



Clark County Climate Change Planning

Community Advisory Group Meeting #10

January 22, 2025, 5:30-8:30pm PT

Public Service Center in Vancouver, WA, and
Zoom Webinar

Meeting Summary

FUNDED BY WASHINGTON'S

CLIMATE
COMMITMENT
ACT



The WA Department of Commerce climate planning grant is supported with funding from Washington's Climate Commitment Act. The CCA supports Washington's climate action efforts by putting cap-and-invest dollars to work reducing climate pollution, creating jobs, and improving public health. Information about the CCA is available at www.climate.wa.gov.

Attendees

Community Advisory Group members: Councilor Michelle Belkot, Jessica Brown, Sharon Ferguson, Ann Foster, Janet Kenefsky, Noelle Lovern, Brent Marsden, Nick Massie, Gabriela Mendoza Ewing, Sunrise O'Mahoney, Dave Rowe, Andrea Smiley, Don Steinke, Terry Toland, Alana Tudela, Justin Wood, Monica Zazueta

County staff: Amy Koski, Jenna Kay, Jose Alvarez

Consultant team: Sylvia Ciborowski, Nicole Metildi, María Verano (Kearns & West); Tracy Lunsford (Parametrix)

Number of members of the public in attendance: 9

Welcome

Clark County and Kearns & West staff welcomed everyone to the meeting. Sylvia Ciborowski, Kearns & West, provided an overview of the agenda and outlined the meeting's purpose and desired outcomes:

- Review progress made since October 2024 Community Advisory Group (CAG) meeting.
- Share examples of proposed revisions to the Climate Element goals and policies.
- Review process for seeking CAG consensus on goals and policies.

Sylvia reviewed the CAG vision statement and reaffirmed its commitment to implementing House Bill 1181 and supporting Clark County's climate goals.

Sylvia reviewed meeting logistics, participation guidelines, and the process for public comments, which will be taken at the end of the meeting.

Finally, Sylvia asked if members had corrections for the CAG Meeting #9 summary. There were no suggested corrections, and the summary was accepted.

Project Updates

Jenna Kay, Clark County, began by providing updates on council appointments for the year. She announced that Councilor Michelle Belkot would continue serving as the Council liaison to this group, while Councilor Little would step in as the alternate if Councilor Belkot were unavailable. Councilor Belkot confirmed her attendance online during the meeting.

Jenna then reviewed the meeting packet, noting that it included the meeting summary, comments from members of the public submitted since October, and a key document titled "Side by Side Comparison of October 2024 Draft Policies and January 2025 Revised Draft Policies." She also highlighted that the packet provided a library of background materials, including a comment tracker, equity memos prepared for the Environmental Justice Coalition (EJC), summaries of public engagement feedback, policy analysis work conducted by consultants, and a glossary of terms requested by the group earlier in the process.

Jenna provided an overview of the project timeline, emphasizing the significant progress made over the past year. This included drafting policies for resilience and greenhouse gas (GHG) reduction, coming to consensus on many draft policies and goals, and establishing criteria for prioritizing policies. She explained that the group is now entering the final phase of refining and finalizing policy recommendations. Input from groups like the EJC and feedback from the public have been incorporated, and the focus is now on reaching consensus on 20-year county policies for inclusion in the new Climate chapter of the Comprehensive Plan.

Sylvia added that since the October CAG meeting, extensive work has been done to refine the draft policies based on CAG, EJC, partner agencies, and public feedback. Jenna elaborated on the contributions of various groups and provided examples of how their input influenced the policy revisions.

Progress Since the October CAG Meeting

Progress since the October CAG meeting

Jenna shared that since the October 23, 2024 meeting, significant progress has been made on drafting policies. She recapped that at the October meeting, members provided feedback on draft policies, which was incorporated into the working policy list. The policy list incorporating Oct. 23 CAG meeting feedback was used as the foundation for further review by the EJC, Partner Agency Team (PAT), technical consultants, and county staff.

