



METRO POLICY ADVISORY COMMITTEE

December 14, 2011

Metro Regional Center, Council Chambers

MEMBERS PRESENT

Sam Adams
Matt Berkow
Jody Carson
Steve Clark
Nathalie Darcy
Amanda Fritz
Kathryn Harrington
Carl Hosticka
Charlotte Lehan, Chair
Annette Mattson
Keith Mays
Marilyn McWilliams
Wilda Parks
William Wild
Jerry Willey, Vice Chair

AFFILIATION

City of Portland Council
Multnomah County Citizen
City of West Linn, representing Clackamas Co. Other Cities
Trimet Board of Directors
Washington County Citizen
City of Portland Council
Metro Council
Metro Council
Clackamas County Commission
Governing Body of School Districts
City of Sherwood, representing Washington Co. Other Cities
Washington County Special Districts
Clackamas County Citizen
Clackamas County Special Districts
City of Hillsboro, representing Washington County Largest City

MEMBERS EXCUSED

Ken Allen
Shane Bemis
Pat Campbell
Michael Demagalski
Dennis Doyle
Andy Duyck
Jack Hoffman
Doug Neeley
Barbara Roberts
Jim Rue
Loretta Smith, 2nd Vice Chair
Steve Stuart
Norm Thomas

AFFILIATION

Oregon AFSCME Council 75
City of Gresham, representing Multnomah Co. 2nd Largest City
City of Vancouver
City of North Plains, representing Washington Co. outside UGB
City of Beaverton, representing Washington Co. 2nd Largest City
Washington County Commission
City of Lake Oswego, representing Clackamas Co. Largest City
City of Oregon City, representing Clackamas Co. 2nd Largest City
Metro Council
Oregon Dept. of Land Conservation & Development
Multnomah County Commission
Clark County, Washington Commission
City of Troutdale, representing other cities in Multnomah Co.

ALTERNATES PRESENT

Karylinn Echols
Donna Jordan
Peter Truax
Kathy Roth
Marc San Soucie

AFFILIATION

City of Gresham, representing Multnomah Co. 2nd Largest City
City of Lake Oswego, representing Clackamas Co. Largest City
City of Forest Grove, representing Washington Co. Other Cities
City of Oregon City, representing Clackamas Co. 2nd Largest City
City of Beaverton, representing Washington Co. 2nd Largest City

STAFF:

Jessica Atwater, Nick Christensen, Andy Cotugno, Kim Ellis, Mike Hogle, Alison Kean-Campbell, Nui-Tara Key, Kelsey Newell, Sherry Oeser, Ken Ray, Dylan Rivera, John Williams, Ina Zucker.

1. CALL TO ORDER AND DECLARATION OF A QUORUM

Chair Charlotte Lehan declared a quorum and called the meeting to order at 5:05 p.m.

2. SELF INTRODUCTIONS AND COMMUNICATIONS

All attendees introduced themselves.

3. CITIZEN COMMUNICATIONS ON NON-AGENDA ITEMS

There were none.

4. COUNCIL UPDATE

Councilor Hosticka updated the group on the following points:

- Gave an overview of the Regional Flexible Funds projects currently being considered for funding. The Metro Council will vote on which RFF projects will be funded on Thursday, December 15, 2011.
- The Metro Council partnered with City of Hillsboro to purchase the Orenco Woods property; each party contributed \$2 million. This project is unique because 11 acres will be resold for private development while the rest will be left for a nature park.
- Highlighted Metro reporter, Nick Christensen's, regional reset articles that feature interviews with several mayors who also serve on MPAC. The articles can be found online at www.oregonmetro.gov/news.
- Presented Chair Lehan with a certificate of appreciation for her service as MPAC chair for 2011.

5. CONSIDERATION OF THE MPAC MINUTES FOR NOVEMBER 9, 2011

MOTION: Councilor Jody Carson moved, Ms. Nathalie Darcy seconded to adopt the November 9, 2011 MPAC minutes.

ACTION TAKEN: With all in favor, the motion passed (Councilor Marc San Soucie and Ms. Marilyn McWilliams abstained).

6.0 ACTION ITEMS

6.1 2012 MPAC OFFICER NOMINATIONS

Ms. Annette Mattson introduced the nominees for the 2012 MPAC Officers. Mayor Willey was nominated for Chair (Washington Co.), Commissioner Loretta Smith (Multnomah Co.) was nominated for Vice Chair, and Councilor Jody Carson (Clackamas Co.) was nominated for 2nd Vice Chair.

MOTION: Ms. Wilda Parks moved, Councilor Donna Jordan seconded to accept the nominations for the 2012 MPAC Officers: Chair, Mayor Jerry Willey (Washington Co.), Vice Chair, Commissioner Loretta Smith (Multnomah Co.), and 2nd Vice Chair, Councilor Jody Carson (Clackamas Co.).

