



# MONTANA CLIMATE SOLUTIONS COUNCIL

## CLIMATE ADAPTATION COMMITTEE

### MEETING INFORMATION

Wednesday March 11, 2020

1:00 pm

Montana DNRC HQ, Montana Room, 1<sup>st</sup> floor – 1639 11<sup>th</sup> Ave., Helena, MT

### ATTENDEES

John Tubbs	Kathy Hadley
Bruce Maxwell	Craig Henrikson
Sally Ericsson	Hannah Riedl
Bill Bryan	Shaun McGrath
Amy Cilimburg	Renee Lemon
Kelsey Jencso	KarenDe Herman
Laurie Yung	Stacey Barta
Cathy Whitlock	Stephen Kimball

### THEMES

Goal of the meeting was to review the draft recommendations document and make sure information wasn't left out during the synthesis.

1A and 1B -- Kathy Hadley proposed revisions to 1B so that the focus centers on creating an *advisory* council. The bullets listed are more action items, a role not intended for an advisory council. Bruce agreed that some changes were needed; he has edits. John Tubbs pointed out 1B needs to be clear about *who* they are advising. Laurie Young thought Patrick may have combined a couple different ideas, and she recommended councilmembers work to tease them back apart, rather than just eliminate ideas. Kelsey reminded the council what Shaun McGrath said about the need to incorporate agencies so that the council has "teeth;" the drought committee is a good model. Bruce pointed out that Agricultural experimental station and Forestry experimental station have budgets insulated from the university system—could be a house for this type of council.

Kelsey, Laurie, Cathy, Bruce, John and Shaun will convene a phone call to discuss edits to 1A and 1B. Specifically, they will sort out the details of a Climate Advisory Committee: 1) what is its charge? 2) whom does it answer to? 3) How is it funded and how do we connect university and state agency governance? This will be completed and a revised white paper related to 1b will be resubmitted by our next meeting.

1G—Section needs to start with a clear statement about climate change and wildfire. Cathy thinks the language comes across as "we can fix this," where instead it needs to acknowledge wildfire, and related human health issues, is a part of a changing climate. John pointed out that in some ways, this section needs to point to the Forest Action 10-year Plans. Fire needs its own recommendation, Steve agreed. It is a serious climate impact and should be pulled from the ecosystems section focused on rangelands, forests, and wildlife.

Kathy thought that the bullet about "wildlife, habitats, and ecosystems" could be more specific; perhaps state that an updated report is needed every 5 years? Kelsey said that that was the intent of the Montana Climate Assessment, and that concept could be incorporated into 1A and 1B. Tubbs asked if we should require the agencies

to report out to the climate advisory committee in case this new advisory committee does not have a budget. Shaun pointed out that it is important to report out based on need, not on a calendar year.

Clarify that the climate assessments are continuous on a biennial basis. These will be generated and incorporate new sectors (e.g. health, tourism, wildlife, rangelands, etc.) as needs are assessed by the climate committee. State agencies shall contribute existing efforts (i.e. a status update of activities) as these reports are continually updated. This allows us to track progress and assess our efficacy over time. Also, it was pointed out that the climate assessments should be linked all of the natural resources sections to highlight that this is a continuous process that will be updated under the University-State Agency climate committee.

1F—Bruce commented: Need to add fertilizer and pesticide input reduction as a practice that needs to be implemented. Ben agreed it would make sense if it was linked to education and incentive, making sure it's clear that it is not mandatory.

1E—Renee pointed out that the reporting identified in 1E should be linked to 1A and 1B

2N—The council discussed that mass transportation was a comment theme arising in public comments. Renee thought that mass transportation was covered in 2N. Cathy emphasized a need to incorporate inter- and intra-city transportation. Amy thought that there just was not time to integrate this into the draft.

Amy spoke about a need to have local strategies for climate mitigation planning as well as adaptation planning. Amy and others are pulling together the community process recommendations from the GHG mitigation, innovation and CAID committees so that they recommended processes are consistent while recognizing that the stakeholders will differ.

Bill spoke about a need to identify actions for the individual Montanan. Maybe house a group of people in DNRC, MSU Extension, etc., to provide advice for how individuals can “de-carbonize.” Where can they get that information? Will initiatives in other cities or states work in my city? Kelsey pointed out that is the goal of Climate Smart Montana and agreed it should be included in the Plan. John pointed out that there are a lot of programs that exist to help people reduce their energy expenditure.

Hannah made the point that the public comments reinforce the need focus less on a climate change and more on emphasizing the health, economic and other co-benefits.

There was also some discussion that the draft report may need to be strengthened around water issues and appeared to be several members interested in providing effort for that. This included Kelsey.

Tubbs also mentioned that relative to the council discussion, that perhaps the Montana Consumer Council might play some role where some of the recommendations impact costs for Montanans.

## ACTION ITEMS

Authors should review full and condensed whitepapers and the [Draft Montana Climate Solutions Plan](#) for omissions, issues that should be clarified, messaging language, and errors. The goal is to make the recommendations more operational.

The review does not need to follow a specific format, but try to make sure that the questions posed on today's agenda are answered:

*Can the recommendations be implemented with an existing program or initiative?*

*If a new initiative is needed, does it require new funding and/or legislative action?*

*Who is best positioned to lead implementation of this recommendation? (e.g., State agencies, State legislature, counties, cities, ngo's, business)*

*Who must support implementation efforts for it to be effective?*

*What's missing from the draft recommendations?*

*How do we frame the issues in a compelling way for Montanans?*

*How can we communicate the breadth and significance of the recommendations?*

In addition, authors should identify

*the co-benefits (e.g., health, economics, clean air and water) of recommendations*

*activities that the state is doing NOW and activities that could be implemented FAST.*

*how recommendations can be tailored to the individual.*

Please review the initial working papers and update since they eventually will be available to the public.

**Due by March 31**