Public engagement efforts, completed in December with the EJC's assistance, resulted in engagement summaries included in the CAG's background materials. The EJC also applied an equity lens to the draft policies and ensured that their feedback, as well as the feedback they gathered, was accurately reflected in revisions. Meanwhile, technical consultants conducted additional analyses on priority policies.

Jenna further shared that county project staff spent much of the past few months consolidating feedback, reviewing feedback for consistency with the existing Comprehensive Plan, ensuring compliance with laws, and streamlining the policy list to reduce redundancy. A side-by-side comparison document illustrates how the policies evolved from October to January and highlights key changes.

The two policy lists, one for GHG emissions reduction and another for resilience, were consolidated into a single list to address duplication across the two lists. This unified list now categorizes policies under seven themes inspired by the CAG-developed vision statement. The list currently includes 33 goals and 124 policies, some newly added to address gaps and others merged to reduce overlap. In some cases, redundant or unclear policies were removed from the policy list, particularly when another agency held responsibility for them.

Members had the following questions and comments:

- One member asked whether the smaller summary document and the large spreadsheet contained the same content.

- *Response: The smaller document only includes the current revised policies as of January 22, 2025 and the larger spreadsheet provided is a side-by-side comparison of the October 2024 and January 22, 2025 versions.*
- A question was raised about the meaning of “cross-referencing” in the policy list.
 - *Response: Cross-referencing refers to policies that already exist in another Comprehensive Plan chapter but are noted in the Climate chapter for relevance.*
- A member emphasized the importance of incorporating feedback from community groups such as Friends of Clark County, the Alliance for Community Engagement, and the Sierra Club. They requested that these groups' policy recommendations be formally discussed in a future meeting.
 - *Response: These public comments have already been shared with the CAG in the meeting materials email sent ahead of this meeting. Staff recommended process is for CAG members to review and consider public comments as part of their own voting and negotiation with the group, rather than as a separate discussion.*
- Concern was raised about whether additional goals could still be introduced at this stage, given the extensive refinement process already completed.
 - *Response: While the list had been narrowed down to 33 goals through a structured process, new contributions can still be considered, if the CAG agrees, if they strengthen existing goals, rather than introducing entirely new ones. Note from staff post-meeting: staff plan to carefully review additional suggestions to see if they are already covered by existing goals and policies and are within the scope of the project. Staff is interested in avoiding duplication within the policy list as much as possible, staying focused on the project scope on high-level guiding policies for the Climate Element consistent with HB1181 requirements, and not spending staff time and resources at this point in time on implementation details.*
- Another member pointed out that the public process should always allow for additional input, even at later stages.

Public Engagement Feedback Review

Jenna walked through the feedback process and how it influenced recent policy revisions. Over the past year, the county, along with the EJC members, held over 90 public engagement activities, gathering input from about 2,000 people. This feedback played a key role in revising the policy list, with many changes highlighted in bold text in the "Side by Side Comparison of October 2024 Draft Policies and January 2025 Revised Draft Policies" document. Staff tried to honor all of the work over the past year with creation of the draft policy list and weave in additional ideas from members of the public into existing policies as much as possible; keeping the policy purpose the same while reflecting more community members' ideas. There are a few instances where additional policies were added where staff did not see a good way to integrate the idea into an existing policy.

EJC review through equity lens

Jenna discussed what the EJC has done since October, which included reviewing policies through an equity lens created earlier in the project. The EJC's engagement work and help applying the equity lens are helping the county with its requirements under HB1181 to engage with vulnerable

populations and overburdened communities and consider their priorities, reduce harm, and increase benefits. The coalition's work led to the creation of two overarching equity goals and policies: one related specific to climate change and the other more generally to environmental justice. While initially planned to be one overarching equity goal, two goals were created to better align with the structure of the Comprehensive Plan, with the climate-specific goal to be housed in the new climate chapter and the environmental justice-specific goal to be housed in the comprehensive plan's environment chapter. Further changes in the policy list included a stronger emphasis on collaboration with community-based organizations and partner agencies, particularly in culturally relevant and accessible ways. There are revisions throughout the policy list that incorporate these types of considerations.

