

From: [Heather Tischbein](#)
To: [Jenna Kay](#); [Oliver Orjiako](#); [Jose Alvarez](#)
Subject: Climate Vulnerability Index
Date: Wednesday, February 7, 2024 8:54:44 AM
Attachments: [social.png](#)

EXTERNAL: This email originated from outside of Clark County. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Good morning. I'm sending you this link to the Environmental Defense Fund's Climate Vulnerability Index that was recently released, in case it hasn't come across your radar already. What's my first take-away looking at the map? We live where lots of people might decide to migrate to in the next 20 years...within the comp plan update planning time frame. So, how do we address the possibility, this probability, in our planning...in our "scenario planning" exercises? And not just population impacts of potential climate migration...but with simultaneous consideration as to who these possible "newcomers" might be in terms of job skills, education levels, SES "status", and other demographics, and what stressors might these people present on our housing and jobs scenarios...and resiliency planning goals and strategies. And then factor in anticipated climate change impacts on food systems locally, regionally, and nationally and what we need to plan for in terms of food insecurity scenarios. And impacts on realistic emissions reductions targets. It gets so complicated!

Well...I clearly have way more questions than answers.

Anyway, I thought y'all might find this "vulnerability index" interesting, and perhaps even useful to the CAG and Environmental Justice Council conversations.

I've been reflecting this morning on the questions that CAG applicants were asked about how they see themselves engaging effectively in consensus-decision making processes, and thinking that if a values set was agreed upon first...this is what we all care about...then it might be easier to manage the differences in strategies that will arise...always coming back to what do we value...what are "we" most trying to achieve thru the comp plan update? And do "we" want to try to balance the protection (and enhancement) of private property rights (returns on investments) and values with some shared understanding of protecting and enhancing the common good, well being for all? Do "we" even want to try to do that?

Elizabeth Fitzgerald, the ED at Clark County Volunteer Lawyers Assn., has did some historical analysis on systemic racism in land use planning in Clark County for SWEC a while back, and I'd like to recommend her to you as someone who would be a valuable resource in creating an historical context for people in these two groups...with the intention of trying to create a "same page" foundation for the beginnings of the comp plan conversations. What can we all agree on to begin with? What do we all care about? Something like this to come back to when differences in strategies and options arise. And if there are genuine conflicts of values and goals...then let's surface those in the very beginning...and explore options for resolving genuine conflicts of values and intentions in the beginning...so as to avoid arguing "facts" when it's really values and intentions that are in dispute.

So...thinking about y'all this morning. And looking forward with barely restrained patience

to see the rosters of the CAG and EJC. Let's get to work...engaging early and often.

All the best,

Heather Tischbein

