AGENDA

600 NORTHEAST GRAND AVENUE | PORTLAND, OREGON 97232 2736 TEL 503 797 1542 | FAX 503 797 1793



Agenda

NG

CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL

2:00 PM	1.	ADMINISTRATIVE/CHIEF OPERATING OFFICER AND CITIZEN COMMUNICATIONS	
2:15 PM	2.	CHANGE ORDER 30, MODIFICATION TO WASTE TRANSPORT CONTRACT	Hoglund
2:45 PM	3.	STATE GREENHOUSE GAS STRATEGY	Turpel
3:00 PM	4.	INNOVATIVE WET WEATHER PROJECTS	Vecchio
3:15 PM	5.	BREAK	
3:20 PM	6.	DEPARTMENTAL PROGRAM BUDGET OPTIONS	TBA
4:20 PM	7.	GOAL 14 RULE BRIEFING	Benner
4:35 PM	8.	COUNCIL BRIEFINGS AND COMMUNICATIONS	

ADJOURN

CHANGE ORDER 30, MODIFICATION TO WASTE TRANSPORT

Metro Council Work Session Tuesday, November 9, 2004 Metro Council Chamber

METRO COUNCIL

Work Session Worksheet

Presentation Date: 11/9/04

Time:

Length: 30 minutes

Presentation Title: Discussion of Change Order No. 30, Modification to the Contract between Metro and CSU Transport, Inc. entitled "Waste Transport Services", Contract No. 900848

Department: Solid Waste and Recycling

Presenters: Gary Goldberg, President CSU, Inc. and Mike Hoglund

ISSUE & BACKGROUND

In March 1989, Metro entered into Contract No. 900848 for the provision of Waste Transport Services until December 2009. The original contract required the provision of performance and labor and materials bonds in the amount of \$2.5 million. In addition, Metro retained 5% of each monthly payment until a retainage fund of \$2.5 million was established. The bonds and retainage fund constituted the security instruments to protect Metro against defaults in the performance of the contract.

In May 1999, the Metro Council approved Change Order No. 24 that released retainage to the Contractor and allowed the substitution of a letter of credit (LOC) in the amount of \$4.1 million that decreased annually to a base amount of \$1.3 million. The intent of the change order was to assist the Contractor in maintaining its financial viability while providing a reduction in rates charged to Metro.

In January 2001, the Metro Council approved Change Order No. 25 that required the provision of a security instrument acceptable to Metro in the amount of \$1.2 million (the Contractor chose to provide a corporate guarantee from its corporate parent) in exchange for allowing a change in ownership. The \$1.2 million corporate guarantee was in addition to the \$1.3 LOC. These security instruments were continued under Change Order No. 26 in which Metro consented to the change of ownership to the current Waste Transport Contractor-CSU, Inc.

CSU has requested that it be permitted to substitute a performance bond in the amount of \$2.5 million for the existing security instruments. The substitution has two primary benefits to CSU. By eliminating the letter of credit, CSU can increase its line of credit with its financial institution by a corresponding amount. Since provision of a corporate guarantee to Metro must be listed as a liability, substituting a bond for the guarantee significantly improves the financial reports of CSU and its corporate parent. Approval of Change Order No. 30 would permit the substitution.

Following are brief definitions of the three forms of security instruments being considered by this Change Order:

Corporate Guarantee

A corporate guarantee is a pledge by the contractor (or in the case of this contract, CSU's corporate parent that has more resources than CSU) to assure the unconditional performance of the contract. Such a security instrument unconditionally guarantees payment of all actual damages by the contractor that occur as a result of any default by the contractor that results in any loss to the owner (in this case Metro, up to a limit of \$1.2 million).

The current contract with the Waste Transport Contractor contains similar language under its general default language. The value of the additional corporate guarantee is to strengthen this right, and to link it explicitly to the corporate parent.

It is expected that Metro would still need to pursue the payment of such damages through legal actions or negotiations with or without the corporate guarantee.

Letter of Credit (LOC)

An irrevocable letter of credit is a security instrument provided by a financial institution (in the case of CSU - Mellon Bank). The financial institution agrees to pay up to the amount of the LOC if the owner (Metro) submits a request for payment testifying that the contractor is in breach. Such requests must be in conformance with the language of the LOC, including a statement that all other remedies have been exhausted prior to submitting a claim. The amounts requested are to reflect Metro's actual damages from the contract breach. In the event of contract breaches that result in termination, the full amount of the LOC would be due.

In theory the LOC is straightforward. Metro would submit its claim for payment based on actual damages and the financial institution would make payment. In practice, disputes over the extent of the breach, the value of such damages and whether all other remedies have been exhausted are likely to complicate the collection of such payments.

Performance Bond

A performance bond is akin to the contractor taking out an insurance policy for the faithful performance of the contract. Under a performance bond, the company providing the bond and the contractor sign a pledge to promptly remedy any default of the contract, up to the face amount of the bond.

The bond company must hire the personnel, equipment, etc. to cure such defaults unlike a LOC that anticipates directly paying Metro damages. In practice, Metro could be paid by the bond company to cure the default.

OPTIONS AVAILABLE

• Council approves the Change Order

Approval of the Change Order would benefit CSU financially as described above. The result would be security for Metro in the form of a single \$2.5 million performance bond to replace the \$1.3 million letter of credit and \$1.2 million corporate guarantee. This Change Order also requires that the Contractor provide a replacement of their security instrument at least 30 days prior to the expiration of the security instrument in effect. If the replacement is not provided Metro has the right to withhold payment until the \$2.5 million has been accumulated in retainage.

• Council does not approve the Change Order

Rejection of the Change Order would preserve the status quo.

IMPLICATIONS AND SUGGESTIONS

The Waste Transport Contractor seeks approval of the Change Order because of the financial benefits to the firm. Based on analysis of Metro staff from the Office of Metro Attorney, Finance and Administrative Services and Solid Waste & Recycling, the proposal is neutral to slightly beneficial to Metro.

The anticipated effects of this Change Order would be to substitute a performance bond in an amount of the existing corporate guarantee plus the existing LOC. In addition the change order requires that the performance bond be renewed at least thirty (30) days prior to expiration. If the bond is not renewed, Metro may withhold payments until the instrument is renewed or Metro has retained the value of the instrument - \$2.5 million. It is anticipated that the substitution reduces Metro's risk of defaults related to the performance of the contract. This is because a third party would be financially liable for ensuring performance of the contract and Metro has a financial remedy in the event of non-renewal.

This is not the case under either the corporate guarantee or LOC. While the LOC would provide Metro with funds to cover its increased costs for nonperformance (up to the limit of the LOC). Metro would have to take actions such as hiring a replacement contractor to ensure performance. The LOC was probably a more appropriate security interest when Change Order 24 was executed, since that created significant financial risk. Now that the risk is related to performance and operations, a performance bond can provide adequate security.

As pointed out above, while the corporate guarantee provides Metro with explicit rights to recover actual damages from the corporate entity providing the guarantee, litigation would probably still be necessary. The performance bond theoretically ensures performance before such damages are incurred.

QUESTION(S) PRESENTED FOR CONSIDERATION

Does the Metro Council, sitting as the Metro Contract Review Board, wish to grant approval for the Chief Operating Officer to execute Change Order No. 30 to Contract No. 900848?

