the 4th of July parade. He is also moving forward with helping the 10x20 Initiative. This group signed interested people up at the CEAP open house (he read the proposal aloud). He stated that the goal of this proposal is to be aggressive but realistic.

Ray Molett: Stated he was impressed with the recent open house. He spent time afterward looking more into the greenhouse gas inventory. He would like to encourage this group to, as part of the goals, lay out what citizens can do to make reductions in household goods. Goals should focus both on what the City can do and what the citizens should also do.

Allie Rosenbloom: Stated that today she sent a draft ordinance to staff regarding climate action. She wanted to take this opportunity to introduce herself.

5. Review of Open House #1

Beigell-Coryell gave an overview of the committee survey results. Group discussed some of their concerns including the desire to make sure that the survey questions at the open house match those on-line, that only 13% of the attendees were under the age of 34, the lack of an MC/moderator to guide the event, and the “dullness” of the presentation regarding climate science.

6. Vision, Goals & Targets

Group discussed the draft Vision Statement. Jones stated that, “Ashland leads” is too vague. Leads what? the community? Oregon? the State? the nation? Several group members raised concerns that the statement does not include the word, “electric” or “energy” even though that’s a main focus of this action plan.

Committee member Koopman arrived 6:00 p.m.

Alick questioned what the intended purpose and audience are for this statement. Is it for the community, the committee, or the City of Ashland staff and Council? This clarity may help focus the language. Additionally, she raised concerns with the word, “diversity.” Is it referencing a diverse population, a diversity of resources, or something else?

Koopman raised concerns regarding the word “prosperous,” as it typically only refers to money but the group probably intends something beyond just financial prosperity. Most of the group agreed this was probably not the best word.

7. Discussion of Preliminary Goals

Group went through each question listed in the packet and voted on their preferred answer. For those questions with consensus, there was no discussion, for those questions without consensus the group had a short discussion regarding their votes.

1. Which type of inventory would you like to include in Ashland’s emission reduction goal?

a. Sector-based emissions

b. Consumption-based emissions

Vote: a = 2, b= 7

Green stated that he voted for sector only, even though consumption must be addressed. Unfortunately, there is no way to get good numbers, particularly Ashland-specific numbers, for consumption. This means having a goal focused on consumption with no tracking ability is problematic. Group discussed what the best approach would be regarding inclusion of consumption. Some felt it appropriate to include consumption in the plan as Ashland is a small

community with limited growth and no big-scale industry. Others felt the plan should not include goals related to specific consumption reductions but should include a strong community education component regarding consumption.

2. Do you think Ashland should include purchasing offsets as an option to reach its emission reduction goal?

a. Yes

b. No

Vote: a = 8, b= 1

Koopman stated that she does not have enough information regarding offsets to agree to them now. Hartman stated it might be good to let the community decide on the desirability of offsets – the plan will cost money whether they are used or not, it's just a matter of how much money the community is okay with. Koopman also expressed concerns that many offsets sold are for projects which would have been done regardless of the offsets, and therefore are of no real value or aid in reducing greenhouse gas levels.

Many in the group felt that by selecting option 'a' (voting 'yes') they were doing so with caveats – offsets are not intended to be the whole approach but should have limits and be as helpful to the local economy as possible. Group members mostly agreed that voting 'yes' doesn't necessarily mean offsets will be part of the final plan, but it does leave the option open.

3. Do you think Ashland should have a specific goal for reducing emissions from City operations?

a. Yes

b. No

Vote: a = 9, b= 0

4. If yes to #3, should the targets be fossil fuel reduction or greenhouse gas reductions?

a. Fossil Fuel

b. GHG

c. Both

Vote: a = 0, b = 0, c = 8

Green stated that he declined to vote because he believes greenhouse gases are just a larger umbrella over fossil fuels, so the question is redundant.

Group mostly agreed that fossil fuels reduction should be the short-term focus, with a longer-term focus on reducing greenhouse gases. Many other plans have separate and more aggressive

reductions for city operations (in both timeline and goals). Overall, the group agreed that more aggressive reductions for city operations is their preference.

