

**Natural Resources Commission Special Meeting  
Minutes**

**October 18, 2021; 6:00 p.m.**

APPROVED 1-24-2022

Commissioners Present: Michelle Byars, John Johnston, Richard McCann,  
Tom Rost, Hannah Safford, Meg Slattery, Keara  
Tuso

Commissioner(s) Absent: None

Council Liaison(s): Lucas Frerichs absent

Staff Present: Ashley Feeney, Assistant City Manager  
Dianna Jensen, CAAP Project Director, City Engineer, PWET  
Kerry Daane Loux, CAAP Project Manager, Sustainability  
Coordinator, Community Development & Sustainability

---

1. **Call to Order:** 6:02 pm, by Chair H Safford.

2. **Approval of Agenda** – Approved unanimously (Safford/Slattery 7-0)

3. **Regular Item**

**A. Climate Action and Adaptation Plan (CAAP)**

Ashley Feeney welcomed the commissioners and gave an introduction to the CAAP process, the draft prioritized actions and the information to be discussed at the special meeting.

Josh Lathan, AECOM, provided a presentation on the CAAP process to select and prioritize the actions. The Chair asked if there were any technical questions or general comments by commissioners and commission liaisons. R McCann asked for an explanation of the Action Selection and Prioritization (ASAP) tool, Step 3: Initial Screening. Why were some actions identified as ‘No Pass’ and forced out of the evaluation process? J Lathan explained that this was a workaround for actions not considered to be appropriate by staff or the consultant. M Slattery asked about GHG reduction potential with the identified actions, and about modeling grid mix assumptions if the CAAP does not lead to 100% carbon neutrality. Staff noted that there will be many checkpoints for progress metrics and action adjustments (through GHG Inventory and other analysis) between now and 2030/2040 target dates.

Public Comment

The Chair requested that the commission consider limiting public comments to two minutes each, given the number of community members present. Total attendance, in addition to three City staff and two AECOM consultants, included

eleven commissioners from the NRC and commission liaisons, and fourteen members of the public. With the objection of several commissioners, the comment period was left at three minutes each.

Chris Granger, Cool Davis Executive Director, noted that Cool Davis has just completed ten years of work in the community, focused on behavior change to implement carbon reduction. She noted that she hopes that the CAAP can be used to make a case for actions to do what we can as fast as possible. Cool Davis has provided comments that hopefully will be included:

- Both mitigation and adaptation actions should be included.
- The background data from the GHG inventory and Vulnerability Assessment should provide baseline understanding. Cool Davis is concerned that the current list of actions are not tied back to inventories/VA
- Need more definition of commute-related VMTs – who is driving where and what and how will these actions actually reduce fossil fuels in their use?
- This is City's second CAAP and should be grounded in good data
- Thanks for all your work on this and work moving forward

Jason Bone, Cool Davis Board of Directors Chair noted that the presentation from consultant was helpful, and that info could be summarized to community to know how actions were derived, will be measured, etc. He has a lot of questions about how to evaluate these actions with the information provided.

Lorenzo Kristov is concerned whether there are adaptation actions. These should have equal weight as mitigation measures in the plan.

Alan Pryor (on Sierra Club and others, speaking as private citizen)

- Many of priorities have little chance of being implemented (e.g., parking pricing)
- Would have little GHG reduction, huge commitment of resources
- Community gardens is a bad idea too – people drive there to do their gardening
- Implement WWTP – little GHG reductions, huge resources
- Biking - little to address intercity commute traffic pouring into traffic – this isn't in 25 priorities
- Go back and do laser focus on GHG reducing actions only and skip all else
- Forget about carbon sequestration strategies unless it's planting 25k trees in Davis which will have real heat island and other co-benefits

Scott Steward

- Complimented effort Davis has made in preparing a CAAP
- As part of workshop participant and tech aspects of plan – would be helpful if public was informed about what actions would make most impact on GHG reduction and adaptation at outset
- Looking forward to unfolding technical aspects and communication to public so they can choose among the options

The Chair invited general comments and thoughts from Commissioners and other Commission liaisons.

Andrew Cullen, Bicycling, Transportation and Street Safety Commission (BTSSC) shares same concerns as Chris Granger in how some of these are grounded in VA or inventory.

Jim Cramer, Tree Commission, wants lots of education on items where we might see low feasibility, if that could help move the needle on participation and GHG reductions.

Leilani Buddenhagen, Senior Services Commission, is observing but not commenting tonight.

Stephen Streeter, Planning Commission, said that he finds it difficult to prioritize among all the actions identified. On one specific action, he asked if we should share cars among neighbors for economic advantage as well as GHG

Richard McCann noted that he has two thoughts on this; he wants to see more synergy between actions that are proposed – each are discussed in isolation and not clear how they all fit together into an overall plan – what is the package of these?

- Combine micro-mobility with transit options to enhance emissions reductions
- Considering how we encourage solar with EV charging, use, storage – to make EVs much more attractive to buy
- Some crafting we can do down the road, but need to think of this as we pick our 25

Secondly, be sure we take input from commissioners and public on these measures – glad to hear we'll go back and revisit measures based on the actions

- To the extent NRC can see that reflected in near-future would be helpful
- Also wants to have as much refurbishment of list going into 25 as possible – maybe we want to make significant changes after public workshop

Keara Tusso echoed Richard that it would be nice to lay out how things are grouped a bit easier to facilitate their review.

Michelle Byars commented that the list is not exhaustive. There are lots of technical people out there who are researching this topic and really understand how to get most bang for buck.

John Johnston echoed many previous people: the list of 25 doesn't look like a plan, looks like list of actions and too detailed list – in-city buses are one item and intercity buses are another. Why aren't these combined into a single item that demonstrates the need. There's a lack of connection to the problem statement and to the cost effectiveness. The whole organization is bothering him and doesn't lead to an effective plan.

Tom Rost agrees with Cool Davis about communicating to the public – maybe 0.1% of public are participating so how will we get participation in implementation? Davis is basically an island and if we have a nice plan how will we communicate that to neighbors – if we're not collaborating, we won't make any progress on climate change

Meg Slattery said that ordering policies by problem statement would bring cohesion to report, but also understand process is herculean and takes lots of different forms to consolidate.

Hannah Safford had no comments at this point.

Following general comments, the Commission discussed each of the 25 prioritized actions to address content and clarity of action language. Additional information about this detailed input will be provided in a separate document, 6B ATT 1.

Two other actions for this meeting were to receive recommendations for 'promoting' any non-prioritized actions from the full list of evaluated actions and to review individual commissioner recommendations for the top five actions to recommend to City Council for first phase implementation. Due to the late time of the meeting, the NRC decided to provide this information to the staff liaison via email rather than to discuss at the meeting.

**4. Adjourn: 9:38 p.m.**