

Green New Deal Oversight Board Meeting Minutes

MEETING SUMMARY	Date: 08/21/2023
	Time: 5:00pm – 7:00pm
	Location: Zoom
MEMBERS PRESENT:	Ken Workman, Keith Weir, Andrea Ornelas, Tomás Madrigal, Emily Meyers, Steve Gelb, Maria Batayola, Matt Remle, Jess Wallach, Nina Olivier, Peter Hasegawa, and Eunice How
MEMBERS ABSENT:	Debolina Banerjee (on leave) and Rachel Heaton
GUESTS:	Elise Rasmussen (OSE), Sara Cubillos (OSE), Lylianna Allala (OSE), Sandra Mallory (OSE), Michelle Caulfield (OSE), and Devin Speak (freelance journalist currently writing for Real Change)

DECISIONS MADE	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> APPROVED: July Meeting Minutes APPROVED: GND Oversight Board 2023-2024 Workplan APPROVED: GND Oversight Board Proposed Amendment to the Tree Protection Ordinance
-----------------------	---

FOLLOW-UP ACTION ITEMS			
#	ITEM	RESPONSIBLE PERSON(S)	TARGET DATE
1	Publish and transmit the Board’s 2023-2024 Workplan	Elise	8/31/23
2	Next steps to move forward the Board’s proposed amendment to the Tree Protection Ordinance	Maria & Executive Committee	
3	Share how BEPS revenue from non-compliance payments is allocated in the proposed BEPS legislation language.	Sandra	8/31/23

MEETING NOTES

Peter Hasegawa, Nina Olivier (GNDOB Co-Chairs) and Elise Rasmussen (Climate and Environmental Justice Associate) facilitated the meeting.

Notes taken by Sara Cubillos (Climate Justice Advisor)

WELCOMES AND INTRODUCTIONS

Nina started the meeting, reviewed the meeting agenda, and said the land acknowledgement.

APPROVING PREVIOUS MEETING’S MINUTES

BOARD ACTION Motion: **Keith** moved to approve July meeting minutes. **Matt** seconded the motion.

BOARD VOTES TO APPROVE the July meeting minutes unanimously.

PUBLIC COMMENT

No members of the public signed up for public comment or written testimony.

DISCUSSION: BOARD WORKPLAN AND PRIORITY SETTING

Elise reviewed the Board's revised 2023-2024 draft workplan that was refined with Board feedback. The focus of the presentation was to share the updates to the workplan and to provide ample time for discussion among Board members for any additional feedback, with the goal to approve the workplan at this meeting. Elise focused on two workplan priorities with the most significant revisions since the previous draft.

Board Function & Capacity Priority: The intention of the priority is supporting the Board's goal to be more proactive in determining Board priorities, identifying and perusing Board goals and desired governance processes, and supporting Board member and City staff capacity to implement Seattle's Green New Deal. Elise shared that she shortened the timeline for this priority, in response to Board member feedback.

Budget & Policy Recommendations Priority: The intention of this priority is to create a clear process for the Board to transmit their 2025-2026 budget and policy recommendations. This priority involves, information gathering about City and community GND work to date, reinstating the Policy, Program, and Project Committee (PPPC), tracking progress of investments, and drafting and finalizing budget and policy recommendations. This priority also includes connecting the PPPC to City staff that are subject matter experts on key GND work. All of which will happen in tandem with community engagement to ensure the Board's recommendations are rooted in community and worker priorities. In response to Board member feedback, the PPPC would work in cycles to draft recommendations, work with City staff and the Board to refine and adopt recommendations, and then repeat that process.

Elise relayed the minor feedback she received on the Community and Worker Engagement and Communications priority and the Indigenous Sustainability Projects priority.

Board members then discussed and provided additional feedback on the draft workplan:

Peter shared his desire to condense the timeline for the Board Function and Capacity priority to be less than a year with a proposal to work in three-month cycles to identify goals, similar to the Budget and Policy Recommendations priority. He liked the information gathering activity and would like updates on the climate action plan and GND budget investments. Peter had a concern about how this workplan accounts for emergent work and wanted to make sure the Board does not exclude important opportunities for the GND just because those opportunities are not aligned in the Board's workplan or goals. He stated that he would not like to vote on the plan at this time, and thought the vote should be delayed to September's meeting.

Maria said she agreed with the compressed timeline for the Board Function and Capacity priority. She shared that she would like to focus on identifying gaps in GND implementation and is more concerned with results-based accountability, rather than process-based accountability. Maria said she wants to know how the City has progressed on its incentives, climate resilience plans, and existing coordination efforts across all levels of government, especially as it pertains to funding opportunities.

Steve shared that the GND is such a powerful and broad concept that it might include everything the City does. Steve would like to focus on figuring out: How much climate pollution do we have today? What is the City's progress on eliminating that pollution? What are the City Departments' plans for their near and long-term GND work?