ACTION TAKEN: With all in favor, the motion passed.

7.0 INFORMATION/DISCUSSION ITEMS

7.1 CLIMATE SMART COMMUNITIES SCENARIOS—ROLL-OUT OF DRAFT PHASE 1 FINDINGS REPORT

Ms. Kim Ellis and Mr. Mike Hogle of Metro gave an overview of the draft phase 1 findings report, as well as the overall process and next steps for the Climate Smart Communities Scenarios project. In January, Metro will request that MPAC take action to accept this findings report.

Overview of process and next steps for the CSCS Project:

While HB 2001 requires the reduction of green house gasses (GHG) emissions from light duty vehicles, Metro is taking this as an opportunity to focus on advancing all 6 of the region's desired outcomes. HB 2001 requires that local plans be updated to match the adopted preferred scenario. In light of these facts a collaborative approach is important. The project has emphasized collaborative work and will continue to do so throughout. At the end of the process, the region will need to adopt a preferred scenario.

Phase 1 is coming to a close; its focus has been to learn what the current policies and programs will achieve in GHG reduction, and understand what choices the region has to meet state GHG reduction goals. The Phase 1 findings report will be submitted to Oregon Department of Transportation and Oregon Department of Land Conservation and Development in January. ODOT and DLCD will then include this report in their progress report to the joint interim Senate and House Transportation Committee by February 1, 2012. MPAC will be asked to accept the draft Phase 1 findings report at the January 11th, 2012 meeting, prior to submission to ODOT and DLCD. JPACT will be asked to accept the report as well, on January 12. The CSCS project staff and Council liaisons have meet with some elected officials and local agency staff in the region, and Ms. Ellis offered to schedule group meetings to connect with more jurisdictions as the project moves forward.

Phase 2 will begin in early 2012, and will start by sharing findings with stakeholders, including elected officials and jurisdictions within the region as well as business and community stakeholders. The goal for Phase 2 will be to begin to identify the preferred strategies to be implemented in the region.

Overview of the draft Phase 1 findings report:

The report focuses not only on the options for strategies which will lower GHGs, but also on how these strategies will advance jurisdictions' individual plans and the 2040 growth concept (see pages 6 & 7 of the report). It is important to note that the 2011 Urban Growth Boundary decision is not in effect until January 18, 2012, although the updated boundary has been reflected in the report for context.

There are many states, communities, and regions that are also engaging in scenario planning to reduce GHGs. Staff have looked at these different approaches. The Oregon University System and Oregon Global Warming Commission have done research to identify specific climate challenges for Oregon and our region (see page 9 of report). Reductions in GHG will occur from changes in different categories and sectors (see page 10 in report). The CSCS project has conducted a review of published research that created a strategy toolbox to address how best to meet the targeted GHG

reduction; the combination of the strategy toolbox and scenario analysis has provided a foundation from which to move forward.

Ms. Ellis gave examples for the various types of building blocks for strategies and touched on their level of ambition (see page 13 of the report). Examples include expanding transit service, increasing bicycle mode share for shorter trips, a carbon fee, a transfer of the gas tax to a road use fee, driver education, and car sharing. JPACT discussions identified the fleet mix estimates may be a bit modest, but they are the state's projections. Community design and pricing, in addition to fleet mix, provided the largest reductions (see page 15 of the report). The other strategies have an important role as low-cost options, in terms of capital and political costs, to fill the gaps.

1.2 metric tons of GHG per capita is the equivalent of the state mandated 20% reduction goal for the year 2035. Phase 1 research showed the region can achieve 1.8 metric tons of GHG per capita if we implement the plans and policies already in place in the region. In 93 of the 144 scenarios, we can meet the overall target. It will take additional effort and action in the region to meet the target. We need to look at it at the regional and local level. Phase 2 will focus on which actions to take. Most of the strategies in scenarios are already in place in the region, but will need to be updated to meet the target.

No single category of strategies will meet the target, it must be a mix of strategies (see page 14 of the report).

The results reflect the assumptions made in Phase 1 in regards to the regional and local plans in place. In the end, the region's preferred scenario may not be one of the scenarios tested in Phase 1. Determining what is most effective for the region is significant portion of Phase 2 work (see pages 30 and 31 of the report).

There is implementation possible at all levels of government. Leadership, partnership, and coordination are all important factors in the success of the Scenarios Project and the policies that will be adopted to meet GHG reduction targets. It will also be vital to build in flexibility into the adopted preferred scenario.

The project has not yet looked at cost, cost-effectiveness, economic development or equity; this will be part of Phase 2. These next factors will be important in deciding what direction policies will take.

