

MINUTES OF THE SPECIAL MEETING OF THE AMES CITY COUNCIL

AMES, IOWA

APRIL 5, 2022

The Special Meeting of the Ames City Council was called to order by Mayor John Haila at 6:00 p.m. on the 5th day of April 2022, in the City Council Chambers in City Hall, 515 Clark Avenue, pursuant to law. Present were Council Members Gloria Betcher, Bronwyn Beatty-Hansen, Amber Corrieri, Tim Gartin, Rachel Junck, and Anita Rollins. *Ex officio* Member Trevor Poundstone was absent.

WORKSHOP ON CLIMATE ACTION PLAN: Assistant City Manager Schildroth welcomed the City Council to the fourth Steering Committee Meeting. She noted that the meeting would serve as an informational session lead by Brittany MacLean and Erik Frenette with Sustainability Solutions Group (SSG), who joined the meeting electronically.

Ms. MacLean provided an overview of the information and scenarios that will be covered in the presentation. She highlighted the revised project plan noting that the team at SSG combined the low-carbon modeling with the financial analysis due to there being a lot of excitement around the financial aspect of the Plan.

Approach: Ms. MacLean provided a brief overview and review of the approach. She noted through the approach SSG used “WhatIf” technologies paired with interactive community engagement. Ms. MacLean stated that broad public engagement was completed through town halls, community surveys, with more focused engagement through the Supplemental Input Committee. She noted SSG also took the time to learn about local policies, the jurisdiction and authority of the City, and the other levels of government. She noted that the two pieces of engagement and local understanding play back and forth to influence the modeling and analysis that Mr. Frenette put together.

As part of the interactive process, Ms. MacLean stated, on the technical side, Mr. Frenette modeled the physical reality on the ground and how to sequence the actions to maximize the benefits. She noted that, on the engagement side, SSG looked at local opportunities to learn about the things that people are excited about as well as the local constraints and challenges.

Target Review: Ms. MacLean reviewed the low-carbon pathway selected by City Council to reach net-zero by 2050 with an 83% reduction in carbon emissions by 2030. She noted that this target is in line with the fair share science-based target, which is aligned with global best practices for greenhouse gas emission reductions centered around limiting global warming to 1.5-degrees Celsius.

Ms. MacLean informed the City Council that the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change published a report last week, and the Panel noted it is getting close to impossible to hit the 1.5-degree Celsius target globally if action is not taken right away. She also noted that to reach the 2.2-degree Celsius increase target, global emissions would have to peak by 2025.

Ms. MacLean reviewed where the emissions come from in Ames noting, that compared to the 2050 model, it is about the same due to population growth. She stated this unfortunately does not align with the set target by City Council, emphasizing the largest sector that contributes to emissions is transportation.

Council Member Gartin asked for clarity on how Iowa State University fits into the model. Ms. MacLean responded that on the chart Iowa State University is lumped in with Commercial.

Ms. MacLean provided an overview of the six actions that Ames can take to reduce carbon emissions and explained why these actions were identified for the model.

1. **Building Retrofits** – Ms. MacLean stated that there is a lot of energy use in buildings with emissions resulting from that energy use. She noted there are buildings in Ames that were built before energy and building codes were ever in place so buildings are not as efficient as they could be. She highlighted that the focus here is to maximize building efficiency in Ames.
2. **Net-Zero New Construction** – Ms. MacLean stated that buildings are long lasting assets and the buildings that exist are using a significant amount of energy; a pattern that should not be continued into the future making it necessary for the buildings built now to not require retrofits later.
3. **Renewable Energy Generation** – Ms. MacLean noted that there is a significant amount of energy in Ames that comes from natural gas, which is not emission-free. She stated more solar and wind energy are necessary to get to net-zero. Ms. MacLean highlighted that there are options to create renewable natural gas, but as a limited source, so a change towards renewable sources will be necessary.
4. **Reducing Vehicle Emissions** – Ms. MacLean stated this looks at moving towards electric and biodiesel vehicles.
5. **Increasing Active Transportation and Transit Use** – Ms. MacLean noted that there is already a great transit system in Ames that can be built upon while especially encouraging active transportation since it can be completely emissions free.
6. **Reducing Waste Emissions** – Ms. MacLean stated waste makes up about 3% of emissions right now, which is set to double over the lifespan of the model. She highlighted the key here is diversion and elimination of waste at the source.