LEGISLATION WOULD BE REQUIRED FOR COUNCIL ACTION X Yes No DRAFT IS ATTACHED X Yes No

SCHEDULE FOR WORK SESSION

Department Director/Head Approval

Chief Operating Officer Approval

M:\rem\od\projects\worksessionworksheets\CSU CO30 WKSH.doc (Oueue)

BEFORE THE METRO CONTRACT REVIEW BOARD

)

)

)

)

FOR THE PURPOSE OF AUTHORIZING EXECUTION OF CHANGE ORDER NO. 30 TO CONTRACT NO. 900848 FOR WASTE TRANSPORT SERVICES FOR PROVISION OF A **\$2.5 MILLION DOLLAR PERFORMANCE BOND**) **RESOLUTION NO. 04-3507**

Introduced by Michael Jordan, with the concurrence of David Bragdon, Council President

WHEREAS, the Waste Transport Service Contractor has requested substitution of a single performance bond in the amount of \$2.5 million for the current requirement of a \$1.3 million irrevocable letter of credit and a \$1.2 million corporate guarantee (or other security instrument as described in Change Order No. 25 to the Contract); and,

WHEREAS, as described in the accompanying staff report, such a substitution provides Metro with at least the same amount of performance protection as the current security requirements; now therefore,

BE IT RESOLVED that the Metro Council, sitting as the Metro Contract Review Board, authorizes the Chief Operating Officer to execute Change Order No. 30 to the Waste Transport Service contract, Contract No. 900848, in a form substantially similar to that set forth as the attached Exhibit "A."

ADOPTED by the Metro Council this _____ day of _____, 2004.

David Bragdon, Council President

Approved as to Form:

Daniel B. Cooper, Metro Attorney

M:\rem\od\projects\Legislation\043507 CSU CO30 RES.doc M:\rem\od\projects\worksessionworksheets\CSU CO30 WKSH.doc

EXHIBIT "A"

CHANGE ORDER NO. 30 METRO CONTRACT NO. 900848

MODIFICATION TO THE CONTRACT BETWEEN METRO AND CSU TRANSPORT, INC. ENTITLED "WASTE TRANSPORT SERVICES"

This Change Order No. 30, dated as of the last signature date below (the "Effective Date of Change Order No. 30"), hereby amends Metro Contract No. 900848, entitled "Waste Transport Services," dated March 27, 1989, including all prior amendments (which contract and amendments are collectively referred to as the "Waste Transport Services Agreement").

In exchange for the promises and other considerations set forth in the Waste Transport Services Agreement and in this Change Order No. 30, the parties hereby agree as follows:

A. <u>Purpose</u>

The purpose of Change Order No. 30 is to modify the security for release of retainage provisions now found in Paragraph B.8.i. of Change Order No. 24 to the Waste Transport Services Agreement.

B. Provisions of Change Order No. 30

- 1. In lieu of the Irrevocable Letter of Credit for which provision is made in Paragraph B.8.i. of Change Order No. 24 to the Waste Transport Services Agreement, Contractor may provide a performance bond or other similar instrument of security in a form acceptable to Metro in the amount of \$1.3 million. Such bond or instrument may be combined with and added to any similar bond or instrument required under this Agreement.
- 2. Contractor agrees that the replacement or renewal of any security instrument required under this Agreement shall be effective at least 30 days before the expiration of any such replaced or renewed security instrument. Failure by Contractor to execute and deliver to Metro such replaced or renewed security instrument at least thirty (30) days before the expiration of any current security instrument shall constitute a default under this Agreement. To remedy such default, Metro shall have the right to retain one hundred percent (100%) of any and all payments due Contractor under this Agreement until the total amount of retainage is equal to \$2,500,000.00 or until the default is cured. This remedy shall be in addition to any other remedies for default to which Metro is entitled.

C. No Other Modifications

Except as modified herein, all other terms and conditions of the Waste Transport Services Agreement shall remain in full force and effect. Any conflict between the provisions of this Change Order No. 30, on the one hand, and the original Waste Transport Services Agreement, including other previous amendments and change orders, on the other hand, shall be resolved by reference to and reliance upon this Change Order No. 30.

CSU TRANSPORT, INC.

METRO

Signature Gary I. Goldberg, President Signature Michael Jordan, Chief Operating Officer

Date

Date

M:\rem\od\projects\Legislation\043507 CSU CO30 Exh A.doc M:\rem\od\projects\worksessionworksheets\CSU CO30 WKSH.doc

STAFF REPORT

IN CONSIDERATION OF RESOLUTION NO. 04-3507, FOR THE PURPOSE OF AUTHORIZING EXECUTION OF CHANGE ORDER NO. 30 TO THE CONTRACT FOR WASTE TRANSPORT SERVICES FOR PROVISION OF A \$2.5 MILLION DOLLAR PERFORMANCE BOND

Date: October 21, 2004

Prepared by: Chuck Geyer

BACKGROUND

In March 1989, Metro entered into Contract No. 900848 for the provision of Waste Transport Services until December 2009. The original contract required the provision or performance and labor and materials bonds in the amount of \$2.5 million. In addition, Metro retained 5% of each monthly payment until a retainage fund or \$2.5 million was established. The bonds and retainage fund constituted the security instruments to protect Metro against defaults in the performance of the contract.

In May 1999, the Metro Council approved Change Order No. 24 that released retainage to the Contractor and allowed the substitution of a letter of credit (LOC) in the amount of \$4.1 million that decreased annually to a base amount of \$1.3 million. The intent of the change order was to assist the Contractor in maintaining its financial viability while providing a reduction in rates charged to Metro.

In January 2001, the Metro Council approved Change Order No. 25 that required the provision of a security instrument acceptable to Metro in the amount of \$1.2 million (the Contractor chose to provide a corporate guarantee from its corporate parent) in exchange for allowing a change in ownership. The \$1.2 million corporate guarantee was in addition to the \$1.3 LOC. These security instruments were continued under Change Order No. 26 in which Metro consented to the change of ownership to the current Waste Transport Contractor - CSU, Inc.

CSU has requested that it be permitted to substitute a performance bond in the amount of \$2.5 million for the existing security instruments. The substitution has two primary benefits to CSU. By eliminating the letter of credit, CSU can increase its line of credit with its financial institution by a corresponding amount. Since provision of a corporate guarantee to Metro must be listed as a liability, substituting a bond for the guarantee significantly improves the financial reports of CSU and its corporate parent.

Description of Security Instruments

The following description of security instruments is provided to assist in assessing whether Metro should grant the substitution.

Corporate Guarantee

A corporate guarantee is a pledge by the contractor (or in the case of this contract, CSU's corporate parent that has more resources than CSU) to assure the unconditional performance of the contract. Such a security instrument unconditionally guarantees payment of all actual damages by the contractor that occur

as a result of any default by the contractor that results in any loss to the owner (in this case Metro, up to a limit of \$1.2 million).

The current contract with the Waste Transport Contractor contains similar language under its general default language. The value of the additional corporate guarantee is to strengthen this right, and to link it explicitly to the corporate parent.

It is expected that Metro would still need to pursue the payment of such damages through legal actions or negotiations with or without the corporate guarantee.

Letter of Credit (LOC)

An irrevocable letter of credit is a security instrument provided by a financial institution (in the case of CSU - Mellon Bank). The financial institution agrees to pay up to the amount of the LOC if the owner (Metro) submits a request for payment testifying that the contractor is in breach. Such requests must be in conformance with the language of the LOC, including a statement that all other remedies have been exhausted prior to submitting a claim. The amounts requested are to reflect Metro's actual damages from the contract breach. In the event of contract breaches that result in termination, the full amount of the LOC would be due.

In theory the LOC is straightforward. Metro would submit its claim for payment based on actual damages and the financial institution would make payment. In practice, disputes over the extent of the breach, the value of such damages and whether all other remedies have been exhausted are likely to complicate the collection of such payments.

Performance Bond

A performance bond is akin to the contractor taking out an insurance policy for the faithful performance of the contract. Under a performance bond, the company providing the bond and the contractor sign a pledge to promptly remedy any default of the contract, up to the face amount of the bond.

