

Task Force Meeting #3  
Biddeford  
Monday Feb. 6th, 5:30-7:30

**Biddeford Task Force Meeting Notes**

TF Attendees: Meaghan Daly, Steven Reiter, Brad Favreau, Bill Emhiser, Jake Aman

Project Team Attendees: Karina, Abbie, Tom H.

**Key takeaways**

- Vision statement is being drafted after community input
- Readiness to start thinking about GHG emissions reduction strategies
- Need for more guidance about a strategy prioritization process that is clear and transparent
- Getting started on significant public engagement, in particular a photovoice exhibition at Engine this Spring

**Action Items**

- Task Force
  - Draft vision statement and share with SMPDC
  - Review SMPDC's matrix of buildings and energy strategies and provide feedback.
    - Start writing down thoughts, comments, questions about strategies
- Project Team
  - Provide a list of potential strategies with local examples for buildings and energy category
  - Compile emissions reduction strategies for the other categories
  - Complete draft vulnerability assessment by end of Feb.

**Intro**

- Question (Brad): what's the timeline for finding a new public engagement consultant? How long do you think it will take to find one?
  - Depends on how tomorrow's meeting with Carol M. goes. If there's support for moving forward with Carol and Zoe, we could bring them on board very quickly. If TF want to go another route, the timeline would change.
  - Brad: Are we still on track for completing the plan by September?
  - Karina: Yes, I think so, especially with the progress Biddeford TF has made. Project team is still moving forward with work to meet the September deadline

**Task Force Updates:**

- Brad: Put together a strong communications plan with strategies and messaging that they'd like to take out to the community. Nailed down a budget for engagement events and put out a request for ideas to develop the vision statement. They have a number of responses, although not as many as hoped, but strong enough to proceed with **drafting vision statement this week.**
  - Will share with project team once statement is drafted

- Strongly working with Engine to put together a photovoice project to gather input from community. Will be exhibited at Engine in mid- March through May 1. Will have a voting component for community to vote on top photo. Engine is very eager to work with TF and has been a strong partner.
- Efforts are really focused on community engagement right now

### **Vulnerability Assessment**

- Steve Lives in block group 3 and he and many of his neighbors use wood, pellets, or biomass bricks for home heating. Is there a way to capture that information? Maybe a survey question for community members.
  - Karina: This information is captured in the ACS for primary heating, but not for supplementary heating
- Bill: would like to see expanded info regarding flood hazards. He lives in block group 18 and during a recent storm, his property was basically an island because of the coastal flooding
  - Abbie: Will be many more maps and info about flood hazards in the complete vulnerability assessment
- Meaghan: comment and question about lack of info about energy infrastructure in the B&E summary document.
  - Karina: Power outage data will be in vulnerability assessment. Might be difficult to find information on Energy infrastructure locations.

### **Strategy Development**

- Steve: thinks they're ready to start brainstorming loosely what the strategies might be and where they need to go with high-impact actions for GHG reductions
- Meaghan: feel like we need a more structured and facilitated process for developing strategies. Thought that project team said it would be doing data gathering of what other ME communities have done and best practices - an overview of some of those practices and available tools in the toolbox would be really helpful for TF when they're trying to think of strategies.
- Karina: we have that for B&E, but didn't want to share before the meeting in case TF felt it wasn't ready to see it yet.
- Steve: suggests a group brainstorm of reviewing the example strategies and coming up with a comprehensive list
- Brad: agree with Steve's suggestion. It would be good to have some structure or outline to take into their public engagement that they could use to get input and buy-in from community regarding what strategies are important to them.
- Meaghan: thought that one of 4E's strengths and appeal was that they said they were really good at helping communities prioritize actions/strategies. That turned out to not be the case, but really want to prioritize
  - How do we actually want to do what steve suggested - coming up with comprehensive list of potential strategies
  - Then, how do we narrow and prioritize list of strategies