Engagement: Ms. MacLean discussed the results of the survey, which was open from March 2, 2022, to March 20, 2022, online or as a printed copy. She highlighted the survey included educational components so participants could understand the referenced technology, such as heat pumps. The survey yielded 626 responses with a detailed response summary available on the Climate Action Plan website. Ms. MacLean noted the demographic intake from the survey showed fewer student responses than the first survey.

Ms. MacLean provided an overview of the key takeaways from the survey before reviewing the other channels of engagement.

Ms. MacLean stated that focus groups were conducted in which a ninety-minute presentation was provided to a specific community sector with a roundtable discussion centered around what that sector would like to see the City lead in and what areas their sector could lead in. In each of the focus groups, SSG asked the participants to provide feedback on an equity question as well. She provided a high-level overview of the comments received from the roundtable discussions noting that full notes from the focus groups will be available shortly.

Two meetings were held with the Supplemental Input Committee. In the first meeting SSG presented the Six Big Moves, and in the second meeting SSG presented the low-carbon scenario with the financial analysis. Ms. MacLean noted that there was mixed feedback from the Supplemental Input Committee regarding the first model from SSG as it did not reach the target set by City Council. She provided City Council an overview of the feedback received at each of the meetings.

Council Member Betcher asked for clarification on how to interpret feedback that read “Take it to the state house to overrule”. Ms. MacLean responded that the question asked to get that response was “How do you believe your sector will react based on the feedback you’ve received from your sector?” regarding the low-carbon scenario. She noted the individual who provided the feedback declined to elaborate on further details.

The last form of engagement was staff engagement. Ms. MacLean noted that the Technical Advisory Team was engaged at the low-carbon scenario and financial assumptions to provide assistance in informing financials as well as to provide feedback.

Council Member Rollins asked, with the 626 participants that were part of the survey, how statistically significant that might be when thinking about representing all of the City. Ms. MacLean clarified that the survey is not statistically significant because it operated differently than a public interest poll; however, the survey was reflective of the community demographics because it did reach a broad cross section of the community.

Council Member Gartin asked if SSG has any sense from the survey as to the price sensitivity that was communicated by the respondents. Ms. MacLean noted that the price data was not available at the time of the survey; what SSG gathered from open-ended survey responses in regard to financials were concerns about the ability and willingness to pay. SSG also heard a lot of feedback in those comments that there was a preference towards program incentives, rather than the regulation or mandate of action at this time.

Mayor Haila inquired about the value of the survey is if it had a very specific group of people who responded to it. Ms. MacLean clarified that she would not say a specific interest group answered the survey; SSG does not know who answered the survey aside from some general demographic markers. SSG created an engagement strategy to involve the public through presenting the ideas and proposals to ask for feedback. Ms. MacLean noted that the promise to the public was to tell them how their feedback was looked at and how SSG tried to incorporate it. She stated that it is

up to the City Council on how they want to interact with that based upon where the engagement level was set.

Mayor Haila commented that there were some people who objected to the fact that an email address was required to take the survey. He asked how the City Council thinks about that given that the survey responses may not be balanced. Ms. MacLean responded that the survey was not meant to require an email to submit the response; it was a technical error when the survey went live. SSG removed the email requirement as soon as they were notified of the issue, so it was not there for the duration of the survey.

Mayor Haila asked Ms. MacLean to comment on the education level of the survey respondents. Ms. MacLean noted that the education level, like the other pieces of demographic information collected through the survey, is not a marker for value. It was used for SSG to understand if they were reaching a good cross section of the population. She clarified that this objective was achieved; however, student representation in the responses was lacking. Mayor Haila noted that 76% of survey respondents had an undergraduate or graduate degree while only 1% had no degree and 1.5% had a high school diploma or GED. He stated that this seems weighted in terms of the demographic that is responding. Ms. MacLean agreed with Mayor Haila's statement. Mayor Haila said that the same seems to be true for income. He noted that 13% of the respondents made less than \$50,000 per year while 65% made more than \$50,000 per year. He wondered if this accurately represented the community. Ms. MacLean noted that roughly one quarter of the respondents did not disclose their income which made it harder to understand the results. She also reiterated that the survey is not meant to be a public poll; the demographic information was there to understand whom the survey reached.

Technical Approach: Ms. MacLean reviewed the low-carbon action development. SSG developed a list of potential actions and strategies based on the target, local context, and best practices. She noted that these are the modellable strategies, the on-the-ground reality based on a period of time, that will be covered by Mr. Frenette.

