CECAP Task Force Meeting 3

Goal Setting – Meeting Notes

Wednesday, July 29, 2020

6:00 PM – 9:00 PM

Held electronically via WebEx

The Community-wide Energy and Climate Action Plan (CECAP) Task Force held an electronic meeting on July 29, 2020 at 6:00 PM via WebEx.

The slide deck can be found online here.

These meeting notes capture the general activities conducted and discussions that occurred during the meeting. These notes should be viewed in conjunction with the presentation, found at the link above.

Attendees

Roughly 80 participants, including 25 Task Force members

Welcome and Introductions (Jay Fisette, DMV Strategic Advisors and Maya Dhavale, Fairfax County)

The meeting of the Task Force was convened by Jay Fisette, consultant. A roll call was conducted, per the requirements of electronic meetings. Maya Dhavale from the Office of Environmental and Energy Coordination (OEEC) reviewed the CECAP process and timeline, the governor's legislation allowing for electronic meetings as well as FOIA requirements.

Mr. Fisette reviewed the agenda and the expectations and key outcomes of the meeting. The expectations and key outcomes were for the Task Force to vote on a long-term GHG reduction goal as well as interim and/or sector-specific goals.

Key Takeaways from Google Form (Maya Dhavale, Fairfax County)

Maya Dhavale reviewed the key takeaways from responses to the Google Form, which was sent to Task Force and Focus Group members following the March Task Force Meeting. The Google Form was used to solicit initial feedback on goal setting and on the emission reduction scenarios modeled by COG. Feedback and responses to the Google Form can be found online here:

- Task Force and Focus Group Google Form Comments with Responses

- <u>Task Force and Focus Group Google Form Comment Summary</u>

Outstanding questions from the Google Form were answered by Fairfax County and the consultants.

- Steve Walz, Director of Environmental Programs at MWCOG, provided answers to questions on the inventory methodology, including how aviation and waste emissions were accounted for in the inventory.

- Adam Agalloco, ICF, emphasized that regulatory and cost considerations will be incorporated into the mitigation strategy modeling work under Task 3 and will be discussed at future Task Force meetings.

- Mr. Agalloco explained that questions about mitigation strategies will be discussed at a subsequent Task Force meeting focused on mitigation strategies.

- Maya Dhavale provided answers to CECAP process questions. Elements of the CECAP may be implemented prior to the formal plan adoption. In addition, adaptation and resilience will be considered under a separate program. Ms. Dhavale provided a link to the <u>Adaptation and Resilience presentation to the Board of Supervisors</u>.

Review of Scenario E+ (Jeffrey King, MWCOG)

Jeffrey King, Chief of Energy and Climate Programs at MWCOG, delivered a presentation on the "Scenario E+." Scenario E+ represents a more aggressive pathway through which Fairfax County could achieve an 87% reduction of GHG emissions from a 2005 baseline by 2050.

Review of Goal Setting Best Practices (Adam Agalloco, ICF)

Adam Agalloco, ICF, reviewed goal setting best practices based on the GHG Protocol Mitigation Goal Standard, an internationally accepted and widely used framework for goal setting. Mr. Agalloco reviewed options for goal time frames, including the option to adopt an interim year goal and/or sector-specific goals in addition to a long-term goal.

Next, the concept of goal level, or quantity of emission reductions, was discussed and the terms science-based goal, attainable goal, and aspirational goal were defined.

Definitions of common terms used in goal setting were provided including definitions for zero carbon, carbon neutral and net zero. In addition, specific considerations for interim goals and sector-specific goals were provided.

Finally, a summary of commonly adopted goals and example goals from relevant jurisdictions in the region were provided.

Set Final Emission Reduction Goals (Jay Fisette)

Prior to the goal setting discussion, step-by-step instructions were provided for how to use WebEx's feedback function and how to notify the moderator to be called on to speak.

The key discussion points included:

- Decide on target year goal – year and level

- Decide on interim year goal – yes/no, year and level

- Decide on sector-specific goals – yes/no, sector/metric, year, and level

Polling and Discussion

The following polls were conducted during the meeting. A summary of comments and questions raised during the discussion is provided as well.