Members had the following questions and comments:

- One member asked for clarification on the definition of "burden" and how it correlates with the map of overburdened communities.
 - *Response: "Burden" refers to a broad list of factors, such as affordability of housing, utilities, and food, which are outlined in the Growth Management Act's (GMAO) new definition for overburdened communities. The term is broadly defined, and staff can follow-up to provide the list of these factors both in the GMA definition of the term and the factors used in the Department of Health Environmental Health Disparities Map. Additionally, staff noted that the terms "overburdened communities" and "vulnerable populations" seem to be used interchangeably in the state legislation, where overburdened communities is referencing specific geographic areas, vulnerable populations speaks to examples of factors that make individuals more vulnerable to poor health outcomes from environmental hazards.*
- One member asked if the materials were available in hard copy.
 - *Response: Some materials were printed and available at the meeting, but not all. The county offered to print additional materials if needed and also can provide Excel versions of the materials for easier viewing. Staff also noted that some of the tables are quite large and don't print well, and recommend reviewing on a computer, zooming into the areas of interest.*
- One member shared that personal circumstances had caused them to miss some meetings and stressed the importance of being flexible and not excluding people from the process for missing deadlines.
 - *Response: Thank you for expressing this, we appreciate your feedback. There is a need for grace in such situations and a need to balance this with recognition of a coordinated group process.*

Partner Agency Team (PAT) review

Jenna shifted focus to the feedback received from the PAT, which consisted of technical experts from various county departments and partner agencies (such as local cities, utilities, fire districts, school districts, regional agencies, and state agencies). The feedback helped identify issues related to consistency with state laws and highlighted major barriers to implementing certain policies. It also pointed to opportunities to improve policy execution.

One gap identified in the feedback was the need for better food security and access to affordable food in emergencies. This concern was raised by both the partner agencies and through public engagement feedback. In response, new food security policies were added to the policy list, such as one that focused on using local and regional food networks for distribution during climate disruptions that affected food delivery systems.

Jenna also explained that approximately 20 to 30 of the 80 invited agencies had provided feedback. Each agency designated a representative who coordinated input within their organization. This collaborative approach ensured a wide range of perspectives from different sectors.

Members had the following questions and comments:

- One member asked for clarification on the types of agencies involved in the partner review team.
 - *Response: The team included approximately 80 agencies, such as school districts, fire districts, cities, hospitals, utilities, and state agencies, among others.*
- Another member asked how the feedback process worked within each agency and how many people were involved.
 - *Response: Each agency selected a representative to gather feedback from their colleagues and then send it back. Staff estimate that 20 to 30 agencies out of 80 provided feedback. Staff do not have full insight on the number of people involved within each agency on their organization's review.*
- A member asked if the feedback was sent to one person or a team within the partner agency.
 - *Response: The feedback was typically sent by a designated representative from each agency. This person was responsible for gathering input from others within the organization.*
- One member asked for an example of how climate disruptions could affect food delivery systems.
 - *Response: Disruptions could be local, such as flooding that blocks transportation routes like I-5, or from global issues, such as food shortages caused by climate events that impact food sources or ports.*

Technical Consultant Analyses

Jenna provided an overview of the work done by the technical consultant teams, starting with a recap of the Level 1 analysis conducted last fall. The technical teams, led by Tracy Lunsford, Parametrix, and Dana Hellman, CAPA Strategies, then carried out the Level 2 analysis on the priority policies identified from the level 1 analysis. The Level 2 analysis included assessment of five criteria for Resilience policies and six for GHG reduction policies. The additional criteria for GHG reduction policies includes an estimate on the impact the priority policies could have on reduction GHG emissions. Jenna emphasized that while this analysis was more detailed, it remained high-level, and precise cost figures, for example, are not available because there are no specific projects to provide cost estimates for.