Ms. MacLean reviewed the financial modeling process, noting that this was done by developing a financial assumption sheet before loading the data into the model. She clarified that the financial modeling reflects the investments needed at the community level, meaning it is spread across all levels of the community. She noted that because of this, the net returns are also spread across the community. Ms. MacLean stated that the other thing to keep in mind with that is the entity making the investment is not always the entity to receive the return, so a utility may be providing an incentive and the homeowner is receiving the monetary energy savings benefits. SSG did not identify who is making the investments at this point in the model.

Mr. Frenette reviewed the financials and how they work in the model.

Council Member Gartin asked, referring to the electric vehicle (EV) purchase, if the model also took into the account the challenge of providing that electricity. He clarified that if the City were to provide electricity to those electric vehicles at a stage where it would make a significant difference, the City may not have the capacity to provide that electricity without infrastructure improvements and wondered if those costs were incorporated into SSG's analysis. Mr. Frenette

responded that the cost for the EV charging infrastructure is included in the model but the infrastructure to manage the demand for the electricity had not been included. Council Member Gartin noted that it will be an important component to consider the investment into the community to meet the energy demand as the City electrified.

What Was Modeled – Run One: Ms. MacLean reviewed the “What” for each of the six actions in the model.

1. **Building Retrofits** – Mayor Haila asked Ms. MacLean to define “retrofit” for residential, industrial, commercial, and municipal building. Ms. MacLean responded that it means a 50% use intensity reduction and a 10% plug load reduction. Mayor Haila asked, of the 90% of residential building that need to be retrofitted as outlined on the presentation, if that was 90% of residential buildings older than 1980 or 90% of the total residential building stock. Ms. MacLean clarified it would be 90% of the stock of residential buildings in Ames up to 2018 built. She noted that SSG expects a greater percentage of the older buildings being retrofitted earlier on in the model. Mayor Haila asked how the commercial and industrial buildings, such as the school district, fit in. Ms. MacLean responded that those would fit into institutional buildings. Mayor Haila asked for clarification on if these buildings would also need to be retrofitted even though many of the Ames school buildings have been renovated or rebuilt in recent years. Ms. MacLean highlighted that the model assumed approximately 1% of the building stock would be retrofitted each year regardless of the Climate Action Plan target. She noted that since this model is at the community scale, those buildings would be covered in the 1% assumption.

Council Member Gartin inquired about how the City would require 90% of the residential buildings to be retrofitted. Ms. MacLean responded in the Building Code of the State of Iowa, a municipality does not have the jurisdiction to require a building code or building code standards that are higher than what has been adopted at the State level. She stated that the way to make this happen is through education and incentives. Ms. MacLean noted that the City does not have complete control over implementation; other mechanisms must be used because the Climate Action Plan is not only the City’s responsibility, but will take community participation.

Council Member Gartin commented that it would be helpful as a data point to know if there are any other communities in the United States that are spending proportionally anything similar to the proposed price tag to make these types of changes for climate action. Ms. MacLean noted that there are hundreds of other communities across the United States that have adopted similar plans. She stated that she can provide City Council with some copies of other plans that SSG has done across the United States to better understand the financials.

2. **Net-Zero New Construction** – Council Member Gartin inquired about how much it would cost to build a net-zero house. Ms. MacLean responded that it ranges between 1.5% to 7% in additional cost. She stated that achieving net-zero new construction is much easier than

the retrofits. Council Member Gartin asked that, if homeowners are going to have these kinds of savings from a net-zero home, why are homebuilders not doing it on a voluntary basis now. Ms. MacLean noted that part of why homebuilders are not investing into net-zero new construction practices is partially education and the other is the unattractive upfront cost as explained by Frenette.

3. Renewable Energy – Mayor Haila asked Don Kom, Director of Electric Services, who attended the meeting in person, what the current Power Plant capacity is. Director Kom noted that the City of Ames has four units: the two baseload units total 100 megawatts, and the two peaking units total another 45 megawatts. Mayor Haila commented that if the City were to transition to 340 megawatts of solar and wind, the Power Plant would essentially be retired. Mr. Frenette explained how waste-to-energy facility factors into the model with the renewable energy option.

Mayor Haila asked for clarification from Director Kom on the current generation from the solar farm and inquired about the size of solar farm needed to generate the proposed objective of 340 megawatts. Director Kom provided an estimate that to generate the proposed 340 megawatts, the solar farm would need to be approximately 2,800 acres. Mr. Frenette clarified that, in the model provided, SSG used power purchasing agreements located outside of the City; however, he would be able to calculate the size of solar farm required based on the model after the meeting and provide that information to the City Council. Council Member Betcher asked Director Kom for the current size of the solar farm. Director Kom noted that the farm is about eight acres for the two megawatts generated.