The bond company must hire the personnel, equipment, etc. to cure such defaults unlike a LOC that anticipates directly paying Metro damages. In practice, Metro could be paid by the bond company to cure the default.

ANALYSIS/INFORMATION

1. Known Opposition

None.

2. Legal Antecedents

Metro Code section 2.04.058 (b), Public Contract Amendments, requires approval of this change order by the Metro Council.

3. Anticipated Effects

The change order would substitute a performance bond in an amount of the existing corporate guarantee plus the existing LOC. In addition the change order requires that the performance bond be renewed at least thirty (30) days prior to expiration. If the bond is not renewed, Metro may withhold payments until

the instrument is renewed or Metro has retained the value of the instrument - \$2.5 million. It is anticipated that the substitution reduces Metro's risk of defaults related to the performance of the contract. This is because a third party would be financially liable for ensuring performance of the contract and Metro has a financial remedy in the event of non-renewal.

This is not the case under either the corporate guarantee or LOC. While the LOC would provide Metro with funds to cover its increased costs for nonperformance (up to the limit of the LOC), Metro would have to take actions such as hiring a replacement contractor to ensure performance. The LOC was probably a more appropriate security interest when Change Order 24 was executed, since that created significant financial risk. Now that the risk is related to performance and operations, a performance bond can provide adequate security.

As pointed out above, while the corporate guarantee provides Metro with explicit rights to recover actual damages from the corporate entity providing the guarantee, litigation would probably still be necessary. The performance bond theoretically ensures performance before such damages are incurred.

4. Budget Impacts

None.

RECOMMENDED ACTION

The Chief Operating Officer recommends approval of Resolution No. 04-3507.

M:\rem\od\projects\Legislation\043507 CSU CO 30 StfRpt.doc M:\rem\od\projects\worksessionworksheets\CSU CO30 WKSH.doc

STATE GREENHOUSE GAS STRATEGY

Metro Council Work Session Tuesday, November 9, 2004 Metro Council Chamber

METRO COUNCIL

Work Session Worksheet

Presentation Date: November 9, 2004 Time: Length: 15 minutes

Presentation Title: Possible Response to draft *Oregon Strategy for Greenhouse Gas Reductions*

Department: Transportation

Presenters: Andy Cotugno

ISSUE & BACKGROUND

Governor Kulongoski appointed an Advisory Group on Global Warming earlier this year. Membership included Metro Councilor Rex Burkholder. During the past nine months the Advisory Group and subgroups have met and discussed the topic and made suggestions for action. In October the Advisory Group released a draft *Oregon Strategy for Greenhouse Gas Reductions* and public comment sought through November 15.

The *Strategy* includes a goal of stopping the growth of Oregon's greenhouse gas emissions by 2010 and by 2050 to achieve a "climate stabilization" level that is less than or equal to 75 percent below 1990 levels. There are six types of actions suggested ranging from energy efficiency and electric power generation to transportation and materials use, recovery and waste disposal.

Metro advisory committees are scheduling this item for their agendas and recommendations are being formulated.

OPTIONS AVAILABLE

The Metro Council could:

- review comments from JPACT and MPAC and agree or disagree through a joint letter to the Advisory Committee;
- decline to comment, but encourage advisory committee or individual cities or counties to comment.

IMPLICATIONS AND SUGGESTIONS

The greenhouse gas issue is one which is immense in scope and import. The Advisory Committee has said that there will need to be an ongoing effort to deal with the many different aspects of this issue and therefore there should be several opportunities in the future to participate in this discussion and help shape actions.

QUESTION(S) PRESENTED FOR CONSIDERATION

Would the Metro Council like to review MPAC and JPACT recommendations about the draft *Strategy* that are scheduled for November 10 and November 17, respectively?

LEGISLATION WOULD BE REQUIRED FOR COUNCIL ACTION __Yes _x_No DRAFT IS ATTACHED __Yes __No

SCHEDULE FOR WORK SESSION

Department Director/Head Approval ______ Chief Operating Officer Approval ______

Draft Oregon Strategy for Greenhouse Gas Reductions October 13, 2004

Executive Summary

This draft Oregon Strategy for Greenhouse Gas Reductions was developed and is offered for public comment by the Governor's Advisory Group on Global Warming. The Advisory Group was appointed by Governor Ted Kulongoski to perform this task early in 2004. This Strategy, if adopted, will complement the agenda of the West Coast Governors' Initiative on Global Warming undertaken by the Governors of California, Oregon and Washington to address greenhouse gas emissions at a state and regional level.

The Advisory Group invites Oregon citizens, businesses and organizations to offer their comments, additions and criticisms of the goals, approaches and actions assembled in this document. These will be taken into account before final recommendations are made to the Governor. The overall Strategy may be summarized as follows:

<u>Goals:</u>

Three proposed goals relate to Oregon Benchmark #76, which sets the goal of reducing carbon dioxide (CO_2) emission levels at or below 1990 levels by the year 2010. Oregon emissions in 2000 were 18 percent above this benchmark. While other states have proposed meeting a comparable emissions goal by 2010, the Advisory Group recognizes that its draft strategy is not likely to achieve this goal within the time frame. However, measurable progress towards attaining this goal is possible.

The Advisory Group proposes the following goals:

- 1. By 2010, arrest the growth of Oregon's greenhouse gas emissions (including, but not limited to CO₂) and begin to reduce them, making measurable progress towards meeting the existing Benchmark of not exceeding 1990 levels.
- 2. By 2020, achieve a 10 percent reduction below 1990 greenhouse gas levels.
- 3. By 2050, achieve a "climate stabilization" emissions level that is less than or equal to 75 percent below 1990 levels.

These goals offer a pathway to climate stabilization that requires vigorous action, but also allows time for necessary individual and business adjustments.

<u>Strategies:</u> This draft Oregon Strategy articulates a set of Principles (Section 2.1) and four broad strategies:

- 1. Invest in Efficiency
- 2. Replace Greenhouse Gas-Emitting Energy Resources with Cleaner Technologies
- 3. Increase Biological Sequestration (farm and forest carbon capture and storage)
- 4. Promote and Support Education, Research and Technology Development

<u>Recommended Actions</u>: The draft Strategy proposes actions in seven areas: (1) Integrating Actions; (2) Energy Efficiency; (3) Electric Generation and Supply; (4) Transportation; (5) Biological Sequestration (carbon capture and storage); (6) Materials Use, Recovery and Waste Disposal; and (7) Government Operations. Within these areas, the Advisory Group identified two categories of actions¹.

<u>Category I</u>: Significant Actions for Immediate State Action. These actions promise significant greenhouse gas savings, are technically feasible today, and are the most cost-effective first actions to be taken.

<u>Category II</u>: Other Immediate Actions. These actions make sense for the State to undertake immediately. In most cases the greenhouse gas savings are less significant, but costs are also proportionately lower and many actions are cost-effective now.

The Advisory Group particularly wishes to invite comment on Category I actions. Accomplishing these will usually require the most concerted and disciplined effort on the part of Oregonians; equally, meaningful progress toward the proposed goals will be extremely difficult to achieve without substantially achieving most or all Category I actions. These actions include:

Integrating Actions (IA-1): Arrest the growth of and begin to reduce Oregon's greenhouse gas emissions by 2010. Meet a goal of 10% below 1990 Oregon emissions levels by 2020, and of 75% below those levels by 2050.

Energy Efficiency (EE-1): Meet Oregon's energy efficiency target set by the Northwest Power Planning Council for the next 20 years, capturing at least 960 average megawatts (aMW) of electricity savings and comparable conservation of natural gas and oil.

Electric Generation and Supply (GEN-1): Develop about 130 average megawatts (aMW) of renewable generation by 2006 and comparable or greater amounts each biennium thereafter.