- Steve agrees - first step is a group brainstorm in-person, and then go through a prioritization activity based on constraints (e.g., budget, feasibility, etc.). He is a six-sigma black belt, so he has the tools and skills to help guide the prioritization and is happy to do that. So that would be in-person
- Bill: when will we have the example strategies for the other buckets?
  - Karina: need to wait for the vulnerability assessment results for the adaptation ones, which will be early March
- Brad: have you considered community action items that GOPIF published?
  - Karina: yes, other question is how the CAP strategies might relate to the comp plan strategies. How does the CAP relate to the comp plan, and vice versa and how/where is there alignment.
  - Bill: Some alignment will be there and good, plans will be released within 4 or some months of each other, the comp plan will be more general in nature
  - Meaghan: most recent version of comp plan is almost a placeholder recognizing that City is doing the CAP and that will spell out much of what needs to be done on climate change. Some of what the cons comm and task force recommended in the comp plan got lost in iterations of comp plan chapter revisions. Comp plan really points to the CAP for climate actions/strategies
  - Brad: Comp plan chapters have been boiled down to very digestible content and data will be packed into an appendix. All goals/strategies that TF recommended are definitely in the comp plan
- Abbie: would group like to see more or less info about strategies right now (just a list of strategies vs. strategies with supplemental info like cost, type, considerations, feasibility, co-benefits, etc.)?
  - Jake: always interested in seeing more info than less for strategy examples. Especially co-benefit information.
  - Meaghan: vision statement will help the group with what criteria is used to prioritize actions/strategies. Charter says that TF will come up with equitable, effective, and efficient strategies. So maybe TF needs to think about, all other considerations aside, what are those strategies that meet those charter requirements, and then apply some of the other criteria (feasibility, etc) to hone strategies

### **GHG Modeling & Strategies**

- Tom: Benchmarking might not be a really impactful strategy for lowering emissions, but it serves as the foundation for implementing and evaluating other emissions reductions strategies, so it's a really important strategy
- Tom: overview and benefits of stretch code
  - Only applies to new buildings, but some communities have applied it to rental properties or other types of buildings to apply it to more existing buildings
  - Buildings constructed under the stretch code are about 15% more efficient than those constructed under 'base' building code

- Karina: TF can use list of example actions that project team provides to manipulate strategy options in the ICLEI model to being to figure out what strategies are needed to achieve GHG targets
- Jake: one thing that TF talked about at last mtg - dealing with some dissenting voices in community about how realistic GHG emissions reductions targets are. TF decided that it wanted to be very transparent about decision making and process, so the ICLEI model/tool is valuable for that. Not necessarily easy for most people to understand the tool because it's complicated and underlying assumptions aren't necessarily clear, Building trust around the use of modeling tool will be needed, and some sort of easily understood explanation of what it is, could help with transparency around strategy development.
- Meaghan - transparency is important, but want to make sure they're not bogging people down in data. if the TF could develop 2-3 different scenarios and show alternative strategies for reaching emissions reductions targets so that if community doesn't like certain strategies, the TF could show those alternatives - show community members a few different pathways to achieve targets - 'here are the relative levers the TF/City has to manipulate and here's what the impacts of each are'. High-level example of 'turning of the different model knobs' could be an effective way to think about and communicate some of the different mitigation strategies.
  - Information about what the 'levers' are and feedback from community members about what they're preferred levers would be with info about how each impacts the emissions reductions and helps the city meet its targets
- Tom: transparency is important, he doesn't want anyone to think that models are perfect, wants to make assumptions of model clear and transparent.
- Tom offered that TF members could do a self-guided exercise with a copy of the ICLEI model that he's put together for Biddeford
- Meaghan: are there any examples of how the ICLEI clearpath tool has been used for/as part of community engagement, or has it been more used behind the scenes?
- Tom: within past 5 or so years, the tool has been used to show that targets that maybe people thought were not achievable, were actually doable and what the emissions reductions would be
- Meaghan - thinking that the Clearpath tool is somewhat similar to the **En-ROADS** tool and that there are examples of that tool being used for engagement and how pulling different layers results in different outcomes. Maybe there's transferability there that could help inform how the TF might use Clearpath for engagement.
- Tom: thinks Clearpath tool is additive to the community conversation, but not necessarily the centerpiece for engagement.
- Karina: question, in relation to Jake's comment about dissent from community members about how achievable GHG targets are, about workshop content/format and if the topic/sector based workshop format still is a good approach, or not - maybe a workshop about emissions reductions strategies would be helpful
- Jake: TF could take input from community members about what strategies are wanted, and then plug those into the Clearpath tool to see if they can achieve the City's GHG emissions reductions targets, and communicate the findings back to the community -

and maybe the result is re-evaluating whether or not the targets are reasonable/achievable.

- Does putting strategies into bins make sense? How much overlap is there between strategies that might be in different bins/buckets? Example - heat islands - overlaps multiple bins.
- Karina: most strategies are very interrelated and spans multiple buckets. The designated buckets just provide some guidance and a framework for thinking about and IDing strategies
- Jake: having topic based workshops all helps potential attendees/participants to self-select what events that would want to go to.