4. Reducing Vehicle Emissions – No questions from the City Council.
5. Increase Active Transportation and Transit Use – Council Member Gartin stated that increasing transit use is something that the City Council has been working on with CyRide for decades. He asked the consultant for suggestions on ways that the City Council can move the needle on this. Ms. MacLean noted that there will be a change in land use and City planning over the next few years as Ames gets ready to welcome an increase in population, which grants an opportunity to look at new developments and orient those developments to be transit-friendly. Council Member Gartin noted that the City Council and City staff have worked hard at this, but the challenge is that the routes are maxed out. He stated that the City worked with a consultant on a project called CyRide 2.0 to try and maximize efficiency and tight constraints were identified on being able to do this, especially financially. Council Member Gartin noted that this is something that the City Council will need to discuss further at a later time.
6. Reduce Waste Emissions – Council Member Betcher asked how, as a homeowner, would she know what percentage her waste is being reduced. She noted she understands that the City of Ames Resource Recovery Plant knows how much waste is being taken in, but how

as an individual does she judge what her reduction is. Ms. MacLean noted that it's not important to know exactly how much the individual resident is decreasing their waste by but providing the education on how to reduce waste is important. She stated that some consumer level waste reduction will also happen naturally over time as different manufacturing companies work to reduce packaging.

Mayor Haila noted that 13 different communities in Story County bring their waste to the Resource Recovery Plant (RRP). He asked how that is factored into the model, and wondered if this would be a county-wide waste reduction or per capita. Mr. Frenette noted that SSG used the 2018 emission inventory as the baseline. Mr. Frenette and Ms. MacLean agreed that SSG can work with City Staff to identify how much waste comes to the RRP from other communities, including Iowa State University, and revise the data per capita.

Results – Run 1: Ms. MacLean reviewed the results of Run 1 of the model. She noted that this Run did not meet the City Council's target of an 83% reduction by 2030 and explained that SSG did not push the model to the 83% reduction by 2030 because extraordinary action would need to happen to make that a reality. Ms. MacLean noted that most of the emissions that are remaining in 2030 belong to the transportation sector and she discussed the options for electrification to get the model closer to target.

Ms. MacLean presented the financials associated with Run 1. Mr. Frenette reviewed the fuel price sensitivity, noting that fuel prices are highly volatile and how greatly that can affect the trajectory of the model.

Council Member Betcher asked how population growth fits into the trajectory of the model. Ms. MacLean noted that SSG used the same population projections in the model as they used in the reference scenario. She said SSG built into the model new residents moving into Ames adopting the same practices as current residents, meaning that new residents will be purchasing a net-zero home or retrofitting an older home and purchasing low-emission vehicles starting in 2030. Council Member Betcher asked if that assumes those moving to Ames are in a higher economic bracket and not those who might be coming in as workforce moving into more newly developed affordable housing. Ms. MacLean noted that this scenario would be similar to a resident currently living in Ames so there would be a variety of income brackets. She stated that there would need to be programs to ensure that all residents, new and established, can participate in reaching the target.

Council Member Gartin commented that SSG has provided the price tag of 2.4 billion dollars, but there is not a breakdown in terms of how they arrived at that number. He stated that he assumed there are associated costs with each aspect of the plan. He asked if there is a spreadsheet with that information that SSG would provide to City Council. Ms. MacLean stated that is a possibility with a big caution of interpretation because there is interplay between the different actions and the associated costs. Mr. Frenette listed the different cost analysis that SSG would be able to provide and noted he could explain the interplay between the associated costs when the City Council reviews the spreadsheet.

Council Member Gartin noted he's concerned about losing residents and businesses due to placing significant expenditures on the population. He asked the consultant how the City Council should think about selling the Climate Action Plan to the community in a way that doesn't encourage fear of flight. Ms. MacLean noted that it comes down to the way the Climate Action Plan is framed and how the implementation is designed. She said it's important to think about how to encourage and incentivize residents, and when regulation comes into play. She explained there is also a cost to inaction so there is a balance to find.