Nina asked if there might be repercussions from postponing the workplan.

Sara shared that there would be no major repercussions, but the Board is already delayed in adopting a workplan. Sara added that having a workplan helps to organize the Board as well as City Departments with our collective GND priorities and said that the Board does not need to follow the workplan to a tee.

Tomás asked who on the Board has the capacity to condense something that is a long term priority into a shorter timeline? He shared his concerns about capacity and does not think the Board or staff have the resources or capacity to make this work happen faster. He said it was on the Board to step up and do the work faster if the Board wants a more compressed timeline.

Maria replied to Tomás and said that Elise and Sara would coordinate with the City Departments to gather information on greenhouse gas emissions and climate resiliency. She said the Board needs to get a good sense of where the City is going, figure out the gaps, and then focus on the gaps. Maria said it is on the Board to get clarity on goals and not work piece by piece or issue by issue.

Steve wondered if these two ideas could exist together. The “information gathering” activity could be changed to “information gathering on GND goals and top-level objectives in the City”. Steve said the information we gather should be focused so the Board can move more quickly with goal development.

Andrea said she was also in favor of shorter timeline for the Board Function and Capacity priority. She asked if there is any discernment about how soon the Board can get that done and who can be a part of getting this priority done?

Maria responded to Andrea that the Board first needs access to the information, then the Board can spend a big block of time digesting the information, discussing, and setting priorities.

Eunice shared that she was also in favor of delaying the vote and making shorter term goals that we can then revisit and reevaluate on an ongoing basis.

Elise responded to Board comments about wanting the Board to have the flexibility to address or respond to emergent issues and said that being nimble can be a Board goal. She added that this priority would support the Board in having agreed upon processes for how the Board will function in a more nimble manner to respond to emergent needs.

Steve commented that the Board is facing an interesting dilemma in that we are trying to move more quickly but we are also delaying approving the work plan, which will slow us down. He added that there is nothing in the plan that says the Board cannot move faster. He stated that he does not want to have another meeting discussion about the work plan, instead he would rather discuss GND activities going forward. He urged the Board to do what everyone wants and move forward with the plan.

Sara lifted up Tomás’ idea to make the Board Function and Capacity priority iterative in 3-4 month cycles like the Budget and Policy Recommendations priority. She added that staff can get the Board data on the Payroll Expense Tax investments as well as other information and data that is currently available and then continue to revisit Board goals as new information and data comes in.

Maria proposed the idea of adopting the workplan as provisional so the Board can adjust the workplan as needed in the future. Maria shared that she is nervous about doing the work in smaller chunks because it may not allow the Board to see the big picture. She added that the PPC should include Board

members with expertise in all three buckets (climate resiliency, economic inclusion, and climate pollution elimination) to accomplish this accelerated timeline.

The Board took a five-minute break.

Peter opened the meeting again with a recap of what was discussed so far on this agenda item and asked Elise if she thought it would be feasible to do this work in four months.

Elise noted that there will be five new Board members in the late fall/early winter, and they need to be able to have input on the goals once they are appointed. Elise then shared she will support the Board if the Board decides complete this activity in four months, but that might mean that other activities and priorities may need to be delayed, depending on Board and staff capacity.

Peter replied that it is the Board's responsibility to prioritize this and get the work done in four months. He added that if staff are willing to work with the Board to do this goal setting process in four months, he thinks the plan is feasible and asked his fellow board members to support this plan.

VOTE: BOARD WORKPLAN

BOARD ACTION Motion: **Peter** moved to approve the Board's 2023-2024 workplan with the amendment that the goal setting process only take 4 months. **Steve** seconded the motion.

BOARD VOTES TO APPROVE their 2023-2024 Workplan.

- Note: **Ken** voted "yes, with reservations."

UPDATE AND DISCUSSION: BUILDING EMISSIONS PERFORMANCE STANDARDS (BEPS)

Sandra Mallory (OSE) shared that we are at the point where we have a final BEPS policy proposal, and it is ready to go through the political process. She thanked the Board for their engagement on this policy and listed several specific points where the Board helped to shape the policy proposal. Sandra also noted that BEPS has GND Payroll Expense Tax funding for supporting BEPS implementation for under-resourced buildings. Sandra noted that the pathway for BEPS still includes significant rule making, program design, and implementation. She welcomed the Board to continue engaging throughout that process.

Steve asked to Sandra to please keep the Board informed of the needs that under-resourced buildings have to be able to participate in the accelerator program so they can comply early.

Maria offered to continue helping with community engagement in Beacon Hill throughout this process.

Peter asked Sandra where penalty payment funding goes.

Sandra replied that funding goes to under-resourced buildings to help them reduce emissions. The proposed policy allots at least 40% of that funding for those buildings. Sandra also noted that the City's Budget office ultimately decides how the revenue is allocated.

Peter asked Sandra for the specific language on where those funds would go.

