

Attachment A

December 2, 2021 YCCAC meeting minutes

MEETING MINUTES
Yolo County Climate Action Commission
December 2, 2021 | 5:30 PM – 7:30 PM

COMMISSIONERS:

Suzanne Reed, District 1 appointee	Chris White, Technical Lead
Robin Datel, District 2 appointee	NJ Mvondo, Environmental Justice Lead (CHAIR)
Mark Aulman, District 3 appointee	Bernadette Austin, Climate scientist/subject matter Expert
Andrew Truman Kim, District 4 appointee (VICE-CHAIR)	Pelayo Alvarez, Climate scientist/subject matter Expert
Adelita Serena, District 5 appointee	

Ex-Officio Members

Sarah Morgan, Yocha Dehe Wintun Nation
Matt Dulcich, UC Davis

SUPERVISORS:

Supervisor Don Saylor, Yolo County Board of Supervisors, District 2
Supervisor Jim Provenza, Yolo County Board of Supervisors, District 4

MEETING ACTION ITEMS

Yolo County Staff Action Items

- Develop a long-range calendar for Commissioners to submit agenda items of interest
- Add a Commission Member comment section to next agenda
- C. Tschudin to send out additional Doodle poll to select time for January Commission meeting
- Work with Chair and Vice-Chair exclusively to determine recurring time for future Commission meetings
- Update County Website to recruit more applicants
- Send Charter to potential applicants
- Send Commissioners a copy of the Climate outreach list
- Identify/interview jurisdictions which also seek to achieve carbon negative status

Commission Action Items

- Commissioner Austin to send state definitions for disadvantaged communities
 - Submit additional early actions, as needed, consistent with the early action eligibility criteria before January 31 deadline
-

MEETING MINUTES

1. **Authorize remote (teleconference/videoconference) meetings by finding, pursuant to Assembly Bill 361, that local officials continue to recommend measures to promote social distancing as a result of the COVID-19 pandemic.**

Decision: Approve

Moved By: Reed / **Seconded By:** Aulman

Ayes: Reed, Datel, Aulman, Kim, Serena, White, Mvondo, Austin, Alvarez

Noes: None.

Abstain: None

Absent: None.

Additional Comments/Action Items: None

2. **Elect Chair and Vice-Chair**

Decision for Chair: Elect NJ Mvondo

Moved By: Serena / **Seconded By:** Kim

Ayes: Reed, Datel, Aulman, Kim, Serena, White, Mvondo, Austin, Alvarez

Noes: None.

Abstain: None.

Absent: None.

Decision for Vice-Chair: Elect Andrew Truman Kim

Moved By: Reed / **Seconded By:** Datel

Ayes: Reed, Datel, Aulman, Kim, Serena, White, Mvondo, Austin, Alvarez

Noes: None.

Abstain: None.

Absent: None.

Additional Comments/Action Items: NJ Mvondo requested T. Echiburu to continue facilitation for the remainder of the meeting, and she would assume Chair responsibilities at January Commission meeting

3. **Public Comment**

- Commissioner Aulman requested consideration of Commission on Teichert Shifler Mining & Reclamation Project
- S. Reed commented that analysis of such project impact must be evaluated prior to any Board decision
- D. Saylor suggested adding a section outside of public comments on future agendas for members to bring forward matters of interest to be agenzied

- **Action Item:** D. Saylor suggested County staff develop a long-range calendar for Commissioners to submit agenda items of interest
- D. Saylor commented the best way for Commission to weigh in on projects is to advise on policy instead of specific projects (i.e. policy framework for water or land use). Commission should leave project analysis to the Planning Commission.
- J. Provenza supported D.Saylor’s suggestions and recommended the Commission stay within the roles and responsibilities as described in the Charter (i.e., developing and implementing a CAAP)
- B. Austin supported D. Saylor’s suggestion on considering policies vs. projects and as a point of order, suggested Commission not comment or discuss beyond agenda items for future meetings
- **Action Item:** NJ Mvondo suggested Commission add a Commission Member comment section to next agenda
- NJ Mvondo commented if Commission should consider amending the Charter regarding the public’s expectations of the Commission
- A. Serena also supported prioritizing policy considerations over projects and suggested there are several areas where Commission can assess impacts and conduct outreach for upcoming projects

4. Approve November Meeting Minutes

Decision: Approve

Moved By: Reed / **Seconded By:** Kim

Ayes: Reed, Datel, Aulman, Kim, Serena, White, Mvondo

Noes: None.

Abstain: Austin, Alvarez.

Absent: None.