Mayor Haila asked if it was correct that natural gas disappears from Ames. Ms. MacLean clarified that sources of non-renewable natural gas would be eliminated. She noted that there is not going to be an equal amount of renewable natural gas available as there is natural gas so there will need to be a transition to other energy sources. Mayor Haila noted the majority of houses in Ames have gas fired furnaces, water heaters, stoves, and ovens. He said that, on top of that, the City of Ames has boilers and Iowa State University has three natural gas boilers. He asked Ms. MacLean if the transition to renewable natural gas is feasible to accomplish. Ms. MacLean stated that a lot of communities have robust natural gas systems and renewable natural gas is not going to meet all the needs that are currently there. She said that it is highly unlikely that Ames will receive the renewable natural gas needed to meet the need because it is so in demand. She stated that, in the model, SSG has allocated the renewable natural gas to the utility as a backup and a switch over to electric in residential through retrofits.

Council Member Betcher commented that it is interesting for SSG to mention a shift to electricity from natural gas in a community where there is one municipal electric service, but three other electric services serving Ames, one of those being Alliant Energy, that supplies natural gas. She said there could be a lot of pushback from a natural gas supplier that is not also the electric supplier. She noted that this adds a level of complexity to what must be accomplished in Ames to make the Climate Action Plan work. Ms. MacLean responded that SSG can work with Alliant Energy to start a conversation and understand its plans for the future.

Mayor Haila referred to the year-over-year incremental investment and returns chart. He asked for clarification on how the data works in the chart. Mr. Frenett clarified that the chart displays the aggregate of the whole system, so the chart does not carry over the investments from the previous year.

Results – Run 2: Ms. MacLean explained that Run 2 is the model that SSG ran after meeting with the Supplemental Input Committee based on their feedback. She noted that in this model there is an additional cost of \$621 million, for a total cost of over \$3 billion, to reach a 78% emission reduction by 2030 and 98% reduction by 2050.

Financial Insights: Ms. MacLean reviewed the highly volatile financials that impact the costs associated with the Climate Action Plan.

Key Takeaways: Ms. MacLean reviewed the model and emphasized that the Plan is meant to be a living plan that adapts with changing conditions over time.

Council Member Junck commented that the \$500 per resident per year outlined in the Key Takeaways would come out to \$14,000 per resident over the 28 years of the model. She asked how much of that is more heavily weighted upfront due to the aggressive nature of the Plan versus in the later years. MacLean noted that SSG has not done that calculation precisely.

City Manager Steve Schainker stated that the consulting team has done a good service to the City Council by laying out what it will take to reach the aspiration goal that the City Council has set. He noted that the Climate Action Plan is going to be complex, challenging, daunting, and costly. City Manager Schainker said that this process has reached a point where City staff needs to get involved again to put the Plan into terms that City of Ames customers understand. He noted that what the citizens want to know is how much their property taxes are going to be per year and what electric rates are going to be. City Manager Schainker also noted that City staff needs to look at the feasibility of implementing as some of the actions are very labor intensive. He stated that the State of Iowa is limiting city government's authority to legislate behavior and ability to raise funds, which means that City staff will need to look at the legality of the outlined actions and means to get there. City Manager Schainker said that the next step is to lay out an implementation plan with a financing plan that the City Council believes is feasible for the Ames community so it can be communicated to the citizens.

Mayor Haila clarified Iowa State University's plan to upgrade facilities to be more energy efficient and its commitment to making changes for a more sustainable future, noting that University staff is in the pre-study stage, as they try to understand the associated costs.

Council Member Junck commented that in the presentation materials it says the City Council may add to the list of requested information. She asked if it would be possible to get information about alternative funding sources, such as State or Federal funding. Ms. MacLean responded that the Federal Government recently released a list of the funding available to states and municipalities relating to energy and emissions reductions. She noted that SSG can filter that list into pieces that might be relevant to Ames and the Climate Action Plan.

Council Member Rollins stated she had a question about education and incentives. She asked SSG if they do work with best practices around that and wondered how the City Council can build those alliances and have communication across partners, but then also education for the community so everyone is involved in the process. Ms. MacLean noted that is a service that SSG provides; however, it is not what a part of what SSG was tasked to do outside of the engagement process outlined in the engagement strategy.

Council Member Betcher commented on the quote in the presentation from the Energy Innovation Policy and Technology LLC noting that she thinks it is an inspiring quote, but she doesn't think it is fitting. She explained that leaders in the federal government have power that municipal leaders just don't have. The layers of government above municipal government can preempt what municipal governments are trying to do. She stated that when President Roosevelt and his administration put the Rural Electrification Act into effect, it was a hard sell. She said that she got left with the impression that anybody can do anything when she sees the quote in the presentation. She noted that she doesn't think that is true and it is going to take a lot of effort. She said the

question for the City Council is going to be how much effort will be put into the Climate Action Plan and the educational component of it. Ms. Betcher asked if staff resources are available, to have the ability to sway the hearts of minds of the people of Ames to be on board with the Climate Action Plan. The City Council is dependent on the citizens for making it happen. Council Member Betcher also noted that she believes it is well worth the staff time to investigate the issue of the “how”, now that SSG has presented the “what” in terms of the Climate Action Plan. She does not think that the City Council has enough information at this time to make a decision.