Jenna mentioned that the analysis would serve as a resource for decision-making as well as for future implementation by staff. She then passed the discussion to Tracy who provided an update on the upcoming work on GHG emissions reduction. Tracy provided an update on setting interim emission reduction targets, with the state goal of achieving net-zero emissions by 2050, and mentioned that there would be further discussion on this at the next meeting.

Members had the following questions and comments:

- One member commented that they appreciated the information about GHG emissions reduction targets, as they had been wondering where the targets were.
 - *Response: The overall state goal is to reach net-zero emissions by 2050, and the interim targets will track progress towards this goal with milestones for different sectors of emissions.*
- A member asked if the Level 1 and Level 2 analyses took place during the break period from October.
 - *Response: The Level 1 analysis took place in late summer/early fall and the Level 2 analysis was conducted during the end of year break period.*

County Staff Review

Jenna provided an update on the work that county staff has been conducting over the past few months. She explained that the team compiled feedback from all of the other groups providing feedback (EJC, PAT, public) and evaluated it with legal considerations and the Growth Management Act Climate Element requirements in mind. Staff also reviewed policies and identified areas requiring revision to ensure alignment with state law and other relevant requirements.

Jenna discussed Initiative 2066, which was approved in the November 2024 election and focuses on protecting access to natural gas. She outlined the challenges in aligning county policies with this initiative while also complying with House Bill 1181, which calls for reducing GHG emissions. She mentioned that the county was waiting for guidance from the state to help navigate these issues and that a subcommittee of CAG members would be formed to review proposed revisions to the building and energy policies based on that guidance. The revised policies will be presented in February, with further discussion and final decisions taking place in March.

Jenna addressed the feedback received regarding word choice in policy revisions. She acknowledged that some feedback called for more specific and stronger language in the policies and noted that staff had already made some revisions to reduce the use of vague or passive terms. She reminded everyone that any proposed changes would need to align with the county's legal authority and capabilities.

Jenna introduced the concept of "mobility as a service," a coordinated system that provides comprehensive information on all transportation options available, such as rideshare, public transit, and specialized transportation services. This term was incorporated into a policy revision to address public feedback about improving accessible transportation services in the county and a desire for "1 call, 1 click" type option where a single phone call or application can provide all key transportation option information. She also explained that in some instances, existing county

policies were cross-referenced as part of the revision process, to avoid the need to create entirely new policies.

Members had the following questions and comments:

- One member asked how the subcommittee for revising the energy and buildings policies will be selected and whether they will be asked to volunteer.
 - *Response: Volunteers will be sought, with a focus on ensuring a diversity of perspectives. Any ideas from the subcommittee will need to be shared with the full CAG for review.*
- A member asked whether a maximum number of subcommittee members is set.
 - *Response: We will have to wait until the volunteers are gathered to determine the number, but it needs to be less than a quorum of the group.*
- A member asked about the word choice “facilitate” and suggested using a stronger term like "promote" instead.
 - *Response: This concern will be discussed later in the meeting.*
- Another member stated that word choice in the policies is very important and stated that they had gone through all the revised draft policies to make revisions.
- One member asked about the process for legal review of the proposed policies and whether they will be codified.
 - *Response: The legal team will review the policies after the CAG is done with its work, which includes confirming the county has authority to do what is written in the policy. The plan itself will not be brought forward for adoption until final revisions are made.*
- Another member brought up the concept of "mobility as a service" as a new term in the policies and wanted clarification.
 - *Response: This term refers to a coordinated transportation system that includes various transportation options like Uber, buses, and other community transportation services, and it is part of a policy aimed at improving transportation accessibility and coordination.*
- One member inquired about the cross-referencing of existing policies, particularly regarding climate-related policies that are already in place.
 - *Response: Some policies have already been adopted by the county that are already related to climate, and they are being pointed out as part of this project so that they formally are considered climate element policies. However, staff do not want to duplicate policies in multiple places and will just reference policies in the Climate chapter to note they are considered climate policies but live in another place.*

Revised Draft Climate Element Policy List

Jenna provided a walkthrough of the revised policy list. She shared that the document includes a column summarizing the changes made from the October 2024 versions, providing high-level explanations for the revisions. Details behind these changes are available in the comment tracker included in the background materials.