Electric Generation and Supply (GEN-2): Convene an interim work group to recommend to the 2007 Legislature, a "carbon content" standard for delivered energy (electricity, gas and oil) that will establish a schedule for reducing the greenhouse gas emissions from these sources consistent with the State's overall goals.

¹ Note: The Advisory Group considered Category III Actions that, for various reasons including simply manageability of the process, it chose to defer. As these and other possible actions are proposed, they can be developed and considered by a successor to this Advisory Group.

Transportation (TRAN-1): Convene an interim work group to recommend a proposal for the Governor, the Environmental Quality Commission and the Legislature to adopt 1) California Low Emissions Vehicle Standards (LEV II); and 2) California Greenhouse Gas Emissions (Pavley) Standards for vehicles.

Materials Use, Recovery and Waste Disposal (MW-1): Achieve the waste disposal and recovery goals already adopted by Oregon. (Note: There are three other Category I Actions in the MW section.)

Depending on the schedule of emissions reductions achieved in GEN 1 and MW 1, these five actions alone should result in reversing the continued growth of greenhouse gas emissions generated from Oregon and set us on a path of declining emissions. Costs of these actions also will vary, depending on when actions are undertaken, but the energy efficiency and transportation actions are selected to be cost-effective for Oregonians, independent of their greenhouse gas savings.

Abstract of

DRAFT Recommendations of the Oregon Strategy for Greenhouse Gas Reductions (The Governor's Advisory Group On Global Warming) October 13, 2004

This abstract lists the draft recommendations of the Governor's Advisory Group on Global Warming. The full report is at <u>http://www.energy.state.or.us/climate/Warming/Draft_Intro.htm</u> Recommendations fall within seven action areas:

- Integrating Actions (IA)
- Energy Efficiency (EE)
- Electric Generation and Supply (GEN)
- Transportation (TRAN)
- **Biological Sequestration (BIOSEQ)**
- Materials Use, Recycling and Waste Disposal (MW)
- Government Operations (GOV)

Also included is a graph that shows a forecast of the cumulative, sequential reductions that would result from the proposed actions as subtractions from the "business as usual" approach.

Specific actions are identified with an abbreviation denoting the action area and a number for easy reference. Actions are also grouped as Category I or Category II as follows:

<u>Category I</u>: Significant Actions for Immediate State Action. These actions promise significant greenhouse gas savings (usually greater than or equal to 0.25 million tons/year of CO_2 or equivalent savings); are technically feasible today; and are the most cost-effective first actions to be taken.

<u>Category II</u>: Other Immediate Actions. These actions make sense for the State to undertake immediately. In most cases the greenhouse gas savings are less significant, but costs are also proportionately lower and many actions are cost-effective now.

In the tables below, column three shows estimated CO_2 savings in million metric tons (MMT) through 2025. Column four asks if the action is cost-effective(C/E) - yes (Y) or no (N) - to the consumer over the action's lifetime. (This does not include whether it is cost-effective considering the projected effects of global warming.) Estimates for the CO2 saving for energy efficiency and some generation actions assume displaced generation at a 50-50 mix of gas-fired and coal-fired generation. Please refer to the graph on page 8 for the cumulative impact of measures.

10-13-04 ABSTRACT OF DRAFT ACTIONS TO REDUCE GHGs

INTEGRATING ACTIONS TO REDUCE GREENHOUSE GASES

The three recommended Integrating Actions described in this section are crosscutting and affect the six other action areas. In order to slow and then reverse greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions, it is essential to have a long-term focus.

Action IA-1 recommends goals that provide a long-term context for all other draft actions. The goals extend out 50 years.

Action IA-2 recommends that the Governor continue the work this group has begun. This includes appointing a successor group that could oversee implementation of global warming actions, develop adaptation actions; and develop additional actions to reduce GHGs.

Action IA-3 recommends the Oregon University System develop a research strategy for technologies and techniques to reduce GHGs and adapt to climate change. This would allow Oregon to foster new industries and would help Oregon's economy.

Integrating Actions			
	CATEGORY I – SIGNIFICANT ACTIONS FOR IMMEDIATE STATE		
	ACTION		
IA-1	Recommend the Governor adopt near-term, intermediate and long-term greenhouse gas emissions goals for Oregon.		
IA-2	Urge the Governor to renew the charter of the Advisory Group on Global Warming (or a successor body) to continue the Advisory Group's unfinished agenda.		
IA-3	The Oregon University System should develop strategic and targeted research,		
	development and demonstration (RD&D) programs for greenhouse gas reduction		
	technologies.		

ENERGY EFFICIENCY ACTIONS TO REDUCE GREENHOUSE GASES

Issue: For the past twenty years and more, Oregon has had successful energy savings programs for electricity, natural gas and petroleum users. These have included incentive programs and building codes. Even so, significant savings remain to be captured, and new technologies create opportunities for still more savings. Petroleum and natural gas use emits CO_2 and other greenhouse gases directly. Almost half of the electricity used in the Oregon is met by coal and gas-fired generation that emit greenhouse gases (GHG).

Solutions: To reduce emissions, Oregonians will need to use all energy more efficiently. Oregon's incentive and building code programs need to be reviewed and upgraded, based on concerns over global warming.

	Energy Efficiency Actions		
	MMT	C/E?	
	STATE ACTION	CO2e	
EE-1	Meet the Northwest Power and Conservation Council (NWPCC) goal of	2025	
	implementing cost-effective electricity efficiency measures for electric		
	users and an equivalent goal for natural gas users.		
	EE-1a: Expand and coordinate electric incentive programs for Investor-	3 20	Y
÷	Owned Utilities (IOUs). Coordinate Oregon Department of Energy (ODOE).	0.20	^
	Energy Trust of Oregon (ETO), consumer-owned utility (COU) efficiency		
	programs; 2005 assessment; legislation to amend Residential Energy Tax		
	Credit (RETC).		
	EE-1b: Upgrade building codes on a 3-6-year cycle. (Add building	0.52	Ý
	commissioning and increase enforcement funds)		
	EE-1c: Amend building codes to set minimum space and water	0.09	Y
	heating/cooling standards.		
	EE-1d: Adopt state appliance efficiency standards. (requires legislation)	0.41	Y
	EE-1e: Advocate with Bonneville Power Administration (BPA) and	1.24	Y
	Oregon COUs to meet NWPCC goal.		
	EE-1f: Support Oregon Public Utility Commission (OPUC) actions to	0.24-	Y
	evaluate NW Natural/ETO and ODOE natural gas incentive programs.	0.48	
	(Coordinate programs; conduct an assessment in 2005 to see if it is possible to		
	double the base goal of 4.6 TBtu per year in energy savings)		
	EE-1g: Advocate with OPUC for Avista and Cascade to meet gas energy		
savings goals comparable to NW Natural			
	EE-In: Advocate for federal equipment and appliance efficiency	0.40	Y
	EE 1: Strengthen state marketing of energy efficiency and incentive		V
	programs; initiate Governor's Awards		I
		6.15-	
	SUB-TOTAL FOR EE-1	6.39	
	CATEGORY II: OTHER IMMEDIATE ACTIONS		
EE-2	Support OPUC and COU efforts for modified rate designs (to reflect daily	0.16	Y
56	and seasonal peak demand)		^
EE-3	Support OPUC initiatives for Gas Fuel Switching Programs (residential	0.10	Y
	electric water heaters and commercial oil boilers)		
		6.41-	
	TOTAL ALL EE ACTIONS	6.65	

10-13-04 ABSTRACT OF DRAFT ACTIONS TO REDUCE GHGs Page 3

ELECTRIC GENERATION AND SUPPLY ACTIONS TO REDUCE GREENHOUSE GASES

Issue: Oregon electricity supplies, once nearly all renewable (hydro), are now over 40 percent from coal and another 8 percent from natural gas. Both emit CO_2 and other greenhouse gases (GHG) in combustion (although gas has lower emissions).

