



Metro | *People places. Open spaces.*

JOINT POLICY ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION AND
METRO POLICY ADVISORY COMMITTEE WORKSHOP

April 2, 2010

Oregon Convention Center, Rooms F150-151

JPACT MEMBERS PRESENT

Carlotta Collette, Chair
Sam Adams
Rex Burkholder
Jack Burkman
Nina DeConcini
Craig Dirksen
Fred Hansen
Kathryn Harrington
Donna Jordan
Lynn Peterson
Jason Tell

AFFILIATION

Metro Council
City of Portland
Metro Council
City of Vancouver
Oregon Department of Environmental Quality
City of Tigard, representing Cities of Washington Co.
TriMet
Metro Council
City of Lake Oswego, representing Cities of Clackamas Co.
Clackamas Co.
Oregon Department of Transportation, Region 1

JPACT ALTERNATES PRESENT

Jeffrey Dalin
Ann Lininger
Troy Rayburn
Rian Windsheimer

AFFILIATION

City of Cornelius, representing Cities of Washington Co.
Clackamas Co.
Clark Co.
Oregon Department of Transportation, Region 1

MPAC MEMBERS PRESENT

Charlotte Lehan, Vice Chair
Pat Campbell
Jody Carson
Nathalie Darcy
Denny Doyle
Carl Hosticka
Robert Liberty
Keith Mays
Charlynn Newton
Alice Norris
Rod Park

AFFILIATION

Clackamas Co.
City of Vancouver
City of West Linn, representing Clackamas Co. Other Cities
Washington County Citizen
City of Beaverton, representing Washington Co. 2nd Largest City
Metro Council
Metro Council
City of Sherwood, representing Washington Co. Other Cities
City of North Plains, Cities in Washington Co. outside UGB
City of Oregon City, representing Clackamas Co. 2nd Largest City
Metro Council

MPAC ALTERNATIVES PRESENT

Bob Austin
Paul Manson
Doug Neeley
Dresden Skees-Gregory

AFFILIATION

Clackamas Co.
Multnomah Co. Citizen
City of Oregon City, representing Clackamas Co. 2nd Largest City
Washington Co. Citizen

1. WELCOME

Mr. Michael Jordan, Metro Chief Operating Officer, welcomed attendees and introduced Metro Councilor Carlotta Collette, JPACT chair, and Clackamas County Commissioner Charlotte Lehan, MPAC vice chair.

2. REGIONAL AND LOCAL CONTEXT

Councilor Collette overviewed regional policy and planning actions that address greenhouse gas emissions and urged collaboration amongst regional policymakers and planners to continue developing creative strategies that address GHG emissions.

Commissioner Lehan overviewed Clackamas County's policy and planning actions that address greenhouse gas emissions.

3. STATE CONTEXT

Ms. Gail Achterman, Oregon Transportation Commission chair, spoke on behalf of the OTC and the Land Conservation Development Commission. Ms. Achterman stated that the OTC, the LDCD and the State of Oregon have made GHG emissions mitigation a priority by developing comprehensive strategies that support GHG emissions mitigation at each level of government, determining GHG emissions targets for regions throughout Oregon, and developing a GHG emissions mitigation toolkit.

4. MAKING THE CASE FOR CLIMATE ACTION

Dr. William Moomaw, professor and founding director of the Center for International Environment and Resource Policy at Tufts University and lead member of the Nobel Prize-winning Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC), presented on the science and implications of climate change. The presentation covered climate trends throughout history, contemporary climate research, and the current and potential impacts of unmitigated climate change.

5. Q & A AND DISCUSSION GROUP

Mr. Jordan facilitated a question and answer session. Issues discussed included:

- The “deliberative noncatastrophe” in which policy and planning operate to fully prevent potential catastrophes;
- Fostering a “tipping point” for public support and political motivation focused on addressing climate change;
- The availability and feasibility of cost-benefit analysis tools for determining projects' effects on greenhouse gas emissions;
- Personalizing climate change to increase individual awareness and understanding, and encouraging concerted action at the individual level and at all levels of government; and
- Combining greenhouse gas emissions mitigation with human lifestyle adaptation, and considering consumption and human preference and their effects on climate change.

6. BREAK

Attendees recessed for a 15-minute break.

7. BENDING THE CURVE: GETTING FROM THERE TO HERE

Dr. Moomaw presented on greenhouse gas mitigation techniques applicable internationally and nationally, and at the state, regional, city, local and personal levels. Topics discussed included:

- The “wedge” theory; various policy scenarios and their predicted greenhouse gas emissions mitigation, with the goal of 450 parts per million by the year 2020;
- Aggressive sequestration to combat greenhouse gas levels;
- An overview of the Copenhagen climate change conference; and
- The role that planners and policymakers can play in greenhouse gas emissions mitigation.