Jenna also clarified that the yellow highlighting on the document identifies priority policies that were either in the top 15 or 16 for GHG reduction or resilience based on the results from the Level 1 analysis. These highlighted policies come from a prioritization exercise conducted in August and September, with 15 priority GHG policies and 16 resilience policies, totaling 31 yellow policies.

Members had the following questions and comments:

- One member asked if the first two pages of the document were supposed to be yellow.
 - *Response: The yellow highlighting indicates policies that were prioritized due to their high scoring in GHG reduction or resilience level 1 analysis. This was based on the prioritization process.*
- A member asked if there was a fixed number of policies highlighted in yellow.
 - *Response: 15 priority GHG policies and 16 resilience policies were identified, totaling 31 yellow-highlighted policies. These were chosen based on the prioritization process, which was done to account for the technical teams' limited resources. The yellow-highlighted policies have more analysis information, but this does not necessarily indicate they are more important for implementation.*
- Another member asked for clarification on the prioritization process and how the numbers for the yellow-highlighted policies were determined.
 - *Response: During the first phase of prioritization, 15 priority GHG policies and 16 resilience policies were identified, and those 31 policies are marked in yellow.*

Discuss Climate Element Goals and Policies and Process for Coming to Consensus

Sylvia outlined the next steps for the group. She detailed the process of building consensus and clarified that a survey would be sent out after this meeting to assess alignment on the goals and policies, except for those related to buildings and energy, which would be addressed in a subcommittee. She encouraged members to balance their personal interests with the broader requirements of the legislation.

Sylvia explained that minor wording preferences should not obstruct overall agreement. If consensus is reached, a goal or policy would be considered approved for staff to move forward into the adoption process. Jenna then expanded on why the county opted for a consensus-based approach, recognizing the complexity of the project, the diverse perspectives involved, and the need to move efficiently due to state mandates. She emphasized the value of a unified recommendation and explained that even if full consensus was not achieved, documenting differing viewpoints would still be useful for decision-makers.

Sylvia then laid out the next steps for the coming months. A survey would be distributed, requiring members to evaluate the policies by February 12. Policies with broad agreement would be quickly confirmed, while those with significant concerns would be discussed in detail during meetings in February and March. She asked members to not only raise concerns but also propose solutions. Jenna added that survey responses would be categorized on a scale from full support to major concerns, with space provided for suggested revisions. These results would then guide the group's discussions moving forward.

Jenna highlighted that the survey was a preview of what would come in future meetings and encouraged members to focus on succinct, meaningful feedback. She reiterated that the process aimed for consensus, balancing the needs of the county while adhering to legislative mandates, and reminded everyone of the limited time available for discussions.

She reassured the group that their feedback was valuable, urging them to provide alternative language suggestions if they felt a policy needed revision. Jenna emphasized the importance of identifying areas of consensus early to maximize discussion time on more contentious points.

Members had the following questions and comments:

- One member asked what the process would be if some policies don't reach consensus, and if that effectively gives one person a veto.
 - *Response: The process aims for consensus, but if an agreement is not reached, those differences will be documented for decision-makers to consider.*
- A member questioned the rationale behind using a consensus-based approach for the project.
 - *Response: Consensus was chosen to navigate the complexity of the project and diverse community perspectives while ensuring compliance with state mandates. It also aims to present a unified recommendation to the Planning Commission and County Council.*
- A member shared that they were initially skeptical of the consensus process but have since changed their view, recognizing the value of collective decision-making.
- One member asked for clarification on the survey deadline.
 - *Response: The survey will be sent out the day after the meeting (Jan. 23) and should be completed by February 12th.*
- A member sought clarification on whether discussions on proposed changes would take place in March.
 - *Response: Discussions will start in February and continue into March as needed.*
- One member expressed concern that reviewing and evaluating policies in the survey would be time-consuming.
 - *Response: The survey is structured by goal areas to make it more manageable, and members are encouraged to provide specific feedback on policies they take issue with.*

The meeting included a practice survey question to help familiarize everyone with the survey process. The group was asked to respond to a goal focused on green jobs, which included one goal and three associated policies. Members were asked to rate their level of support on a scale from 1 to 4, where 1 was full support, 2 was able to live with it, 3 indicated concerns, and 4 meant strong objections. Members were encouraged to note any specific concerns with the policies if they rated them a 3 or 4.

