

MINUTES FOR THE CLIMATE & ENERGY ACTION PLAN ad hoc COMMITTEE
Wednesday, September 30, 2015
Siskiyou Room, 51 Winburn Way

1. Call to Order

Chair Rich Rosenthal called the meeting to order at 5:00 p.m. in the Siskiyou Room.

Committee members Stuart Green, Roxanne Beigel-Coryell, Louise Shawkat, Bryan Sohl and Greg Jones were present. Staff member Adam Hanks was present. Committee member James McGinnis arrived late.

Rosenthal welcomed the new members and thanked them for agreeing to participate. Group introduced themselves.

Rosenthal reviewed the scope of work for the new members.

Approval of Minutes

Shawkat requested that the minutes be altered to reflect that both Bryan and Hannah Sohl were present and participated in the discussion at the last meeting but the difference was not clear in the minutes. Sohl stated that Hannah's name was spelled incorrectly as well.

Sohl/Biegell-Coryell m/s to approve minutes with the name clarifications as stated. Voice Vote: All Ayes. Motion Passes.

2. Public Forum

Marni Koopman, 1206 Linda Avenue, wanted to continue the adaptation discussion from the last meeting. The plan was originated with a heavy emphasis on mitigation. Most effective is longer-term adaptation. To protect us now, adaptation is critical. She gave examples, such as the OSF cancellations of outdoor performances and rafting company shut downs due to air quality issues caused by fires, etc. Other communities are having similar climate-related problems. Fort Collins is leading in conservation due to the dramatic events (flooding, fires, etc.) they have faced recently. GEOS came up with some initial strategies in a 2008 report, which would be good for this group to use and update as a focus for Ashland. She is happy to answer any questions regarding adaptation strategies.

Committee member Jim McGinnis arrived at 5:14 p.m.

3. Climate Plan Kick Off Event

Rosenthal asked Koopman to stay to answer questions and participate in the conversation.

Group asked if there are any modifications to the kick-off event plans to those which were in the September 23rd Conservation Commission packet and the discussion of that date. Koopman stated that there weren't many, as mentioned at the Conservation Commission meeting the on-going challenges will be monthly rather than annually. The group is looking for musical guests, sponsors, etc.

Group asked if the kick-off planners are actively seeking donors. Koopman stated that yes, they

are seeking donations and sponsorships and have received some from the community and businesses. They will ultimately make the event work with whatever funds end up being raised.

Rosenthal requested that they do an update at the next committee meeting.

4. Climate and Energy Action Plan RFP

Rosenthal stated that public process requires a very specific, carefully orchestrated process and he appreciates the work Hanks has put in to the draft thus-far. Hanks gave an overview of an RFP process.

Group discussed the need to include both adaptation and mitigation strategies. Jones stated that general science says there is more benefit to looking at both together. Rosenthal is concerned that the scope of work from the Council is focused specifically on greenhouse gas reduction and reminded the group that this plan is just the start of the conversation, not the end. Group determined that direction from Council doesn't preclude adaptation strategies, if they help achieve overall mitigation. In other words, all mitigations will need to consider adaptations.

Group discussed whether the suggestion from Sohl to include details like use of IPCC AR5 models should be included or are they too specific? Group agreed that requests to use them should be included, just not as part of the summary as originally suggested by committee member Sohl.

Group discussed possibly including full-cost accounting (looking at all externalities in relation to all strategies). Group was concerned this could increase the cost of potential responses too significantly.

Shawkat wondered if we should specifically include mentions of health or healthcare as part of bullet #5 under Plan document – contents. Group agreed that this area is part of the “etc.” and would be understood by the contractor.

Group discussed the desire to ensure our plan meets or exceeds requirements in State plans and doesn't get trumped by other plans (local and State) but is instead a way of helping Council make good policy decisions across all plans. The hope is to have a plan which is actionable and achievable and, “doesn't allow Ashland to lose.” If we set the bar too high, we may lose overall by being unachievable. The group hopes this plan will be flexible enough to be altered as goals are met or amended (“aggressive but successful”).

Group discussed the public engagement process section and the desire to have lots of investment from a variety of sectors, including a wide range of ages, ethnicities, income levels, and disabilities.

Group discussed why first qualification read, “...with emphasis on Oregon cities.” Hanks stated this is because Oregon has a pretty unique set of laws, rules and regulations. Having an understanding of where we are unique is important. Group agreed to change the word, “emphasis on” to “familiarity with.”

Group was concerned that some of the specific sector requests of Council are not included in the body of the RFP. Hanks stated that an appendix of all the meetings and information to-date will be included in the RFP to give responders an idea of requests, tone, and Council and committee focus. Group agreed including an appendix was a good idea.

Group discussed the need to be as specific as possible to eliminate subjectivity in scoring whenever possible. This, hopefully, will limit or prevent contractors who want to appeal the final contractor selection decision.

Jones stated that as there is no regulation of people who do this type of work, we should request as much in the way of background references as possible (certifications, recommendations, etc.) Group agreed.

Hanks stated that the scoring listed in the evaluation process is taken from an Engineering Services RFP, and is not specific to this RFP. The group will need to clarify what scoring requirements they prefer. Rosenthal stated this will be done at the next meeting.

Group discussed overall expected timeline of RFP process.

7. Agenda Items for Next Meeting

Group requested that future meetings schedule be discussed at the next meeting.

8. Public Input #2

Huelz Gutchen, 2253 Hwy 99, stated that mitigation verses adaptation should always focus more on mitigation because it's the hardest thing to do. There should be a list of all the options available with greenhouse gas reduction potential totals and the group should pick those options which would give the best, quickest outcome. This process should be pedal to the metal. We need to deal with reality.

9. Adjournment

Meeting adjourned at 6: 46 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Diana Shiplet
Executive Assistant