8. Q & A

Mr. Jordan facilitated a question and answer session. Issues discussed included:

- Federal tax credits for energy efficiency upgrades to homes;
- Electric vehicle fleets versus the status quo in terms of overall power consumption; and
- Rethinking human behavior and avoiding the reliance on technology’s ability to reduce greenhouse gas emissions.

9. HOW WILL WE BEND THE CURVE?

Mr. Jordan introduced a brainstorming exercise to discuss issues and opportunities to reduce GHG emissions and create livable communities. The separate discussions have been transcribed and included in this report as Attachment A.

10. RANKING EXERCISE

Participants discussed policy options related to energy, land use and transportation, and materials and prioritized the capability for those policy options to achieve a sustainable and prosperous region and reduce greenhouse gas emissions.

11. OBSERVATIONS AND FINAL COMMENTS

Dr. Moomaw thanked everyone for attending and concluded by stating that the enthusiasm and progressive planning in the Portland metropolitan region provides an example that all planning agencies can learn from.

12. NEXT STEPS/ADJOURN

Mr. Jordan recapped the work accomplished in the past year – Regional Transportation Plan, Urban Growth Report, urban and rural reserves, which has all positioned the region well to address climate change. He noted that the challenge facing the region this year and beyond is how to focus our investments in our local communities to increase capacity so we don’t have to expand the UGB, support job development, and create thriving neighborhoods that offer many ways to get around.

Mr. Jordan thanked JPACT and MPAC members and others for their participation and provided Dr. Moomaw with a parting gift.

Mr. Jordan adjourned the meeting at 12:03 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,



Tom Matney
Recording Secretary

ATTACHMENTS TO THE PUBLIC RECORD FOR APRIL 2, 2010

The following have been included as part of the official public record:

ITEM	DOCUMENT TYPE	DOC DATE	DOCUMENT DESCRIPTION	DOCUMENT NO.
	Agenda	4/2/10	Revised Agenda	040210jmr-01
4.	PowerPoint	4/2/10	Climate Change: What it Means for Planning	040210jmr-02
6	PowerPoint	4/2/10	How Many Stabilization Wedges Do We Need?	040210jmr-03
6.	PowerPoint	4/2/10	Next Steps	040210jmr-04
10.	Factsheet	4/2/10	Greenhouse gas inventory for the Portland region	040210jmr-05
	Handout	4/2/10	Toolbox of Policy Options	040210jmr-06

Opportunities, Barriers/Issues, Fears
Flipchart Exercise
Joint JPACT and MPAC Workshop
April 2, 2010

Table #1

Opportunities:

- Electronic carts for public works (North Plains)
- Electronic vehicles for mail delivery -- pursuing signed Mayors climate agreement (North Plains)
- Purchase bikes for fleet use (North Plains)
- Hybrid fleet (Tigard)
- EV charging stations (Tigard)
- Building Green Streets (Tigard)
- Rewrite building codes for energy efficient pump station (Tigard)
- New water treatment plant – solar powered (Tigard)
- Increase 50% sidewalks on main street = more pedestrian activity (Cornelius)
- Company using biomass to produce energy; change power purchasing (Cornelius)
- Look for gray water for irrigation (Tigard)
- 4-day work week, flexible schedules and telework
- Co-generation
- Land use balance jobs closer to housing; need to educate people about the costs
- Investing in downtown to bring resident business back to city center; Build to LEEDs (Vancouver)
- Jobs change more frequently than housing = choices about housing based on other variables – kids, two jobs households
- With economic downturn opportunity to rethink housing/jobs
- WS employees can't afford to live near work (Tigard)
- Planning for 10,000 residents downtown (Tigard)
- Rethink use of malls and big box include housing – e.x. Bridgeport no housing = industrial cleanup issues. Developers and financiers need to be partners.
- Issue of level of service standards limiting higher density aspirations
- Water = reduce use/conservation can reduce energy use. Limited water use on Wednesday for irrigation. (Wilsonville)
- E.x. Ashland cheaper to purchase energy efficiency washers than to build new power plants
- Need to look act better outreach for low income communities around energy efficiency
- Lending community risk adverse barrier to advances

Table #2

Opportunities:

- Committee appointments (Reinforcing Green Value, building trades)
- Education (information to public)
- Incentives for change (i.e. LEED certification)
- Government demonstrate change (i.e. work behavior change, 4 day work week)
- Purchasing power
- Government push and pull of change
- Energy efficiency
- Weatherization incentive
- EV charging stations
- Bike/pedestrian connectivity