The key preliminary findings are:

1. Current local and regional plans and policies are ambitious and provide a strong foundation
2. Targets are achievable but will take additional effort and action
3. The best approach is a mix of policies and strategies
4. Partnerships and collaboration are keys to success

Group discussion included:

Some members were concerned about pedestrian and bicycle safety. Staff responded that system design and building out pedestrian/bicycle systems is an effective method to increase safety. Councilor Harrington referred to the 2035 Regional Transportation Plan which has been updated to include policy changes for pedestrian and bicycle safety. Local TSPs need to be updated to reflect these changes. To learn more, search Local TSP on the Metro website, www.oregonmetro.gov/tsp, to see a 5 minute summary video of these changes and implementation strategies.

Staff shared that the most surprising results of the analysis were that so many mixes of strategies, 93 of 140, met or exceeded the target, and that there is significant federal activity that supports this type of scenario planning.

Some members expressed concern that there was not a level 3 option (most ambitious level) for electric vehicles, EV, (the strategies use the state's projection of 8% for EV/hybrid fleet mix), and would like to see a more ambitious approach for this category. Staff is looking into more aggressive EV projections.

Members expressed concern as to how fleet mix may affect communities on the edge, or to account for differences in local communities in general. Staff responded that Phase 2 and 3 will include more close local analysis and traffic patterns. As for accounting for differences in local communities, CSCS used the Metropolitan GreenSTEP model which allows for analysis at subarea levels. When creating specific local plans, there will have to be flexibility to support local jurisdictions goals and policies. Phases 2 and 3 will focus on how to bring all the different pieces from local jurisdictions to support the regional goal.

Some members called pages 32 and 33 of the report to the group's attention. These pages highlight what expectations are part of each scenario's success. The significant increases in effort between the varying levels of ambition of strategies were highlighted. Some strategies may be conflicting (e.g. EV drivers paying parking fees to account for GHG emissions that an EV doesn't have). The group was encouraged to take a close look at this report, as MPAC will be working with this project for the next 2 years.

Some members asked how accurate scenarios for specific jurisdictions will be. Staff responded that within the Metropolitan GreenSTEP model there are 20 regional subdistricts, which represent groupings of census tracts. The model will not provide information at a city level, but data can be aggregated and disaggregated at the district level.

Members expressed some concern for approaching their communities in regards to cost-benefit analysis. Staff responded that cost-effectiveness will be very important to relative cost-benefit, in addition to other impacts and benefits. State-level staff are working to produce more cost information, which Metro staff will proceed to tailor to the region in Phase 2.

Members expressed concern for potentially inequitable strategy implementation in the region and state-level compliance requirements. Staff explained that there are no state statutes that call for sanctions for non-compliance with HB 2001. HB 2001 is intended to make scenario planning happen and integrate it into regional transportation plans. The Oregon Land Conservation and Development Commission is scheduled to review the targets again in 2015; there will be an ongoing dialogue throughout the CSCS process to address compliance issues. The Oregon MPO is looking at the Metro region as a leader to see how other communities may follow similar scenario planning. Metro staff member, Mr. Andy Cotugno emphasized that other sources aside from light trucks and motor vehicles produce significant GHG emissions, including electricity generation, heating homes, etc.... There is movement in these categories as well, but achieving CSCS goals will help to create a model for action in these other categories.

Some members expressed that community design is going to be important; the fact that the region is growing will probably make implementing the community design more feasible.

Some members inquired into the margin of error in these scenarios and each scenario's flexibility in shifting reduction targets to other strategies. Staff responded that should a scenario fall-short for the state target, the model can be used to identify what additional strategies or levels of implementation are needed. The intent is to apply different strategies and match those appropriately with community aspirations and needs– but in the end the preferred scenario will be a regional strategy that meets the state target. It was noted that changing one strategy assumption could change another strategy's GHG reduction potential; these strategies do not occur independently of each other and this is accounted for in the Metropolitan GreenSTEP model.

There are revenue raising opportunities with some of these strategies, but there are trade-offs with loss of revenue, e.g. decrease utility of gas tax as fleet mix improves. This will be further explored in Phase 2 and Phase 3.

Staff clarified that the data on the relationship of fuel economy and carbon intensity of fuels was provided by the Department of Energy and the Department of Transportation. This topic is very political on the national level and is still under debate. Compressed natural gas may also be considered in fuel type for this section.

It was noted that the Metropolitan GreenSTEP model also takes shifting demographics, like age, income and household size, into account.

7.2 SUSTAINABLE CITY YEAR PROGRAM

Professor Robert Liberty of the University of Oregon and Salem City Manager Linda Norris presented to the group on the University of Oregon Sustainable City Initiative's Sustainable City Year Program (SCYP). SCI staff are soon making a decision on which city, county, or Metropolitan Planning Organization to partner with for 2012-2013. Their presentation offered an opportunity for the group to learn about the program and ask questions.