Straw Poll #1: Straw poll on 3 scenario options

- Scenario E (80% reduction from a 2005 baseline by 2050) – 9 preferences for this option

- Scenario E+ (>80% reduction from a 2005 baseline by 2050) – 5 preferences for this option

- Carbon Neutral – 11 preferences for this option

Comment: Concern that the economic impacts of these scenarios are unknown and may be too high and that there is uncertainty as to how Fairfax County would get to carbon neutral.

Comment: Those living at or below the poverty line in Fairfax County need to be considered and economic subsidies would be necessary to achieve all of the scenario options.

Comment: The long-term goal should be attainable.

Question: How is County staff taking into consideration corporations' commitments?

- *Answer:* While corporate commitments will certainly help Fairfax County reach its goals, during the CECAP process, mitigation strategies will be selected based on what the County is able to control.

Comment: COVID-19 has shown us that what we thought was not attainable is in fact attainable. Fairfax County can get to carbon neutral.

Comment: If Fairfax County is going out to 2050, the goal must be aspirational.

Straw Poll #2: Who would pick Scenario E over carbon neutral?

- Yes – 8 preferences for this option

- No – 14 preferences for this option

Several Task Force members stated that they could not vote for Scenario E+ or carbon neutrality since they did not discuss these goal options with the groups they represent.

Straw Poll #3: Of those voting yes [to the previous straw poll], how many of you would reconsider, if given the chance to have the full discussion with your organizations?

- Yes - 6 preferences for this option

- No - 1 preferences for this option

Straw Poll #4: Who would choose carbon neutral?

- Yes - 16 preferences for this option

- No - 6 preferences for this option

Verbal Poll: Support for carbon neutral. If you disagree or abstain, speak up.

- No – preferences for this option

- Abstentions – 7 abstained. Upon a recount, 5 abstained. One additional abstention was recorded in an email following the meeting.

- Yes – Balance of indicated preferences

Comment: A reason for one dissention was the costs to the low- and moderate-income population.

Comment: It is necessary to also present the benefits of a carbon neutral goal, such as human health benefits and lower costs to healthcare. Two other Task Force members echoed this comment.

Comment: The cost of inaction is considerable.

Discussion Question: Is anyone uncomfortable with a 2050 goal?

Three members expressed interest in a goal before 2050.

Straw Poll #5: Should the plan include an interim year goal?

- Yes – 24 preferences for this option

- No – 0 preferences for this option

Straw Poll #6: Interim goal year

- 2025 - 11 preferences for this option

- 2030 - 12 preferences for this option

- 2035 – 2 preferences for this option

Question: What criteria should be considered when choosing an interim year goal?

- *Answer:* A fairly near term goal is useful to make sure the County is on the right track toward the long-term goal. The ability to implement strategies within the timeframe from a policy perspective and accountability from a data availability perspective should also be considered.

It was decided that further guidance on considerations for choosing an interim year goal will be provided to the Task Force.

Comment: Need to consider that the practicality of a 2025 goal is influenced by when data is available.

Verbal Poll: Should we not have sector level goals?

- No dissentions

Straw Poll #7: Vote for your top three sectors for sector-specific goals.

- Buildings – 12 preferences for this option

- Renewable Energy – 13 preferences for this option

- Energy Efficiency – 9 preferences for this option s

- Transportation – 19 preferences for this option

- County Government – 6 preferences for this option

- Waste - 6 preferences for this option

There was discussion about whether the buildings and energy efficiency sectors should be combined into one goal.

It was determined that consultants will provide further guidance on sector-specific goals, including key metrics to consider and high-level cost/benefit considerations.

Wrap Up and Next Steps

- August 2020
  - Public meeting / online survey

- September 2020
  - Collate and distribute public feedback
  - Task Force Meeting 4 – Discussion of public feedback, finalize goal setting and strategies to meet goals

Motion to adjourn at 9:13 PM.