- Cataloging options (Toolbox) – to help prioritize
- Building friendly to energy efficiency (state, local, national levels)
- Understanding and explaining economic benefits – all benefits
- Education on the “how,” the benefits and the tradeoffs
- Incorporating energy savings into solid waste and recycling
- Remanufacturing
- Waste to energy
- Communicating to people what it means to them personally
- Promote positive aspects of change in lifestyle
- How to package options/incentives to make them more accessible

Table #3

Opportunities:

- Building codes – increased standards
- Incentivize renovation
- Density/efficient/mixed land uses
- LEED – ND (neighborhood districts, local amenities, economic feasibility)
- Reconsider MTIP (the last cycle was a missed opportunity)
- Need more transit, bike routes – (even prior to density)
- Developer agreements linking transit to density
- Education
- Wood waste recycling (e.g. from Demolitions)
- Education – change mindset
- Operations (home and citywide)

Issues/barriers:

- Political will
- Ignorance – lack of understanding for baseline operations
- Cost/lack of funds
- Fear of change
- How to partner with building industry
- Need to have better solution available before asking people to change

Fears:

- Negative reaction from public/ no re-election
- Miscommunication

Table #4

Opportunities:

- Reducing energy demand:
 - Retrofitting buildings (Existing buildings: public, commercial, residential building stock)
 - Set a goal: 50% energy use reduction in 5 – 10 years
- Mainstream this conversation to build momentum.
- Reframe our messages around consumption and energy use as good/bad.
- Education of residents throughout the region, Need to raise the overall level of understanding of this issue. Builds more support throughout region.
- New construction is climate-friendly in terms of energy use and location
 - Also size (i.e. square footage tied to GHG emissions associated with building)
 - Promote shift to local/community benefits nearby

Issues/barriers:

- Who pays for this?
- Resources need to accomplish (human, materials)
- Utilities benefit from reduces demand
 - Cost to utilities
 - How do we finance these retrofits?
- How do we do this at a regional scale?
- Hard to make this concept tangible to public- (i.e. future scenarios or idea of preventing bad outcomes hard to grasp)
- Lack of visibility and leadership on this issue by local governments and lack of leadership by industry/private sector.
- Land prices
- Displacement
- Neighborhoods support vs. resistance
- Regulatory to new/climate-friendly building practices

Fears:

- Homeowner concerns about out-of-pocket costs
- Uncertainty that making these changes will make a difference after all
- People will question the legitimacy and effectiveness of changes
- We will not be successful

Table #5

Opportunities:

- Need education and political will and opportunity (central spatial location)
 - What is in it for the individual resident
 - Financial value
 - Access to goods and services
- Work to incentivize mixed-use/higher density with taxing authority
- Other levers to influence outside taxation
- When retrofit – look for new products that have smaller impact (climate, environment), and longer life
 - Even with increased capital costs
- Look at building codes to improve standards for life of building materials (e.x. roof standard)
- Criterion for investment decisions includes long-term cost and ROI (e.x. Clackamas County)
- Possibility of using electric vehicle batteries as energy storage units at residential locations in order to reduce energy transmission loss. [Use of EV battery as storage for res.] Need building code to allow and anticipate new technology.
- Maybe use approval process to limit sprawling development patterns.
- Increasing service rates because of increased cost
 - Related to education
- Use MPAC to share information (baseline, metrics, etc.) on local sustainability efforts
- Food composting – Example of how to touch/educate all residents on a variety of sustainability issues, despite not being biggest “bang for the buck” or largest impact area

Issues/Barriers:

- Neighborhood resistance to increased density
- Need education and political will and opportunity
- Property values impacted by recession so higher taxation is challenge
- Deteriorating infrastructure in communities (esp. related to sprawl)
- Regulation of building standards done at state level

- Individual decisions for efficiency investments paralyzing for individuals who what to act
- Cost of sprawl (infrastructure) and subsidization of sprawl
- Increasing service rates because of increased cost
 - Equity – transferring costs from one group to another
- Operationally – Challenge of various codes in region; need consistency at state level
- Jobs/housing mix – decisions make at loc – (e.x. Industrial and residential spatial proximity – need to balance jobs access and environmental justice)
- Budget cuts – Cut visualization tools for education and communication
- Need for regional collaboration to show how/what we are all doing

Questions/examples:

- Reversibility
- Don't take action correctly now – longer problems in the future?
- Where get biggest bang for the buck?
- Lake Oswego waste management franchise agreement (e.x. Monthly newsletter includes tips for residents on how to act and how to be more efficient with current resources)
- Increasing service rates because of increased cost
- Green building code to serve as model – (Where are we at?)
- How do we track our efforts to address each of the wedges? How are we doing?