Members had the following questions and comments:

- A member asked how concerns would be categorized in the survey responses.
 - *Response: The survey uses a four-point scale from "support" to "can't live with." Members who rate policies as needing discussion must provide suggestions for revisions.*
- A member asked how much time is available to reach consensus.
 - *Response: There are two meetings, but not all of that time will be dedicated to consensus-building.*
- A member expressed that the county is not equipped to handle workforce development and that it should be managed by other organizations.
 - *Response: The county would not implement workforce development but could play a supportive role, such as convening discussions and seeking funding.*

- A member sought clarity on the word "support" and its level of effort.
 - *Response: "Support" refers to partnering and assisting rather than directly implementing policies.*
- A member expressed concern that certain terms like "support" are too vague and do not indicate clear action.
 - *Response: Members are allowed to propose alternative language when rating policies.*
- A member cautioned against excessive wordsmithing, emphasizing the need for progress rather than revising every term.
- A member suggested agreeing on definitions for key terms like "support," "promote," and "facilitate" to ensure shared understanding.
 - *Post-meeting note: staff included working definitions for terms like support and promote in an updated copy of the glossary provided to the CAG after the meeting.*
- A member asked if the survey could allow saving progress and include comment fields for concerns.
 - *Response: The survey is being set-up to allow edits up until the due date and already includes comment sections.*
- A member noted that vague terms make it easy for elected officials to avoid accountability.

Afterward, Sylvia shared the practice survey question results, which showed mostly ratings of 1s and 2s, indicating broad support.

Public Comment

Sylvia opened the public comment period where five members of the public requested to share their thoughts.

Member of the public: "My name is Carmen de Leon, and unfortunately, I only have two minutes, which is not even enough to get through all these pages, that is how bad it is. I was here last time. I am pretty sure some of you remember me. Unfortunately, when I went home to review what I said, I wasn't online. It says no public comment—zero, nothing. That is disappointing.

We talked about emergencies—snow, fire, and water. Hemp burns 200 degrees hotter than wood. Since this is the environment, we should mandate using hemp blocks instead of wood. It would take much more heat to burn and help avoid large-scale fires.

I also propose making bamboo forests for toilet paper. We use 70,000 acres of trees daily for toilet paper, while bamboo grows in six months and offers a higher turnover. This could be a business for the state, moving us toward becoming the first sustainable state.

I am of Mayan descent and believe only Native communities should be allowed to fish for salmon until the threat of extinction is resolved. Additionally, we need much more public outreach because participation is still far too low."

Member of the public: "Good evening. My name is Jim Byrne, and I'm on the board of Friends of Clark County. Monica mentioned we've made comments, and Jenna said they are in your packets.

I want to talk about two things: trees and water. Mature trees sequester large amounts of carbon dioxide. Preserving them costs the county nothing while reducing CO2. Oregon studies show that

forests managed for carbon storage significantly curb greenhouse gas emissions. Legacy forests provide exceptional carbon sequestration, and Clark County should direct the Department of Natural Resources (DNR) to manage trust lands for conservation.

Urban tree planting is helpful, but pales compared to preserving old growth. Policies must protect legacy trees for their environmental impact. Regarding water, please establish minimum stream flows and maximum temperature thresholds for all county waters. For example, the East Fork Lewis drops to 30 cubic feet per second with temperatures too high for salmon."

Member of the public: "Hello, my name is Meridian Green. I appreciate all the work you've done, it's extraordinary and covers so many things that matter to me. I endorse Jim Byrne's comments as well.

