**Climate Advisory Workgroup (CAW) Meeting #4**

**Meeting Summary**

January 16, 2020, 10:00AM- 12:00PM  
TRPC, 2424 Heritage Ct. SW, Olympia, WA 98502

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agenda Item</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1. Introductions and Project Updates | Self-introductions.  
Allison Osterberg from TRPC provided project updates.                                                                                                                                                   |
| 2. Multi-criteria Analysis   | Allison Osterberg gave overview of the criteria selected by the steering committee (greenhouse gas reduction potential, speed of deployment, control, and co-benefits), and the work completed in December by the consultants and sector focus groups to rank actions according to those criteria. The consultants had given each action a draft Priority Score, which weighted the different criteria. The next step in the process is to use the ranking and priority score to identify the top priority actions that will be further analyzed for the plan – approximately 50 out of the current list of 242 actions. Workgroup members were then presented with three potential approaches to prioritizing actions: by total priority score, top 10 for each sector, top 1-2 actions per strategy. Workgroup members broke into small groups to discuss approaches to weighing criteria and prioritizing actions, including youth scores and dot preferences, which they then shared to the full group (see image below of group discussion notes). Feedback included the following:  
- Alternative approaches to weighting criteria/prioritizing actions:  
  - Top actions across three tiers: 1. Near Term (rank high for speed of deployment and control), 2. Big Impact (rank high for GHG reduction potential), 3. Co-benefits/Equity (rank high for Co-benefits)  
  - Increase weight of Co-benefits score so it is equal to Speed and Control – relatively reduce GHG Reduction Potential.  
  - Maintain some actions for all sectors, but not necessarily proportional for each sector; consider different weights for different sectors.  
  - Boost actions that were priorities in the Climate Adaptation Plan.  
  - Add green dot to blue carbon action.  
| 3. Scenarios Discussion      | Allison Osterberg gave an overview of the scenario analysis tool, which will display how different actions and strategies can help achieve the greenhouse gas reduction target. The tool shows a Business as Usual scenario that includes reductions from implementation of the 100% Clean Energy Transformation legislation that was passed last year and can also show the potential for emissions reductions from sequestration actions. |
The Workgroup will discuss scenarios in more detail in the February meeting, and were to consider the question: What are some pathways that you think we should explore to achieve the target?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4. Project schedule for 2020</th>
<th>The Workgroup will meet again in February, and in May. The current schedule to have a draft plan available in April for public comment. The Workgroup will convene again in May to discuss implementation.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5. Public Comments</td>
<td>3 people gave public comment. Brief summaries follow: Wayne Olsen: I have questions about how we will quantify outcomes down the road at the city level and individual level to see what impact were having. Most of you are aware that our goal posts are moving in terms of what the scientists have found, we are going to need to redouble our efforts and be aggressive to reach our reduction goals. Lynn Fitz-Hugh: I want to talk about sequestration, things that score high on sequestration value do not tend to have high emissions. And so, by their nature sequestration actions may not rate very high for prioritization based on these criteria. We talked about having a sidebar in the plan, so actions that did not make it into the final plan were still represented. I just want to make sure that does not fall off as we move forward with drafting the plan. Frank Turner: The youth made some very moving comments about this process. When we reach our goals in 2050, it will be the youth who are sitting in this room. These are the people for whom we are doing this work, and we have to take that perspective so that we can hand off a workable plan. They are going to be the ones doing this work, so they need to be involved. Nuclear power as an option is being discussed around the country; it would be wise for this group to have an explicit position on nuclear power.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Criteria Weights

Group 1
- Relative criteria weights ok
- DoTs - get more info on why
- Youth - in some way
- Priority Actions from Adaptation Plan

Group 2
- Co-benefits should have more weight
  - GHG 40%
  - Speed 20%
  - Control 20%
  - Co-ben 20%
- DoTs - follow up to get reasoning
- Youth scores in sale

Group 3
- Pragmatic & Powerful
- BL - Speed + Control most important
- Different weights for different
- Different by sector

- Plan for Youth
Meeting Attendance
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Scott Morgan
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Hilary Seidel
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Frank Turner
Lynn Fitz-Hugh
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Jessica Brandt
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Next Meeting: to be determined.

Thurston Climate Mitigation Plan Coordinator:
Allison Osterberg
ostergbergA@trpc.org
360.956.7575 (main) or (360) 741-2513 (direct)

Link to project website: https://www.trpc.org/Climate
TRPC website: https://www.trpc.org/