Solutions: To reduce greenhouse gas emissions, we must use all energy more efficiently, while meeting new load growth and replacing existing fossil fuel generation with energy efficiency and generation that does not produce greenhouse gases.

Electric Generation And Supply Actions			
	CATEGORY I: SIGNIFICANT ACTIONS FOR	MMT	<i>C/E</i> ?
	IMMEDIATE STATE ACTION	CO2e	
CITIZ 1		2025	
GEN-I	Increase the renewable content of electricity.	0.80	Y
GEN-2	Develop a greenhouse gas allowance standard for delivered energy.	At	?
		least	
		7.0*	
	GEN-2a Develop an Oregon Renewable Portfolio Standard (RPS)	7.00	?
	or expanded public purpose charge as an alternative to Gen 2 above		
8	(e.g., have new renewable meet 25% of 2025 load).		
GEN-3	Support Oregon PUC's review of rules and tariffs for renewable	0.54	Y
	and combined heat and power (CHP) facilities.		8
2	CATEGORY II: OTHER IMMEDIATE ACTIONS		
GEN-4	Encourage state government to purchase renewables ("1% for	0.08	N?
	renewables" in new buildings or 20% of energy purchases).		
GEN-5	Advocate for specific federal policies or legislation (Re: CO ₂	varies	varies
	legislation and U.S. Dept. of Energy and EPA policies.		
GEN-6	Advocate with BPA to support Oregon's renewables measure	varies	varies
	(renewable funding, transmission and integration services, and other		
	policies for renewables).		

* Assumes carbon constraint at least equal to an RPS of 25 percent.

TRANSPORTATION ACTIONS TO REDUCE GREENHOUSE GASES

Issue: One-third of Oregon's GHG emissions are from vehicle exhaust. Cost-effective opportunities to reduce these emissions are available, particularly in urban areas.

Solutions: Two categorical solutions are: (1) to reduce greenhouse gas emissions from consumption of fossil fuels by displacing conventional combustion engines with hybrid, electric and other technological/fuel options; (2) to guide land use choices, especially in Oregon's urban areas,

toward more efficient choices including higher densities, transit options, mixed-use neighborhoods, apartment and common wall dwelling designs.

CATEGO	Transportation Actions	Reductions in Greenhouse Gas Emissions in MMTCO ₂ E	C/E
IMMED	LATE STATE ACTION	2025	
TRAN-1.	Convene an interim working group to recommend a proposal for the Governor, Environmental Quality Commission and the Legislature to adopt emission standards for vehicles.		
	TRAN-1a: Adopt Low Emission Vehicle (LEV II) Emission Vehicle Standards.	0.24	Y
1	TRAN-1b: Adopt CO ₂ Tailpipe Emission Standards (per California AB 1493 "Pavley" standards).	> 6.0	Y
TRAN-2.	Integrate land use and transportation decisions with GHG consequences.	0.40	Y
TRAN-3. CATEGO	Promote biofuel use and production. DRY II – OTHER IMMEDIATE ACTIONS	1.0	Y
TRAN-4.	Review and enhance state tax credits and local incentives for citizens purchasing high efficiency vehicles.	-	?
TRAN-5.	Incorporate GHG emission impacts into transportation planning decisions.	-	Y
TRAN-6.	Expand "Transportation Choices Programs" and "Travel Smart Pilots."	-	Y
TRAN-7.	Adopt state standards for high efficiency/low rolling resistance tires.	0.12	Y
TRAN-8.	Reduce GHG emissions from government fleet purchase and vehicle use.	-	Y
FRAN-9.	State and local governments should switch to "clean diesel" fuel and vehicle purchases, retrofits.	0.10	Y
FRAN-10.	Adopt state and local incentives for high efficiency vehicles.	-	Y
ΓRAN-11.	Set and meet goals for reduced truck idling at truck and safety stops.		?
ΓRAN-12. ΓΡΑΝ-13	Set up traffic flow engineering "Best Practices."	0.08	
	transportation efficiency; achieve this through equipment, coordination, and land use.	-	?
ΓRAN-14.	Establish consumer awareness education link to transportation choices.	-	Y
	IUIAL	7.84	

(-) Symbol denotes savings of less than .0001, or unable to be estimated.

10-13-04 ABSTRACT OF DRAFT ACTIONS TO REDUCE GHGs Page 5 $\,$

BIOLOGICAL SEQUESTRATION ACTIONS TO MITIGATE GREENHOUSE GASES

Issue: Carbon dioxide is sequestered (captured and stored) in trees, soils and other biomass. Human activities can release this carbon or increase sequestration.

Solution: To increase sequestration or reduce emissions for forest and other lands Oregonians need to maintain and increase good land use practices.

Biological Sequestration Actions					
Diological Sequestiation Actions					
	CATEGORY I – SIGNIFICANT ACTIONS FOR	MMT	C/E?*		
	IMMEDIATE STATE ACTION	CO2e			
DIGGING		2025			
BIOSEQ-1	Reduce wildfire risk by creating a market for woody biomass	3.2	Y		
	from forests.				
BIOSEQ-2	Consider GHG effects in farm and forest land use decisions.	0.6	Y		
BIOSEQ-3	Increase forestation of underproducing lands.	0.5	Y?		
	CATEGORY II: OTHER IMMEDIATE ACTIONS				
BIOSEQ-4	Expand the application of water-erosion reducing practices for cereal production.	0.2	Y?		
BIOSEQ-5	Leverage the Conservation Reserve Program (CRP) to expand reserved acreage.	0.2	N?		
BIOSEQ-6	Establish a municipal street tree restoration program.	less	N		
	r	than	14		
+ (7		0.1			

* Cost-effective to consumer over measure lifetime? (This does not include whether it is cost-effective considering the projected effects of global warming)

MATERIALS USE, RECOVERY AND WASTE DISPOSAL ACTIONS FOR REDUCING GREENHOUSE GASES

This discussion evaluates actions relative to a common baseline and independent of other measures. The table below lists the measures that are recommended by the Advisory Group. A few of the measures in Figure 3 have been restated by the Governor's Advisory Group. The state's "solid waste management hierarchy" (ORS 459.015) ranks the preferred order of waste management options as follows:

- 1. Prevention/reuse
- 2. Recycling
- 3. Composting
- 4. Energy recovery
- 5. Landfilling

10-13-04 ABSTRACT OF DRAFT ACTIONS TO REDUCE GHGs Page 6

Information sources used to evaluate specific measures include waste composition studies, existing policy documents and feasibility studies, reports from evaluation of existing programs in Oregon and elsewhere, and in some cases, estimates informed by professional judgment.

Because measures interact, CO_2 savings cannot be added. Refer to the graph on page 8 for the cumulative impact of measures.

