

Energy and Climate Change Task Force Meeting #8 Summary

January 4, 2022 | 6:30 p.m. – 8:30 p.m.

Hybrid In-Person & Virtual Meeting

ECCTF Attendees: Stephen Walz (virtual), Leah Devendorf, Mary Harris, Marian Pegram, Sangina Wright, Praveen Kathpal, Alyssa Abosompim, Javier Bastos, Marta Schantz (virtual), Raquel Nicora (virtual)

1) Welcome, Introductions, Meeting Overview

The hybrid meeting commenced at 6:30 p.m. with introductions and rollcall. Mr. Bill Eger walked Task Force members through the agenda.

1) Public Comment

Speaker 1: First, point of order regarding the notice of public meeting. There was not enough notice given via eNews, should be at least 3 days. Staff note: notice was posted on the City calendar over a week prior to the meeting as well as on the website.

Current GBP allows EUI of 54, compared to high-performing buildings with EUI of ~25. Conflicting with need for 95% of new buildings needing to be built net-zero.

Speaker 2: I ask the City to address pollution associated with lawn and landscaping equipment – they have highly polluting (air quality and climate) engines typically. Noise pollution is another issue associated with these types of equipment. Solution is to go to electric lawn equipment from gas-powered. Do not believe that the cost is prohibitive. Have the power to put out RFPs for vendors who use electric over 2-stroke engines.

Speaker 3: Agree with the previous speaker. In the report, the milestone figure has aggressive goals. What is the assumed EUI of homes today and what is the future projected EUI underlying those goals? Also, what are you defining as a net-zero ready building? DOE has a definition that can be used.

2) General Climate Action Updates

Development of Office of Climate Action is still underway, hiring for a Director is underway. Green Building Manager and EV Planner position have been hired and onboarded.

COG Inventory and Analysis confirms that the region has met its 2020 GHG reduction goals.

Federal funding is being considered by City staff, opportunities from the BIL and IRA among others.

Stephen Walz: when the Communications Officer is hired, they should make sure that funding opportunities that can be made available to the community are broadly and clearly communicated.

3) ECCAP DRAFT Report & Task force Discussion

Background: Have presented the working draft report to various staff bodies and commissions (TC, PC, EPC), have shared for feedback with various parties including the ECCTF. Some major themes that were heard were that the audience of the ECCAP should be very wide, demonstrating that it is many parties from the private sector, public sector, community, and more to work together. Also that there is a need for tracking mechanisms and metrics, strengthening language around strategies and actions, scale of

actions needed, milestones and next steps, updated data, financing mechanisms, equity considerations, strengthening language of the GBP, and forward looking targets.

- Feedback from the TF:
 - Sangina Wright – In a better position than the first draft, is more accessible to several audiences.
 - Javier Bastos – I second that, it is more accessible now.
 - Marian Pegram – would like to see information that is accessible for foreign language speakers.
 - Steve Walz – The one-pager is a good idea. **Could have a small callout box about “What You Can Do” that are more personalized to actions people can take in their own life (transit, biking, etc.).** Had a similar sense about the GBP that it probably needs an update quickly in order to meet the targets laid out for the building sector.
 - Marta Schantz – metrics and tracking are critical, so thinking about how to add teeth to that last section is important. Would like to see a proportional amount of detail in the buildings sector to its GHG emissions levels.
 - Praveen Kathpal – **update Table of Contents to better align with the sections (mitigation in particular).** Also, street tree planting is an existing budgeted program and can be directed toward both mitigation and adaptation actions. **A clear visual extracting the most critical areas of GHG reductions is needed: i.e., “if we don’t do these two things, we don’t meet our targets.”** I.e., CE-1.C (municipal aggregation), electric vehicle adoption, electrification of heating in existing buildings. This follows from the understanding that the VCEA does not get us to our target on its own – so if we don’t implement a successful municipal aggregation program, we are highly unlikely to meet our target. Regarding EVs, one tool at our disposal (under T2) is to require that new car dealerships are only allowed to sell EVs there.
 - Mary Harris – **There should either be a callout or very clear and simple message upfront that captures what our goal is (“Net-zero by 2050” or similar).**
 - Javier Bastos – we could add a footnote to an existing graphic to say “if these 3 are not met, we do not meet our X and X goal”
 - Marian Pegram – This should probably be framed as these X actions are prioritized/put at the top vs. just these X get us to our goal.
 - Steve Walz – calling out the priority and most impactful 2 or 3 makes sense.
 - Praveen Kathpal – Figure 6 is the right chart to adapt and make clearer.
 - Sangina Wright – **should we add a qualifier around the term “alternative fuels”** since some are cleaner than others.
 - Javier Bastos – Are we saying anything about what happens if we don’t meet our targets? In other words – what is the accountability level of the City.
 - Steve Walz – We’re putting this plan forward and it is incumbent on all of us to monitor the plan and make sure we’re making progress against our targets.
 - Sangina – Could we suggest that a future Task Force/group of residents convenes to assess progress against the targets?
 - Marta Schantz – the EPC has done this to a great extent with the EAP 2040.
- Motion to endorse the Draft ECCAP and move forward for public comment:

- Javier Bastos: Motion to move forward with the current Draft ECCAP and incorporate comments provided during this meeting that can be reasonably accomplished in the proposed schedule's timeframe, with the rest being addressed during the public comment period, to make available for public comment and distributed to various public forums (libraries, schools, etc.).
- Sangina Wright seconded the motion.
- All Task Force members in attendance (in-person & virtual) voted affirmative to endorsement. The motion passed.

4) ECCAP Schedule

Note from staff – the intake process for public comment internally will require some triage (setting aside certain substantive comments to address and prioritize comments that are easier to incorporate).

3-week public comment period, with various outreach formats (social media, physical materials in public places, etc.)

5) Adjourn

The meeting adjourned at 8:31 p.m.

Meeting Chat

00:23:28 Marta Schantz: I support up-front public comment

00:23:51 Steve Walz: I also support up front public comments

01:08:17 Jessica Lassetter: Here is a copy of the report available online. I will share the link to the Feedback Form next. https://www.alexandriava.gov/sites/default/files/2022-12/ECCAP%20for%20Task%20Force%20Review_12222022.pdf

01:08:45 Jessica Lassetter: Meeting 8 Feedback: <https://www.surveymonkey.com/r/D3G2FZK>

01:17:10 Jessica Lassetter: Here is a copy of the report available online. I will share the link to the Feedback Form next. https://www.alexandriava.gov/sites/default/files/2022-12/ECCAP%20for%20Task%20Force%20Review_12222022.pdf

01:17:25 Jessica Lassetter: Meeting 8 Feedback: <https://www.surveymonkey.com/r/D3G2FZK>

01:29:37 Steve Walz: Yes

02:13:41 Steve Walz: Thank you to staff and fellow ECCTF members