



**Environmental Management Commission
Meeting Minutes November 8, 2017**

Meeting Location: Health Department, 2400 Troost Ave, KCMO

Commissioners present: Carol Adams, Caroline (Molly) Davies, Gloria Ortiz Fisher, Jim Hansen, Marty Kraft, Robin Martinez, DJ Pierre, Ben Proffer, Nacente Seabury, Emily Truebner

Commissioners Absent: Jensen Adams, Bob Berkebile, Rachel Guthrie, Kimberly Hill, Julie Koppen, Seft Hunter Jack Schrimsher

Staff: Dennis Murphey and Jerry Shechter – OEQ; Katie Chandler - Law

Guests: Joy Heaviland – Heartland Conservation Alliance, Mary Ellen Vincent – Sierra Club, David Mitchell, Frank Zilm and Stephen Melton – Citizens Climate Lobby, Scott Klamm – MRI Global

- A. The meeting was called to order at 4:05 pm; A quorum was present. Co-chair Carol Adams welcomed commissioners, staff, and guests who introduced themselves.
- B. Minutes – Ben Proffer made a motion, seconded by DJ Pierre, to approve the minutes of the meetings of October, 2017 as presented. The motion was approved.
- C. Carbon Pricing Proposal - Citizens Climate Lobby (CCL) – Stephen Melton and David Mitchell
This presentation was a follow up to the presentation at the meeting in October; Background and context can be found in the minutes of the meeting of November 2017.

David Mitchell - Carbon pricing is a means to create an atmosphere to address climate change. The draft resolution for consideration, presented at the November meeting, has been revised and distributed.

Stephen Melton – Fielded questions based on CCL responses to EMC questions from the October meeting. He indicated the focus is to reduce carbon build-up using economic pressure. He reviewed the estimated tax burdens over time that would be realized based on the CCL proposal and noted this is a progressive fee structure. There was concern expressed about the impact on low income residents regardless of whether they rent or own property. Mr. Melton responded there is no intent to do economic harm while creating a revenue neutral program.

Ben Proffer asked about any existing models to which Mr. Melton noted the model in British Columbia which has a similar focus using a mix of programs. The CCL proposed carbon fee starts low, at \$15 per ton and increases over time and, hopefully, forces people to think ahead. Marty Kraft asked how to communicate this with people? Mr. Melton speculated the program may need to be enforced on rental units. Carol Adams was concerned about increased fees in later years and the impact of increasing utility process as the impact fees are passed to consumers. British Columbia eliminates the dividend for higher income people and increases it for lower income people.

Mr. Melton noted this proposal is not a way to address poverty but to address carbon use and, hopefully, accelerate the move away from carbon use. He also noted that there is nothing in the proposed draft calling for a flat dividend.

Robin Martinez thanked CCL for bringing this idea and sparking thought among the EMC but expressed some concern about the EMC readiness to make this kind of recommendation to the City. He expressed an alternative that some or all of the dividend could be used for vast improvements in transportation systems or pay for energy efficiency improvements of low income households. He indicated he would like to ask other stakeholders, such as KCP&L or economists at UMKC, to come to the EMC and discuss potential macro-economic impacts. If the EMC is to take this action and make a recommendation to the Mayor and Council, we would need to be as informed as possible. Nacente Seabury agreed. Caroline Davies noted she sees a need to address the education component of the process and the need to bring a lot of people into the discussion about this tool and others. Jim Hansen stated this would give the EMC and City Council an opportunity to think about something new and

to make a policy recommendation to Congress. DJ Pierre sees this as a benign resolution which can be modified to meet a range of concerns. He noted any impactful program would carry unavoidable costs.

Jim Hansen made a motion, seconded by DJ Pierre that the EMC draft a resolution n, with modifications, that addresses reduced impact on lower income households. The vote was 5 to 5 and did not pass.

Carol Adams said she thought it might be appropriate to open a broader discussion, perhaps with MARC's help, regarding the economic impacts of environmental mitigation strategies on low and moderate income residents. She cited the hardships some are facing due to higher water and sewer bills as an example.

Robin Martinez made a motion, seconded by Nacente Seabury, to set out a timetable, by the meeting scheduled for 12.13.17, to invite other stakeholders into the discussion to explore this and related issues with the objective of helping the EMC get comfortable with making a recommendation to the Mayor and City Council. In general discussion, it was noted this would be a forum for community discussion on how to transition to a clean energy economy and how it will affect people, maybe find some local solutions, and be an advocate for national solutions. The first discussion could be in December at the next meeting. The motion passed.

D. Commission Operations – Katie Chandler

Based on the current EMC charter and Rules of Procedure, Ms. Chandler discussed how Commissioners could make changes in those documents and focus. Because the EMC was not written into the decree, the EMC is not governed by the decree and there is flexibility. A City Council ordinance established the EMC with three core duties (as noted at the bottom of each month's agenda): (1) to review plans, budgets, programs and actions of the City which substantially impact the City's environment, (2) to provide for the preparation of plans addressing the long term environmental needs of the City, and (3) to monitor the City's actions for compliance with environmental laws and regulations. The enabling ordinance could be changed in a 2-3 week process. The By-Laws are existing and changes are relatively simple but require 10 votes. She suggested Commissioners might want to look at documents of other boards and commissions and might want to redefine the role to focus more on advocacy. Ms. Chandler will review other documents and provide 2-3 that would be appropriate to review.

Carol Adams asked each Commissioner to think about what makes the EMC effective, what helps the City and how the EMC addresses community issues. We can then look at the current structure and make recommendations to City Council for revising the ordinances and, then, address the By-laws. Carol would like to see intentional overlap with appointments to other bodies as well as other planning activities. However, the EMC must be careful how we interact with constituents of Council members.

This issue was placed on the agenda for the December meeting.

E. Retreat Priorities – Jensen Adams – No report

F. Liaison Updates –

1. Air Quality Forum – No report
2. LEED – No report
3. Solid Waste Planning – No report
4. Climate Protection Steering Committee – The next meeting is Friday, December 1, 2017
5. Vacant Lots – Will have a report next month
6. Health Commission – No report

G. Legal Brief – See D above

H. Old Business – N/A

I. New Business – N/A

J. Remarks

1. Scott Klamm, MRIGlobal – noted that National Renewable Energy Lab (NREL) is offering free training with applications due by 11.17.17 as part of the doe SunShot Program.

The next EMC meeting is: December 13, 2017
 4:00 pm to 5:00 pm
 Health Department – 2400 Troost Ave

The meeting was adjourned at 6:00 pm