	Materials Use, Recovery And Waste Dis	sposal Actions	
CATE IMME	GORY I – SIGNIFICANT ACTIONS FOR DIATE STATE ACTION	Reductions in GHG Emissions in MMTCO ₂ E	C/E?*
D.FTYL 4		2025	
MW-1	Achieve the waste generation and recycling goals in statute.	5.2	Y
MW-2	DEQ should develop guidance to clarify alternative	0.53	N
	final cover performance at larger landfills:		
	Demonstrate control of gas emissions comparable to geomembrane cover.		
MW-3	Provide incentives for larger landfills to collect and	@65 percent: 0.47	N
	burn minimum percentage (65 percent to 80 percent) of methane generated.	@80 percent: 0.88	ана 19 ж 19 г.
CATE	GORY II – OTHER IMMEDIATE ACTIONS		
MW-4	Provide incentives to increase salvage of reusable building materials.	0.02	Y
MW-5	Increase the "Bottle Bill" redemption value from 5-	0.05	?
	cents to 10-cents and expand the "Bottle Bill" to all		•
	beverages except milk, including juice, water, liquor,		
	wine, tea and sports drinks; and consider alternative		
	redemption methods.		
MW-6	Develop statewide recovery infrastructure for	0.03	9
	consumer electronics waste, with shared responsibility		•
	among producers, retailers, NGOs, and government.		
MW-7	Change land use rules to allow commercial composting	less than 0.01 [†]	V
	on land zoned High Value EFU (exclusive farm use).		
MW-8	Increase public awareness to discourage on-site	0.02	V
	burning of garbage, especially fossil-carbon materials.		1
MW-9	Continue landfill regulation with additional reporting	Unknown	V
	and analysis.		
MW-	Evaluate methane emissions from closed landfills and	Unknown	2
10	options to reduce such emissions.	V.	•
the second se			

* Cost-effective to consumer over measure lifetime? (This does not include whether it is cost-effective considering the projected effects of global warming). Measures with savings 0.25 MMT CO2e or more in 2025 are Priority I Measures.

10-13-04 ABSTRACT OF DRAFT ACTIONS TO REDUCE GHGs Page 7 [†] Actual reductions over time could be several times higher than shown, depending on the measure and the details of implementation. Most of the greenhouse gas benefit of these measures is associated with reducing methane generation at landfills; for the dry landfill that accepts most of the Metro area's waste, methane generation occurs up to 150+ years following disposal, so the majority of emissions offsets occur <u>after</u> the 2015 and 2025 time horizons of this project.

GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS ACTIONS TO REDUCE GREENHOUSE GASES

GOV-1	State agencies should use their agency Sustainability Plans as the tool for agencies' dynamic involvement in GHG reductions. Operational activities in the areas of electricity, natural gas, transportation, waste and water will be the focus for reduction opportunities.
GOV-2	Through a collaborative effort, the departments of Energy, Environmental Quality and Administrative Services should develop a process to educate agency personnel about opportunities for GHG reductions including how to set goals and calculate GHG reductions.

CUMULATIVE SUMMARY OF ALL ACTIONS TO REDUCE GREENHOUSE GASES

Emissions are expressed as million metric tons of carbon dioxide-equivalent (MMT CO_2E) in the left vertical axis from 1990 through 2025.



Historic and Forecast Greenhouse Gas Emissions in Oregon and Estimated Cumulative Reductions from All Measures in Sequence

10-13-04 ABSTRACT OF DRAFT ACTIONS TO REDUCE GHGs Page 8

F

0

R

N

A

U

D

Μ



TO:Andy Cotugno, Planning DirectorFROM:Mark Turpel, Principal PlannerDATE:October 27, 2004SUBJECT:Oregon Strategy for Greenhouse Gas Reductions Report - TPAC

The Oregon Strategy for Greenhouse Gas Reductions (Strategy) was released October 13 for public comment due November 15. The entire Strategy is not included in the packet, but may be down loaded from: http://www.energy.state.or.us/Publications/Global_Draft.pdf. I have included a copy of the Executive summary and have prepared a powerpoint presentation that is attached that summarizes the Strategy. Given the comment period, TPAC will only have the November 5 meeting to discuss comments and recommendations about the Strategy. JPACT's next meeting is November 18, after the comment deadline, but TPAC comments would be useful to discussions the Metro Council will have.

A couple of comments prior to getting into a discussion of the Strategy. This issue is very broad and has many aspects of which are complex, unknown and/or contested. The Strategy, including appendices, runs to 152 pages and there are many, many, other relevant reports and data. Accordingly, the following comments or questions are written to anticipate a variety of perspectives and concerns, recognizing substantial constraints of topic breath, review timeline and the potential for substantial debate. In addition, part of the purpose of bringing the Strategy to TPAC is alert members to the Strategy and comment period and to discuss issues which may have transportation import. Individual jurisdictions may wish to comment individually given the comment period deadline. Finally, the Strategy has several different topic areas that I think may be of interest to Metro and several advisory committees, so I have included a discussion of all of these - though TPAC may be more interested in some than others that do not have direct transportation implications.

General Comments

1. Is global warming happening and likely to continue? While there are some that contest this point, the overwhelming scientific review of the data (reported to be the largest peer reviewed effort ever) shows that global warming is indeed occurring. An eight minute video produced by the Oregon Department of Energy which includes Oregon State Professor Jane Lubchenco is available to illustrate the basic dynamics of the question of global warming. While it is possible to engage in debate over this question, it seems that given the scientific research and review, the more important questions are those that pertain to the possible consequences. I recommend that the bulk of discussion address the possible outcomes of global warming, not whether global warming is happening.

2. What are the consequences in our area? Will global warming make any difference here in Oregon or in the Metro area? The scope of the problem is world wide, although the State of Oregon and the metropolitan area have no authority to influence actions that may be halfway

around the world. While citizens of the State or region have in the past and undoubtedly will in the future be concerned about the larger world, they will also want compelling evidence showing what adverse occurrences are likely to affect them, particularly if they are being asked to make significant changes. The Report (page 29) states: "Considerable uncertainty remains over the timing, distribution and potential severity of climate change on storm activity, sea level rise, forest health, water supplies, tropical disease propagation and other terrestrial effects." On page 27, there is a specific reference to the Pacific Northwest ("...University of Washington scientist project a 50 percent reduction in Northwest snow pack by the middle of the century.")

However, it would be useful to know what specific changes global warming might have to the State or the metropolitan area and the probability - at least some estimate. For example, the City of Portland and Multnomah County have estimated that global warming will result in "Reduced Columbia River summer flows by 30 to 50 percent." Does this have significant implications (what is the extent of impact, when might it occur, etc.) for our domestic water supply (there are well fields along the Columbia used in the summertime by Portland)? Marine freight (Would barge traffic be curtailed in summer? Would the deep-water channel be navigable under these conditions?) Agriculture (How much water for irrigation would be available?) Fisheries (How much would salmon and other fish be impacted)? Are there other significant Oregon or metropolitan area adverse impacts?

Further, are there benefits to global warming for Oregon or the metropolitan area? For example, some have indicated that some types of agriculture (wheat farming) could benefit. Taking into consideration both benefits and adverse impacts, what are the net consequences to the State and region?

3. Modification and adaptation. The Strategy notes that in addition to taking actions to reduce greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions, adaptation measures will also need to be taken. It seems like there will be trade-offs that will need to be made between GHG modifications and adaptations. For example, scarce public dollars may be needed to reconstruct (adapt) some portions of low lying roads, rail, marine facilities or airports. How will these uses of public and private dollars rate against efforts to reduce GHG emissions given that adaptation is also assumed to be needed no matter the GHG emission efforts? The Strategy does not include analysis of adaptation, recommending that reduction strategies be addressed first, then adaptation. I recommend that we suggest to the State that these questions be included and further addressed in the Oregon Strategy.

4. Kyoto Protocol implications - Oregon and less developed nations. The Kyoto Protocol, likely to be activated soon for all signatories (though the US is not a signatory and is not bound by the agreement) does not include less developed nations like China or India. Some have expressed concern with US job losses, including manufacturing to these or other less developed nations. What measures could be taken to ensure that adoption of the Oregon GHG measures would not result in further loss of manufacturing or other industries which may emit greenhouse gases (or discourage the location of new industries of this type)?