Three cities have completed the SCYP: Gresham (pilot), Salem, and Springfield, OR. Ms. Linda Norris presented on Salem's experience in the SCYP. Salem had been very interested in sustainability, but, like many other jurisdictions, has had to reduce staff. This program was a great opportunity to partnership on research with the U of O when the city didn't have the staff to reach goals. The city council handed over forward thinking projects to the students in the program. Students are coming from a different perspective staff. They are creative, and they work in the community. They did an excellent job moving goals forward quickly and involving the community successfully. The community was very supportive of this program. Citizens and decision-makers often recall the students' research and use it to make decisions and observe their projections come into being.

Professor Liberty distributed some materials related to completed projects and examples of student's work, as well as comments on both, and circulated a few reports on completed projects. He highlighted that green taxes are also a topic of interest to participants in SCYP. He asked that if MPAC members have a particular project interest to let him know, SCYP can find faculty to work with them.

Professor Liberty then overviewed SCYP costs. There is a minimum fee of \$250,000 for participation in this project. This money is to pay for the program coordinators that work on SCYP, as well as to pay university back for utilities, class support, prepare reports, etc....The fees are variable because of the variable nature of the SCYP—if you ask for more complicated classes or projects, the costs will go up. SCYP does not devise your city's project, you and your city do. Faculty is available to help develop the project.

Group discussion included:

Some members asked if, in light of comprehensive plan reviews and area redevelopment, if the SCYP will be available in future years. The presenters related that the program will most likely continue, it is in its third year. The University of Iowa has also recently begun a similar program.

There is political risk in the word sustainability, but the general SCYP program experience has been that it is quickly overcome when you explore the categories within sustainability.

Some members asked about the logistics of project management. Ms Norris responded that each department had a project leader, with a corresponding coordinator; it was not a drain on staff.

Some members wondered if one year enough is enough time to successfully complete projects. Ms. Norris affirmed that it is as they watched time management closely. Projects continued on for multiple courses, and SCYP and Salem made sure they were completed; some completed in 9 months.

Projects offer a great opportunity for engagement with students and the community.

Some members noted that a county with a large urban population may be a good candidate, and that Clackamas County meets that criterion. Professor Liberty stated that the SCYP is very interested in that unincorporated urban population. Clackamas County is in contention.

A few members inquired as to whether or not any of the recommendations from students' studies were implemented in Salem. Ms. Norris responded that Salem has budgeted for some of these recommended projects and is taking next steps. She also clarified that Salem is still meeting with a private company that was able to benefit from working with the SCYP.

6. MPAC MEMBER COMMUNICATIONS

Mayor Peter Truax reminded the group that Washington County is welcoming Martha Bennett, Metro's new Chief Operating Officer, with a reception on Thursday, December 15, 2011. Metro Councilors Hosticka and Harrington will attend. Washington County is happy to have the opportunity to welcome the new COO and suggested other counts may be interested in hosting a similar event.

Chair Lehan noted Councilor Hosticka's comment that MPAC's work for the last couple of years has been obligatory work. She emphasized that CSCS is the only obligatory work for MPAC for 2012, and the group should consider what work members would prefer to pursue. Vice Chair Willey asked people to review the suggested topics on the work program. Metro staff will send out a list of topics, and MPAC members should prioritize these topics, as well as suggest topics that they feel are

important. Ms. Nathalie Darcy informed the group that she feels more area tours within the regional would be beneficial to the group.

Vice Chair Willey also asked that members be sure to review all MPAC meeting materials prior to the meetings, so that members may have a more time for discussion and more opportunities to communicate with Metro staff.

Vice Chair Willey thanked the Metro Council for the Orenco Park partnership with Hillsboro.

Vice Chair Willey informed the group that the Regional Mayors group have been considering compression (property tax) and how it will affect revenues within the region; as well as projects like CSCS and the Community Investment Initiative.

8. ADJOURN

Chair Lehan adjourned the meeting at 6:41 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,



Jessica Atwater
Recording Secretary

ATTACHMENTS TO THE PUBLIC RECORD FOR 12/14/11:

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

ITEM	DOCUMENT TYPE	DOC DATE	DOCUMENT DESCRIPTION	DOCUMENT NO.
7.1	PPT Presentation	12/14/11	Climate Smart Communities Scenarios Project	121411m-01
7.2	Article	12/14/11	Sustainable Cities Initiative: What people are saying about the Sustainable City Year Program	121411m-02
7.2	Article	12/14/11	New York Times: The Sustainable City Year Program	121411m-03
7.2	Memo	12/14/11	City of Gresham: Sustainable City Year Program	121411m-04