Council Member Gartin stated that he has asked questions tonight with the goal of trying to understand the facets of the Climate Action Plan proposal. He noted that, up until the Climate Action Plan workshop in December 2021, the City Council was unanimous on every single vote with respect to climate matters. He said that what he knows is that, with a \$2.4 billion price tag, the City Council will have to max out what the City of Ames is charging citizens for property taxes and utilities. He stated that he has serious concerns that if the City Council increases the cost of living and doing business in Ames, it is going to make it easier for citizens to relocate, which will have a major impact on the community. He noted that increased living expenses will also make it much more difficult for students and families to choose Iowa State University for education. Council Member Gartin said, in December 2021, he pleaded with his fellow Council Members to not adopt a goal without understanding the price tag. Now that City Council knows the cost of the plan, Mr. Gartin proposed that the City Council take a step back to do a cost-benefit analysis, review a proposal, gather public input, and make a decision on an aggressive and robust plan for climate action through that evidentiary approach.

Mayor Haila asked City Manager Schainker if what Council Member Gartin is asking for is in part a byproduct of City Manager Schainker’s recommendation to the City Council. City Manager Schainker replied in the affirmative.

Mayor Haila noted the City Council needed to be careful framing the financials of the Climate Action Plan because thus far the City Council has taken no action to increase the cost of living in Ames. He stated that the City Council needed that type of information first before making a decision.

Council Member Rollins asked for clarification that the \$2.4 billion was never anticipated to fully be the cost for the City of Ames, and that there are multiple partners that would need to be involved in raising those funds. Ms. MacLean confirmed that Council Member Rollins was correct, noting that the model is a community level financial analysis. Council Member Rollins stated that the City Council is not making that \$2.4 billion commitment, rather the City Council is asking for additional input.

Council Member Gartin noted that property taxes are correlated to the City’s expenditures, expressing concern about where the money is going to come from to fund the Climate Action Plan. He stated he would like the City Council to see what is realistic and go after that aggressively.

Council Member Corrieri said that not anyone who has been engaged in the climate action planning process believes the goal set by the City Council is absolutely going to be accomplished in the next several years. She said in the conversations that the City Council has had, Council Members

have discussed this being an aspiration goal to send a message to the community about the direction that the City Council is moving in. She noted, now that the City Council has seen the financial model, more information is needed to chart a path forward that aspires to reach the goal.

Council Member Junck added it is important for the City Council to see the “how” behind what is possible in the steps presented. She noted there are jurisdictional challenges and financial issues that the City Council needs to see before making a decision to change the trajectory of the Plan. Council Member Junck emphasized that she is supportive of getting more information before making a decision and that the City Council is on the right track in this process.

Council Member Beatty-Hansen agreed with comments from Council Members Corrieri and Junck. She noted that she doesn’t believe that the City Council Members are taking the cost lightly. She emphasized that she can’t explain enough her fear of the cost of inaction. She noted that she believes every level of government needs to step up to help heal the earth, and in the meantime, City Council needs to make that effort where it’s possible.

Moved by Betcher, seconded by Junck, to ask staff to continue working with SSG to develop the “how” of the Climate Action Plan as City Manager Schainker outlined.

Vote on Motion: 5-1. Voting Aye: Betcher, Beatty-Hansen, Corrieri, Junck, Rollins. Voting Nay: Gartin. Motion declared carried.

DISPOSITION OF COMMUNICATIONS TO COUNCIL: Mayor Haila noted that there is one item on the list to inform the City Council that the subdivision of 6.5 acres of land at 2359 210th street for residential use will be placed on an upcoming agenda. He stated that no action was needed at this time.

COUNCIL COMMENTS: Council Member Betcher that commented she wished Council Member Gartin trusted the City Council a little bit more to make wise decisions about the finances based on complete information.

ADJOURNMENT: Moved by Corrieri, seconded by Junck, to adjourn the meeting at 8:51 p.m. Motion declared carried unanimously.

Carly M. Watson, Principal Clerk

John A. Haila, Mayor

Diane R. Voss, City Clerk