5. Switzerland as Example? According to 1995 EPA data (see powerpoint presentation that has chart from http://yosemite.epa.gov/oar/globalwarming.nsf/content/emissionsindividual.html), among industrialized nations, Switzerland had per capita GHG emissions about 70% lower than the US. - almost as much as the long-term goal of a 75% reduction of the Oregon Strategy Report. Has the Advisory Group looked at how Switzerland has achieved this emission rate while maintaining its standard of living? How does their approach compare with the Oregon Strategy? Are there lessons to be learned from the Swiss approach?

6. Clarify Cost-Effectiveness Estimate Method. Some have expressed concern about the economic costs (likely the shorter-term costs) of addressing GHG. The Strategy states: "... many actions will require legislative action. Some of this may come in the 2005 session, but more complex and far-reaching questions may not be ripe for legislative treatment until 2007. This is to ensure that sufficient analytic work has been performed – that we can reasonably gauge costs and benefits, and their distribution." However, the Strategy provides an assessment of cost-effectiveness. Should a recommendation be made that the Strategy include an explanation of how the cost effectiveness assessment was made, specifically, what determined whether a measure was rated cost-effective or not?

Specific Comments

7. Metropolitan Area Policies Already in Place, Quantification. The Strategy calls for reducing GHG emissions in part, by reducing VMT, building more compactly along I-5 corridor, etc. Its not clear whether the GHG report takes into consideration the changes in policy direction that this region has already made starting in 1996 and the implementation that is now occurring. If so, is there a way to calculate how much more of an effort would be needed to be made in the Metro region? (either way, is there a method to calculate how much effort is needed to meet this part of the goal so that efforts can be evaluated over time?)

8. Recognition of Local Jobs and Creating Offsets. This month a new insulation plant in Gresham (Owens Corning) was required to submit an application to emit 283 tons of a greenhouse gas that is used to create air pockets in the foam insulation they will be producing. Outside the region, there are two new power plants approved on land owned by the Port of St. Helens, but which are designed to provide electrical power for the Metro area. Another application for a power plant to serve the Metro area has been submitted for a location in Turner. A voluntary pledge was made October 22, 2004 by the Collins Companies (Portland, Ore.) to reduce total U.S. greenhouse gas emissions by 18% from 2000 to 2010. How can we ensure that we don't discourage companies from continuing operation in Oregon, or new plants considering Oregon sites? (particularly when the effects are global though the jobs could be local or not) Can the Oregon Strategy provide for offsetting GHG emissions from employment sources with reductions in other sectors?

9. Status of City of Portland/Multnomah County and Region. In 2001, the City of Portland revised its earlier GHG plan to achieve a 10% reduction of 1990 GHG emissions and between 1990 and 2000 the City has estimated that it has reduced GHG by over 5%. (and Multnomah County?) does the City (and Multnomah County) already comply if they carry out their plan? What does that mean if the whole region agrees to this goal?

10. Support for/Comment on Specific measures There are several measures that are particularly relevant to the Metro area including:

EE 1b and EE 1c. Energy Efficiency Measure - Building Code Updates.

Pages 15 and 16. The energy efficiency section calls for building code updates every 3 to 6 years (EE 1b and EE1c). Is there a way to simplify this and set performance standard goals and/or incentives for 5, 10 and 15 years out, reevaluating them from time to time so that builders have some idea of the outcomes sought and so that they can be looking for ways to achieve this at lowest cost, rather than having continual code revisions?

Transportation Measures - Suggestions for Broader Program

- Include a call for more transit, and a greatly increased role for state funding of transit, in the Oregon Transportation Plan.

- Work to have the State make a greater commitment to funding urban transit system expansion and operation as well as inter-city transit links (rail and bus).

- Include greenhouse gas reduction as a criterion in making STIP decisions.

- In the OTP, set a priority for addressing transportation problems. Before expanding capacity of a roadway:

1. implement appropriate TDM strategies

2. implement alternative modes, including transit

3. make management changes on facility including ITS, pricing

4. examine changes in land use to reduce demand

- State should invest in rail improvements for freight.

Land Use

- State should develop mechanisms to coordinate growth forecasts and UGB decisions within each metropolitan area's sphere of influence with the goal of reducing travel demand.

Housing

- State funding for Energy efficiency assistance program for residences fund a "Centers Investment Bank" to catalyze development in centers (TOD)

- Dis-incentivize larger houses (eg tie home mortgage interest deduction to energy use).

Transportation Measures - Comments on Existing Strategy

TRAN - 2: Integrate land use and transportation decisions with GHG consequences.

This recommendation (see further text on pages 34 & 35) looks good. In addition, suggest that the EPA mandated MOBILE6.2 air quality software model used by Metro and DEQ to estimate air pollutants from transportation sources now includes a module that estimates GHG emissions. Other MPOs in the state also are now required to use this software. Suggest that the third bullet under TRAN -2 be stated more explicitly as follows: "When transportation plans are updated and air quality conformity determinations are required, estimates of the GHG emissions from transportation sources also should be calculated using MOBILE6 or other software as approved by EPA. Comparisons with earlier GHG emission forecasts should be made when available to document change over time."

TRAN - 5: Incorporate GHG emissions impacts into transportation planning decisions.

See pages 36 & 37. Immediate above comment also applies regarding MOBILE6 use. They also suggest that the Oregon Road User Fee Task Force keep incentives in place for the purchase of fuel-efficient vehicles. Is this something that the region supports?

Section further recommends that TSPs identify and fund strategic transportation investments that reduce GHG emissions and cite pedestrian improvements in high-use corridors where transit providers are looking to implement frequent service lines. Suggest we state our support for this.

TRAN - 6: Expand "Transportation Choices Programs" and "Travel Smart Pilots."

See page 37. This section looks consistent with our Regional Travel Options program, though I've asked our staff to review this section and see if they have any comments or recommendations.

TRAN - 12: Set up traffic flow engineering "Best Practices."

See page 40, 41. This is ITS and CMS related. I've asked some of our staff to comment, so there may be specific responses we may have. Does TPAC have interest in commenting on this?

TRAN - 13: Set up and meet goals for freight (truck/rail) transportation efficiency; achieve this through equipment, coordination and land use.

See page 41. This section cites encouraging warehouse and distribution center development in existing urban areas, which I believe is what the region is now doing. The Port may have some comments on this as well.

Also recommends enabling "...the Hillsboro airport to accommodate larger aircraft to allow for greater access to PDX airport. Moving freight via air would reduce overall emissions and congestion as compared with truck movement." This proposal could have import to many TPAC members, as it touches on freight movement, Port of Portland operations, City of Hillsboro land uses and PIA implications. Does TPAC wish to comment on any aspect of this?

TRAN - 14 : Establish consumer awareness education link to transportation choices.

See page41-42. Believe this section is easily doable. I have asked for Metro public involvement staff to comment to see if they have any further suggestions.

BIOSEQ-2: Consider GHG effects in farm and forest land use decisions.

See page 47. Says that the recommendation is to maintain Oregon's statewide program for landuse planning, no additional policy direction.

BIOSEQ-3: Increase forestation of under producing lands.

Page 47. Recommends converting marginal agricultural, pasture and unproductive brush lands (capable of growing forests) back into healthy, productive forests (both riparian and upland). Not sure that this relates directly to the region, though it could have some interaction with UGB decisions. I have asked Metro staff to review and comment.

BIOSEQ-6: Establish a Municipal Street Tree Restoration program.

See page 50. They propose transferring \$0.25 from vehicle registration fees collected under ORS 803.420. Is this a concern?

MW-7: Change land use rules to allow commercial composting on land zoned High Value EFU (exclusive farm use)

See page 62. Not sure if this has any interaction in future UGB decisions. I have asked Metro staff to review and comment.

Other Materials recovery comments

Metro solid waste staff are reviewing this section of the Strategy and may have comments or recommendations. If so, we will try and incorporate their suggestions in a later version of this document.