Additional Comments/Action Items: T. Echiburu said County staff will send bimonthly updates to Commission via newsletter or email

5. Regular 2022 Commission Meeting Time

Decision: Tabled to January

Additional Comments/Action Items:

- T. Echiburu suggested earlier meeting time such as 4:00pm on the 3rd Wednesday of every month
 - C. White reminded Commission that later Commission meeting times accommodate the general public
- C. Tschudin noted 4th Monday of every month at 4:30pm is time with most Commissioner availability

- **Action Item:** C. Tschudin to send out additional Doodle poll to select time for January Commission meeting
- **Action Item:** D. Saylor suggested County staff work with Chair and Vice-Chair exclusively to determine recurring time for future Commission meetings

6. Approve Timeline and Process for At-Large Commission Member Appointment

Decision: Extend deadline to apply for at-large Commission positions to January 14th, 2022

Moved By: Mvondo / **Seconded By:** Reed

Ayes: Reed, Datel, Aulman, Kim, Serena, White, Mvondo, Austin, Alvarez

Noes: None.

Abstain: None.

Absent: None.

Additional Comments/Action Items:

Action Item: Update County Website to recruit more applicants

Action Item: Send Charter to potential applicants

Action Item: Send Commissioners a copy of the Climate outreach list

7. Update on Climate Action and Adaptation Plan Scope of Work Development

Decision: Not applicable. Staff update.

Additional Comments/Action Items:

Action Item: Identify/interview jurisdictions which also seek to achieve carbon negative status

Additional Comments/Action Items:

- Consider preparing a list of potential questions for RFP respondents and share with Working Group for approval.

8. Approve Timeline for Development and Prioritization of Early Actions, including Due Date for Submittal (Attachment C)

Decision 1: Direct staff to revise prioritization criteria and bring it back to the Commission's January meeting.

Moved By: Reed / **Seconded By:** Kim

Ayes: Reed, Datel, Aulman, Kim, Serena, White, Mvondo, Austin, Alvarez

Noes: None.

Abstain: None.

Absent: None.

Additional Comments/Action Items:

Action Item: Commissioner Austin to send state definitions for disadvantaged communities

Decision 2: Move back by one month the Early Action schedule for prioritization

Moved By: Reed / **Seconded By:** Kim

Ayes: Reed, Datel, Aulman, Kim, Serena, White, Mvondo, Austin, Alvarez

Noes: None.

Abstain: None.

Absent: None.

Additional Comments/Action Items:

Action Item: Commissioners to submit additional early actions, as needed, consistent with the early action eligibility criteria before January 31 deadline

9. Working Groups Update

Decision: Not applicable. Staff update

Additional Comments/Action Items:

- Working groups are ad-hoc and subject to the Brown Act
- Commission must vote to create working groups
- M. McCormick suggested development of an RFP working group
- C. Yvellez suggested development of stakeholder engagement working group to build relationships in advance of CAP development
- S. Reed agrees with development of a working group around RFP scope of work and stakeholder working group
- NJ Mvondo stated the CA Alliance for Family Farmers has expressed interest in participating in a working group
 - J. Provenza expressed interest in incorporating farmers into an agricultural working group
- R. Datel suggested consideration of a youth working group
 - D. Saylor suggested aligning with ongoing local youth climate groups including SACOG youth leadership academy and Woodland Youth Council
- S. Reed suggested leveraging Climate Compact as a forum to exchange info and not duplicate efforts
- NJ Mvondo commented many at-large Commission applicants have expertise in electric vehicles, and therefore suggests a working group around transportation

- P. Alvarez suggested consideration of natural and working lands as a working group opportunity
- B. Austin suggested a mobility working group, RFP working group, CAP stakeholder engagement working group, and food security working group, but advises no more than four working groups at one time.

10. Meeting Adjourned

Attachment B

Staff Report on Updated Early Action Prioritization Criteria

STAFF REPORT

DATE: January 31, 2022

TO: Yolo Climate Action Commission

FROM: Taro Echiburú, Director
Department of Community Services

RE: Approval of Updated Early Action Prioritization Criteria

RECOMMENDED ACTION

1. Approve updated early action prioritization criteria

Reason for Recommended Action

Approval of early actions will help direct limited County staff resources to implementation of priority projects to reduce greenhouse gas emissions consistent with the 2020 resolution adopted by the Yolo County Board of Supervisors declaring a climate crisis requiring an urgent, inclusive mobilization in Yolo County. Approval of prioritization criteria will help the Commission advise Yolo County on the most important projects to implement.

