# Meeting #8 Summary

January 23, 2020, 12-2:00PM

TRPC, 2424 Heritage Ct. SW, Olympia, WA 98502

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agenda Item</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Introductions &amp; Project Updates</td>
<td>Self introductions of the Committee members present. Allison Osterberg gave a brief update of what has been happening with the plan.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 2. Multi Criteria Analysis    | Allison Osterberg gave an overview of the multi-criteria analysis and the scoring for prioritizing actions. The Committee discussed the priority scoring of actions and different approaches for weighting the criteria.  
**It was unanimous consensus by the Committee that the weighting of the criteria would be as follows: greenhouse gas (GHG) 40%, control 25%, speed of deployment 15%, and co-benefits 20%, with a boost provided to actions that were scored as a top priority for youth. Additional direction was to use the priority score to identify the top actions by identifying actions that show up repeatedly in the following lists: top priority score overall, top score by sector, top score by strategy, top for youth and other stakeholders.** |
| 3. Scenarios                 | Allison Osterberg reviewed the proposed approach to developing scenarios for achieving the greenhouse gas reduction targets. She presented the wedge analysis and showed examples of how different scenario changed the wedge and how they achieve the greenhouse reduction target. The Committee discussed different pathways that they could use to achieve the target goals.  
**The Committee directed staff to explore the following tracks or scenarios: focus on land use and transportation actions, focus on actions that scored high for control, focus on actions that rely on personal change by individuals (ex, though education programs), focus on actions that require changes at the state level vs what can be done locally (legislative agenda). If possible, to break it out by major employment sectors (like how much schools can do, capitol campus, and others).** |
- Consultants will be doing targeted interviews.  
- The Steering Committee will meet in February. The consultant will be there. |
5. Jurisdiction Updates on Early & Ongoing Actions

Each jurisdiction provided updates.

6. Public Comments

There were 6 public comments. Brief summaries follow:

Wayne Olsen: Applauds the efforts of the Committee. The cost of inaction is mounting. Urges the Committee to keep more actions and to be aggressive – to choose actions which will result in the most GHG reductions before it’s too late.

Lynn Fitz-Hugh: There is a large footprint of emissions outside of Thurston County that isn’t being accounted for in the plan. Because this process started by using the emissions inventory, emissions outside of Thurston County aren’t being considered. Because of how the scoring is being done, any action with sequestration is scoring low since it isn’t an emitter. Lynn would like to see a sidebar accompanying the plan addressing carbon sequestration actions. Lynn would like to have a decision about adding a sidebar for sequestration actions at the next Committee meeting.

Thad Curtz: Current rating have been skewed because they include actions that significantly reduce GHG emissions, but completely depend on state action. Any kind of tax benefit or write-off won’t be authorized unless passed by the state, and those actions should be lumped into their own lobbying category. Carbon sequestration will not help solve our problems.

Tom Crawford: Not enough knowledge to provide accurate scoring. Government actions and mandates are necessary to face head on, but we shouldn’t depend on statewide actions. The consultant’s quantitative analysis should look at combinations of actions and interactions that would have the most impact.

Lisa Ceazan: Brought comment from Lisa Rasmussen who couldn’t attend the meeting. Lisa requests that regenerative agriculture be included in the mitigation plan as a sidebar, due to its ability to reduce current GHG emissions from conventional agricultural practices, and to draw down carbon emissions by sequestering it in the soil and plants.

Jeff Miller: Electrified mobility and the renewable energy to support it. As we replace gas with electricity, how will we pay for maintenance of infrastructure. What about businesses that will support the change – the future of the economy. There are opportunities for investments, private investments, and investments zones within Thurston County. Everyone is going to need to participate and invest in some way for the change.
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This meeting summary is not a verbatim account – an audio recording of this meeting is available upon request.