One issue not addressed is obsolete infrastructure. As we move away from fossil fuels, infrastructure like gasoline tanks will likely be abandoned. To avoid cleanup costs for the county, this issue should be part of the plan.

While the work so far is amazing, we need to anticipate changes that will occur as this plan succeeds. Thank you for your work and the opportunity to speak."

Member of the public: "Hi, my name is Tonya, and I founded the Vancouver Forest Keepers group, focusing on forest stewardship and grassroots volunteerism.

I endorse all FOCC comments, especially regarding the importance of precise and actionable language in policies. For example, G14 mentions advocating to the DNR, but it should also include facilitating collaboration. When advocating to save legacy forests, we were told the DNR knows what they're doing, which misses the point of protecting resources for climate goals.

Additionally, goals 11, 12, and 15 don't mention biodiversity or soil carbon sequestration, both of which are critical for policy. Thank you."

Member of the public: "Theresa Hardy here from the local Sierra Club. While our president could not attend, we support FOCC language and written comments.

Specificity is critical in policies. Vague terms like "support" allow decision-makers to act against environmental interests. We must address forest threats, including wildfire protection and mining projects, in climate planning.

Clark County should adopt the City of Vancouver's ambitious greenhouse gas reduction goals. Climate resilience is essential for community security, and climate considerations must be incorporated into all planning. Thank you."

Member of the public: "My name is Richard Kolber. Two counties in California—Santa Clara and San Mateo—have adopted Community Climate Roadmaps through their Offices of Sustainability. These roadmaps may align with Clark County's goals.

I recommend reviewing their plans as a reference. They have worked with cities on Climate Action Plans, which could help speed up Clark County's process. The City of Vancouver's Climate Action Framework could also serve as a model. Thank you."

Sylvia reminded the public that there is a form on Clark County's website to submit comments at any time during the project at <https://clark.wa.gov/community-planning/comp-plan-comments> and comments can be emailed to comp.plan@clark.wa.gov.

Wrap-up and Next Steps

Sylvia reviewed the next steps and noted the following action items for the project team and CAG members:

- Project team to send link to survey
- CAG members complete survey by Feb. 12
- Jenna to coordinate building & energy subcommittee

She also shared information about the next meeting, which will be held on Wednesday, February 19, 5:30-8:30 pm.

In addition, Sylvia clarified that public comments are included in the CAG summaries and are posted online. Online recordings of the meetings are also posted online. She encouraged community members to review these materials and report any missing content.

Sylvia also confirmed the formation of a building & energy subcommittee to help county staff address the intersection of HB1181 and I-2066, with members Noelle, Monica, Don, and Nelson volunteering to be on the subcommittee. Jenna will coordinate with the subcommittee offline to meet in the coming weeks.

Adjourn

Sylvia ended the meeting and thanked everyone for their participation and contributions.

The meeting adjourned at 8:28 pm PT.

Appendix A: Zoom Chat

Below is a verbatim, unedited transcript of the Zoom webinar chat.

17:32:50 From Maria Verano, Kearns & West, she/her to Everyone:

For Zoom technical issues, email mverano@kearnswest.com

17:34:08 From Maria Verano, Kearns & West, she/her to Everyone:

We could not hear Brent online

17:34:09 From Andrea Smiley to Maria Verano, Kearns & West, she/her(direct message):

Also couldn't hear Brent

17:34:29 From Sylvia Ciborowski to Hosts and panelists:

Thanks, Brent didn't have mic on

17:34:36 From Janet Kenefsky to Everyone:

sounds great on my end.

17:34:47 From Jessica Brown to Hosts and panelists:

much better

17:35:08 From Maria Verano, Kearns & West, she/her to Everyone:

CAG members, please check your chat settings and choose "Everyone" from the drop down before sending messages.