Background

The Yolo County Climate Action Commission (“Commission”) reviewed the early action memo during the November 1, 2021 Commission meeting and requested additional time to submit early actions, more information about each action to inform the Commission’s decisions re priorities, and prioritization criteria. At the December 2, 2021 Commission meeting, the Commission provided feedback on draft prioritization criteria and directed staff to return with updated criteria at the January 2022 Commission meeting. The Commission also adopted the following timeline for development of early actions:

- January 31, 2022 – Commission approves prioritization criteria
- January 31, 2022 – Deadline to submit early actions
- February 2022 - Commission reviews and prioritizes updated early actions
- March 2022 – Commission reviews project descriptions and associated budgets for top priority actions, as well as receives update on initial funding opportunities
- April 2022 – BOS approval of Early Actions
- May 2022 – Commission approves early action grant strategy

The Commission asked staff to consider the following eight prioritization criteria at the November 2021 meeting:

- Early action is grounded in past policies
- County has authority to implement early action
- Early action benefits the unincorporated area
- There are sufficient resources to implement the early action
- Early action is eligible for American Rescue Plan funding
- Early action can be implemented quickly (e.g., shovel-ready)
- Early action advances equity goals
- Early action reduces greenhouse gas emissions

At the December 2021 meeting, Commission members asked staff to consider the following additional items related to the prioritization criteria:

- Early action is sustainable, meaning there is ongoing funding or resources to support the action
- Early action provides other benefits or co-benefits
- Early action will have long-term benefits
- Early action benefits communities vulnerable to climate impacts, high opportunity areas, or economically disadvantaged communities
- Early action can be scaled and/or adopted by other communities
- Early action is affordable, i.e. the benefits justify the costs
- Early action reflects community needs

Commission members also discussed whether staff should provide a numerical score for each early action and whether the criteria should be weighted. Commission members discussed the possibility of creating high, medium, and low categories for each criterion and adding up the number of “highs” for each early action to assist with the Commission’s ranking. Commission members generally expressed a preference for providing some scoring for each early action to help with ranking while also encouraging Commission members to use their professional judgment to prioritize the early actions.

Commission members also requested staff combine two of the eligibility criteria: 1) Yolo County must be able to work independently or with partners to complete the action by June 30, 2024 (approximately three years); and 2) early actions must have the ability to be funded and implemented in the near term. Commission members also asked to clarify the term “with partners.”

Updated Early Action Eligibility and Prioritization Criteria

Updated Eligibility Criteria

Early actions are “no regrets” projects which meet the following *eligibility* criteria:

1. The early action can be completed by Yolo County independently (or with assistance from partners) by June 30, 2024;

2. The early action must advance implementation of the 2020 Resolution No. 20-114 Declaring a Climate Crisis Requiring an Urgent and Inclusive Mobilization in Yolo County to achieve net negative carbon neutrality goal by 2030.

Summary of Changes to Eligibility Criteria

Staff moved the eligibility criteria #3 (i.e., “grounded in existing policies or listed in adopted plans”) to the prioritization criteria because staff did not want to restrict new ideas not previously included in an adopted plan from Commission consideration. Consistency with existing plans improves the competitiveness of projects for grant applications, so it is more appropriate for the prioritization criteria. Staff also removed eligibility criteria #4 because staff did not want to exclude projects based on their geographic area. However, the County must still control implementation per eligibility criteria #1.

Updated Prioritization Criteria

Since Yolo County is constrained by limited financial resources, the Commission will prioritize early actions. For each of the top 3-5 priority early actions (depending on resource availability), staff will develop full project descriptions and associated budgets. Staff will present these 3-5 early action priorities to the Board of Supervisors as a recommendation of the Commission, develop funding strategies to ensure sufficient funding for implementation, and implement the action (with partners if appropriate) prior to 2024.

Staff recommend the Commission approve the seven criteria below to inform the prioritization process. Staff will assign each early action a high, medium, or low score for each criteria using their best professional judgment. Given the challenge and resources required to accurately quantify costs, benefits, and greenhouse gas reduction of early actions, the scoring of these criteria is based on their performance relative to other early actions rather than absolute values.