5. Which year do you think Ashland should use as a base year for its greenhouse gas reduction goal?

a. 2011

b. 2015

Vote: a = 0, b = 9

6. What do you think Ashland's reduction goal for 2050 should be?

a. <80% reduction by 2050

b. 80% reduction by 2050

c. 90% reduction by 2050

d. 100% reduction by 2050 (i.e. carbon neutral)

e. >100% reduction by 2050

Vote: a = 0, b = 4, c = 0, d = 5, e = 0

Green stated his preference is to have the legally binding (ordinance) portion of the plan be 80% by 2050 but a higher amount of reduction for the overall plan goal. Alick stated that what's really debating is aspirational versus attainable. Sohl stated he thinks the goal should be more aggressive than in other cities because Ashland has little population growth possibilities, no heavy industry, and a somewhat homogenous community. The opportunity to be aggressive with the goal is here. Hartman stated that a 34-year plan (today until 2050) is very long-term. We need to aim high now because if we're afraid of the difficulties now, just wait until things are worse. Koopman agreed and stated that the group requesting a legally binding ordinance did not ask the group to water-down the plan's targets. Beigell-Coryell stated that 34-years in government/large-scale plans is not a long time and so the goal needs to be realistic to the timeframe.

Group raised concerns about putting a plan before Council that is too aggressive and therefore will not be approved or implemented. Some in the group also raised concerns that if they choose a high-target goal how will it be enforced (who is going to carbon jail?). Group agreed that the goal is to make future decision making focused on the goal and to make staff more accountable. Group agreed that the ordinance discussion is making this goals discussion muddy and they need to set it aside for the time being.

7. Which years should be used for intermediate targets?

a. 2018, 2025, 2040

b. 2020, 2030, 2040

c. 2022, 2028, 2034, 2040

d. 2025, 2035

e. other combo

Group agreed they don't like any of the target dates presented. Some were concerned the check-ins weren't frequent enough. Some were concerned they didn't tie into the budget cycles. Some felt that only the final end year was important.

Green/Sohl m/s to have intermediate targets set on five-year increments, starting in 2020.

Discussion: McGinnis stated that so long as there is a method in the plan to connect projects to the budget cycle, this is acceptable. Sohl stated the advantage of check-ins/adjustments to the plan scheduled regularly every five years is that the plan can be adjusted consistently with new science or technology. **Voice vote: all ayes. Motion Passes.**

8. Should the plan include recommendation for goals/targets to be adopted by Ordinance?

a. Yes

b. No

Vote: a = 8, b = 1

Group discussed the potential timeline of an ordinance. They mostly agreed that the best course of action would be to send an ordinance for Council consideration after the plan was approved (or in tandem with the plan) so that the ordinance can accurately reflect the actions/targets/goals of the plan. Group received clarification from staff on a typical ordinance process.

9. If yes, should ordinance match the plan goals/targets or be something different (i.e. absolute vs. aspirational)?

a. Match

b. Different

Vote: a = 7, b = 0

The two no votes stated they could not vote without clearly knowing what will be the final targets.

Group decided to go back and re-vote on question #6 (*6. What do you think Ashland's reduction goal for 2050 should be*).

Vote: a. (<80% reduction by 2050) = 0, b. (80% reduction by 2050) = 0, c. (90% reduction by 2050) = 1, d. (100% reduction by 2050) = 2, e. (>100% reduction by 2050) = 5

Group discussed the desire to be aggressive in the goal, and to also be a leader in these plans. There were concerns raised about whether being too aggressive in the target may be in opposition to the desire to be science-based (i.e. can you be both aggressive and still accomplish things in a real-world, science-based manner?). Group mostly agreed that they want to be as

aggressive as possible. Group agreed that they would like Cascadia to develop a science-based goal for consumption-based emissions for consideration.

9. Next Meeting

The next meeting will be July 6, 2016, at 3:30 p.m. in the Siskiyou Room.

10. Adjournment

Meeting adjourned at 7:32 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Diana Shiplet, Executive Assistant