Jess wanted to understand where the revenue goes, and specifically wanted to know if the revenue generated from BEPS goes to the City's general fund.

Sandra said she would work on getting that language to the Board and noted that this revenue stream would not come for a while. She added that the amount of funding depends on how many building owners choose to go with the non-compliance payment option. Sandra said the proposed legislation language does not specify that those funds will go to the City's general fund, rather, the language is more focused on how the money will be used. Sandra did not believe the language has changed since the SEPA process.

Steve asked the Board if they should consider endorsing BEPS.

Peter asked when the proposed legislation will reach City Council.

Sandra replied sometime this fall.

Peter suggested possibly moving forward with a Board endorsement once the Board gets more information from Sandra about where the revenue would go.

TREE ORDINANCE DISCUSSION REQUEST

Maria opened this agenda item with a presentation and proposal for the Board to consider focused on a proposed amendment to the City's Tree Protection Ordinance. She stated that the ordinance did not adequately protect tree canopy, nor does it include a race and social justice analysis. Maria said the current version of the ordinance is counterproductive to the GND and climate and equity principles and while the ordinance includes an equity plan, there is no clear pathway for an equitable implementation of the ordinance. Maria said she is pushing to have the ordinance include tree equity, climate resilience, and the City's comprehensive plan goal for 30% tree canopy in Seattle. Maria said the City did not partner effectively with the City's Urban Forestry Commission (UFC) when adopting the Tree Protection Ordinance because the ordinance was passed too fast.

Maria asked that the Board support the following proposed amendment to the ordinance:

1. Establish the Tree Protection Ordinance Enhancement Task Force,
2. Task Force to be co-chaired by UFC and the Green New Deal Oversight Board,
3. Include representatives from the Seattle Environmental Committee, tree advocacy groups, City departments and offices,
4. Benefit from the technical assistance from the state Department of Natural Resources,
5. Support the Task Force with \$30K funding for a consultant under the supervision of the Office of Sustainability and Environment, and
6. Provide a report with recommended actions to Council Sustainability or Neighborhood Committee by February of 2024.

Maria added that the Beacon Hill Community Council has been working with tree advocates and has been meeting with Councilmember Morales who told them there is no energy for this amendment and to look at a budget proviso option. Maria said she is willing to work with Councilmember Mosqueda to get support from other council members. Maria also said they have been working with Councilmembers Strauss and Nelson and other allies outside the Council's Land Use Committee and stated that this recommendation can only fly if the Board supports it.

Elise shared staff considerations for the Board to note. She said staff agree that tree canopy equity is important for building climate resilience in frontline communities. Elise said Board staff have also been

in contact with staff who support the Urban Forestry Commission (UFC) and passed along information she has learned from those conversations:

1. The Tree Protection Ordinance was developed over the course of 14 years and many of the recommendations from the UFC were incorporated into the ordinance.
2. UFC staff can present to the Board in September provide more insight and information on this work and the ordinance itself.
3. The UFC is not aware of this proposed amendment. The proposed amendment has not been brought up in a formal setting or a public meeting, so the UFC has not had a chance to discuss or vote on this proposed amendment.
4. The Tree Protection Ordinance is one specific piece of a much broader policy to protect trees, including protecting trees on public lands, right of ways, etc. The City has a less direct role in managing trees on private lands. The only way the City does this is through implementing and enforcing regulations around what property owners and developers are allowed to do with trees on private lands. Because urban forestry management on private lands is a less direct role for the City, it is a smaller piece of the City's work.
5. Executive Order 2023-03 – One Seattle Tree Plan covers trees on public lands. The Board will have several opportunities to engage on the Canopy Equity and Resilience Plan.

Elise recommended that the Board focus on high impact urban forestry work, like providing Board expertise to shape the Canopy Equity and Resilience Plan. She added that staff can help facilitate meetings between members of the Urban Forestry Commission and the Board to align goals/priorities related to the GND.

Maria responded that there is a need to gather community climate perspectives and that she wanted the Board's blessing before going to the UFC with this proposed amendment, however, the UFC Co-Chair has looked at this proposal.

Steve asked if this is not the role better suited for the UFC. He said this Board can support with the climate goals and empower the UFC to work with a climate lens, but was not sure if this was the right role or focus for this Board.

Peter asked Maria if she would like to put forward a vote. **Maria** confirmed she would like a vote.

BOARD ACTION Motion: **Peter** moved to approve Maria's proposal for an amendment to the Tree Protection Ordinance. **Nina** seconded the motion.

BOARD VOTES TO APPROVE the proposed amendment for the Tree Protection Ordinance.

- Note: **Tomás** abstained because the UFC was not yet on Board and **Steve** voted "I don't approve, but I don't block"

UPDATES AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

The Board did not have an opportunity to discuss this agenda item.

NEXT STEPS & ADJOURN

Peter adjourned the meeting at 7:01pm.