1. The early action builds on or advances existing collaborations or partnerships. A collaboration/partnership is defined as an entity which is contributing funding or staff time to the early action.
 - a. High: The early action is a collaboration between three or more entities
 - b. Medium: The early action is a collaboration between two entities
 - c. Low: The early action involves one entity only
2. The early action is grounded in existing policies or listed in adopted plans

- a. High: The early action is already listed as an existing policy or strategy in an adopted plan (i.e., 2021 Sustainability Plan, 2011 Climate Action Plan)
 - b. Medium: The early action indirectly advances a policy or strategy in an existing adopted plan
 - c. Low: The early action has not been previously considered in an existing plan

3. The early action benefits an economically disadvantaged community or a community vulnerable to climate impacts, as measured by CalEnviroscreen or another appropriate tool. Community can refer to a census tract or census block group.
 - a. High: The early action benefits three or more such communities
 - b. Medium: The early action benefits 1-2 such communities
 - c. Low: The early action benefits no such communities

4. The early action reduces greenhouse gas emissions.
 - a. High: The early action reduces greenhouse gas emissions significantly more than other proposed early actions.
 - b. Medium: The early action reduces greenhouse gas emissions more than some other proposed early actions.
 - c. Low: The early action does not reduce greenhouse gas emissions, or increases greenhouse gas emissions.

5. The early action provides co-benefits other than reducing greenhouse gas emissions, such as improving health and safety, creating jobs, or otherwise increasing economic output, or increasing property values.
 - a. High: The early action provides three or more co-benefits
 - b. Medium: The early action provides 1-2 co-benefits
 - c. Low: The early provides no co-benefits

6. The benefits of the early action justify the costs. Given the lack of quantitative data available on benefits and costs for early actions, this assessment may be based on best professional judgment or qualitative information.
 - a. High: The project delivers significantly more benefits than costs relative to other proposed early actions
 - b. Medium: The early action more benefits than costs relative to other proposed early actions
 - c. Low: The early action delivers more costs than benefits relative to other proposed early actions

7. The early action has a secure, sustainable funding source for ongoing implementation or operation and maintenance. A secure funding source is defined as a contract or other firm commitment to provide resources for a specified time.
 - a. High: The early action has a secure, ongoing funding source for 10 years or more
 - b. Medium: The early action has a secure funding source for 5-9 years

- c. Low: The early action does not have a secure funding source or only has funding for up to four years
8. The early action is scalable and/or will be adopted by other communities.
- a. High: The early action is highly likely to be adopted by other communities
 - b. Medium: The early action is likely to be adopted by other communities
 - c. Low: The early action will not be adopted by other communities

Summary of Changes to Prioritization Criteria

Staff did not include American Rescue Plan eligibility or the sufficiency of resources to implement early actions as a criterion for prioritization because funding availability should not affect the selection of priorities. Staff will work to identify funding after the Commission prioritizes early actions. Staff also did not include whether the County can control implementation, because projects that do not meet this criterion are not eligible for consideration as an early action, per the eligibility criteria.

Attachment C

Staff Report on Ad-Hoc Commission Working Group for the Development of the Scope of Work for the Climate Action Plan

STAFF REPORT

DATE: January 31, 2022

TO: Yolo Climate Action Commission

FROM: Taro Echiburú, Department of Community Services

RE: Working Groups Update

RECOMMENDED ACTION

Staff recommends the Yolo County Climate Action Commission (“Commission”) pass a motion to create an ad hoc working group tasked with supporting the development of the scope of work for the Yolo County Climate Action Plan, and to appoint 2-3 members of the Commission to serve on the ad hoc working group. The scope of work will be included in the Request for Proposals (RFP) to consultants to assist the County in developing the Yolo County Climate Action Plan.

Reason for Recommended Action

At the December, 2021 Commission meeting, the Commission supported the idea of creating an ad hoc working group that could support staff’s development of the scope of work for the Yolo County Climate Action Plan. Staff are now proposing the creation of the scope of work ad-hoc working group to support a focused opportunity to inform the development of an RFP that will be used to obtain support from a technical consultant.

Background

The Board of Supervisors approved the Commission’s charter at their November 23, 2021 meeting, which specifies that working groups are subject to the Brown Act. The charter includes the following language on working groups: “The Commission may establish ad hoc working groups focused on selected topics to advance the goals set forth by Resolution No. 20-114” (page 8). During the December, 2021 Commission meeting, Commission members discussed the creation of an ad hoc working group to support the development of the scope of work for the Yolo County Climate Action Plan, but took no formal action to create or appoint Commission members to the working group. The time commitment for participation in two meetings of the ad-hoc working group is approximately 8 hours between February and April 2022.

Attachment D

YCCAC Long Range Calendar

Yolo County Climate Action Commission

Long Range Calendar 2022

Month	Topics
February	Early Action Prioritization CAP Working Groups
March	CAP scope of work Review Early Actions with associated budgets -Recommend to BOS
April	CAP Request for Proposals (initial discussion) (BOS consideration of Early Actions)
May	Cap Request for Proposals Recommendation to BOS (if needed) Early action grant strategy
June	(Release of RFP)
July	
August	
September	(Contract for CAP award)
October	CAP process
November	CAP Kickoff
December	