17:35:11 From Janet Kenefsky to Everyone:

1

17:35:19 From Jessica Brown to Everyone:

yes

17:38:35 From Maria Verano, Kearns & West, she/her to Everyone:

Email comments to comp.plan@clark.wa.gov or submit a comment online:
<https://clark.wa.gov/community-planning/comp-plan-comments>

17:42:40 From Janet Kenefsky to Everyone:

I'm not having any issues. you are loud and clear online.

17:43:32 From Gabriela Ewing to Everyone:

It sounds good

17:43:51 From Jessica Brown to Everyone:

Bret sounds good

17:44:04 From Maria Verano, Kearns & West, she/her to Gabriela Ewing(direct message):

Gabriela, we can barely hear you when you speak. If we miss your comment, please let us know

17:44:33 From Gabriela Ewing to Everyone:

Thank you Maria.

17:45:00 From Sylvia Ciborowski to Hosts and panelists:

thanks for your patience all!

17:45:24 From Gabriela Ewing to Everyone:

Sounds good

18:02:06 From Jessica Brown to Everyone:

was the updated goals document (small document Ann held up) included in the attachments sent in Nicole's email.

18:07:48 From Nicole Metildi, Kearns & West (she/her) to Everyone:

Here is a link to the large printed document we have in person: Side-by-side comparison of Oct. 2024 draft policies and Jan. 2025 revised draft policies - <https://clark.wa.gov/media/document/191986>

18:08:24 From Nicole Metildi, Kearns & West (she/her) to Everyone:

Jenna also printed out column for "1/22/25 Version of Draft Climate Element Goals and Policies" for people that came in person

18:08:36 From Nicole Metildi, Kearns & West (she/her) to Everyone:

These are the documents sent ahead of the meeting

18:11:08 From Jessica Brown to Everyone:

Thanks, I have the side by side. Just wanted to make sure I was not missing a document.

18:11:19 From Nicole Metildi, Kearns & West (she/her) to Everyone:



19:06:44 From Sylvia Ciborowski to Everyone:

On break. We'll resume at 7:20pm

19:21:43 From Gabriela Ewing to Everyone:

Hello

19:41:27 From Nicole Metildi, Kearns & West (she/her) to Everyone:

Find Goal 10 on Page 15: <https://clark.wa.gov/media/document/191986>

19:43:07 From Janet Kenefsky | Greater Vancouver Chamber to Hosts and panelists:

No questions

19:43:09 From Jessica Brown to Everyone:

no

19:43:12 From Justin Wood to Hosts and panelists:

no

19:43:18 From Gabriela Ewing to Everyone:

no

19:45:32 From Jessica Brown to Everyone:

2

19:46:26 From sunrise omahoney, she/her/hers to Everyone:

1

19:46:59 From Andrea Smiley to Everyone:

2

19:47:47 From Gabriela Ewing to Everyone:

1

19:47:56 From Alana LG Tudela to Everyone:

1

19:49:05 From Don Steinke to Everyone:

2. I can live with. It could be improved with additional policies:

Under G10: Green jobs

Add G10-P4: Assign staff to apply for the \$2 billion Federal appropriation awarded to Rewiring America to support Building Electrification.

Add G10-P5: Consult with organized labor and NW natural about Thermal Energy Networks. See: <https://www.ilr.cornell.edu/climate-jobs-institute/public-impact-0/climate-jobs-institute-explores-building-decarbonization-approach-achieving-scale-equity-and-high>

Add G10-P6: Develop a pilot program to aggregate demand for heat pump wh retrofits.

19:49:19 From Justin Wood to Hosts and panelists:

2

20:27:19 From Maria Verano, Kearns & West, she/her to Everyone:

CAG webpage: <https://clark.wa.gov/community-planning/community-advisory-group>

Project webpage: clark.wa.gov/community-planning/climate-change-planning

Project contact: Jenna Kay, jenna.kay@clark.wa.gov

20:27:21 From Janet Kenefsky | Greater Vancouver Chamber to Everyone:

Thank you to the sub committee volunteers!

20:27:43 From Jessica Brown to Everyone:

Thank you

20:28:00 From Gabriela Ewing to Everyone:

Thank you