Other Suggestions for Measures

- Ensure that conclusions of Greenhouse Gas Reduction Plan are integrated into other state functions: e.g., ODOT (above) and: 1) Education (reduce busing, site schools within neighborhoods) 2) Agriculture, Forestry, PUC, DLCD (30 year review of statewide land use planning program): 3) Corrections (don't locate facilities outside of Metro areas/Willamette Valley), Health, GSA.

As you can see, the Strategy touches on many issues and is complex. I would be happy to work further with TPAC to secure a set of recommendations.

Thank you.

INNOVATIVE WET WEATHER PROJECTS

Metro Council Work Session Tuesday, November 9, 2004 Metro Council Chamber

METRO COUNCIL

Work Session Worksheet

Presentation Date: October 26, 2004

Time: 1:00 PM

Length: 15 minutes

Presentation Title: Innovative Wet Weather Projects

Department: Oregon Zoo

Presenters: Tony Vecchio & Teri Dresler

ISSUE & BACKGROUND

Zoo staff is working together the from City of Portland, Bureau of Environmental Services (BES) to identify innovative storm water handling projects to be constructed at the Zoo. These projects are being funded by the Environmental Protection Agency with pass-through funds to BES. There is \$200,000 in grant funds available for this project. The project will be funded entirely by the grant. The funding period ends June 30, 2004.

A study of potential projects was completed by GreenWorks, a contractor for BES. Based on that study, five projects were identified and agreed to be priorities by BES and the Zoo. The recommended projects are all in public areas where educational messages regarding storm water can be easily communicated via simple interpretives, a requirement of the grant.

The projects selected include installation of bioswales in a portion of the Washington Park Parking Lot, installation of a storm water treatment facility near the concert lawn, disconnecting downspouts on the viewing kiosks adjacent to the elephant front yard, and if funds are available, projects in the Kongo Ranger Station and Sankuru Trader areas of the zoo will be explored.

OPTIONS AVAILABLE

IMPLICATIONS AND SUGGESTIONS

- Create legislation to amend the Zoo's FY 04/05 budget to allow acceptance of the \$200,000 grant and corresponding expenditure.
- Approve the Intergovernmental Agreement between City of Portland BES and Metro.
- Approve issuance of the RFP for design / build contract for construction of innovative storm water projects at the Zoo.

QUESTION(S) PRESENTED FOR CONSIDERATION

LEGISLATION WOULD BE REQUIRED FOR COUNCIL ACTION _X_Yes __No DRAFT IS ATTACHED __Yes _X_No

SCHEDULE FOR WORK SESSION

Department Director/Head Approval ______ Chief Operating Officer Approval _____

Agenda Item Number 7.0

PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO STATE-WIDE PLANNING GOAL 14 AND PROPOSED NEW ADMINISTRATIVE RULE

Metro Council Work Session Tuesday, November 9, 2004 Metro Council Chamber

METRO COUNCIL

Work Session Worksheet

Presentation Date: November 2, 2004 Time: Length: 15 minutes

Presentation Title: Proposed Amendments to State-wide Planning Goal 14 and Proposed New Administrative Rules

Department: Planning/Office of Metro Attorney

Presenters: Dick Benner

ISSUE & BACKGROUND

Goal 14, the "Urbanization" goal, was one of the first goals adopted by the Land Conservation and Development Commission (LCDC) in the early 1970s. The main objective of Goal 14 is to focus urban development inside urban growth boundaries in order to conserve farm and forest land and to foster the efficient use of land and public facilities.

Throughout the acknowledgement process in late 1970s and 1980s, LCDC was required to interpret Goal 14's UGB amendment provisions, much of which has never been codified in commission rules. A number of court decisions established additional interpretive precedents. Today, people reading the goal may be unaware of these interpretations and the ramifications for the process outlined in the goal. In addition, new and amended statutes enacted since the goal's original adoption are not reflected or referenced in the goal.

In 1998, LCDC directed staff to propose, with the assistance of stakeholders, administrative rules to interpret and implement Goal 14 and amendments to Goal 14 itself. With the passage of Measure 7 in November 2000, LCDC suspended the Goal 14 project and the project was not restarted until June 2004.

Since June 2004, a workgroup has been working to propose amendments to Goal 14 and a new administrative rule to clarify and streamline the UGB amendment process. Statewide public hearings are being held November 5 through November 10 and LCDC may adopt the changes at its December 8-10 meeting. Metro staff has participated in this workgroup and will outline the proposed Goal 14 changes and new administrative rule.

OPTIONS AVAILABLE

IMPLICATIONS AND SUGGESTIONS

QUESTION(S) PRESENTED FOR CONSIDERATION

Does the Council want to submit formal comments on the proposed Goal 14 changes?

LEGISLATION WOULD BE REQUIRED FOR COUNCIL ACTION __Yes _X No DRAFT IS ATTACHED __Yes _XNo

SCHEDULE FOR WORK SESSION

Department Director/Head Approval ______ Chief Operating Officer Approval ______ TO:President David Bragdon and Metro Council membersFROM:Andy Cotugno, Planning DirectorDATE:November 9, 2004SUBJECT:Oregon Greenhouse Gas Reduction Strategy

In early 2004, Governor Kulongoski appointed members to the Governor's Advisory Group on Global Warming, including Metro Councilor Rex Burkholder. On October 13, The Advisory Group completed a draft *Oregon Strategy for Greenhouse Gas Reduction (Strategy)* and is seeking public comment. The materials have or will be sent to TPAC, MTAC, MPAC and JPACT.

The draft *Strategy* and request for public comment bring up several questions including:

1. Does the Metro Council wish to comment on the draft *Strategy*?

2. If so, what level of greenhouse gas reduction action would the Council prefer to recommend?

3. If the Council wishes to comment, would the Council wish to have a letter prepared for signature by the Metro President as well as the chairs of JPACT, MPAC?

Your Metro Council informal packets included a staff memo commenting on the draft *Strategy* and last Friday, November 5, TPAC discussed the memo.

Following are TPAC comments:

Geographic Scope of Draft *Strategy*. The region may wish to urge that the draft *Strategy* make a distinction between those strategies that are suitable for urban areas and those that may be workable in rural areas. For example, transit and improved transit is not provided or is provided at much lower levels of service in rural areas than urban areas.

Region-wide Versus Project level Assessment. The greenhouse gas implications of a proposed transportation plan, which includes a package of transportation improvements, is preferable to assessing individual projects. Within a proposed transportation plan some projects may lessen greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions, others that may increase GHG emissions, but the most important consideration is what is the impact of the overall mix of projects, not the impact of an individual project. This would follow the same approach as federal air quality requirements.

TRAN 13 - Employer Actions and Hillsboro Airport. The wording of this measure seems to single out Port employees for GHG emission reductions when it seems more appropriate to

encourage such actions of all employers. In addition, the recommendation about making changes to the use of the Hillsboro Airport, shifting some PIA traffic, needs further analysis. It could be inconsistent with the overall aviation plan and should be checked.

Warehouse Location and Transit. While it is important for a variety of reasons, including reduction of GHG emissions, to serve employment locations with transit, the economics of transit service should not be ignored. In some cases, a warehousing center with very low employment density may not lend itself to transit service.

Oregon Actions in Global Context. If Oregon took whatever actions were necessary to reduce GHG emissions to zero, it is unlikely that it would make a significant difference, worldwide. The region should be cautious about how far it goes to reduce GHG emissions because the region, or even the State, have limited control over worldwide GHG emissions and any consequences that may occur as a result of increased GHG emissions.

Oregon Leadership, West Coast Governor Context. The draft *Strategy* suggests that Oregon can benefit from showing leadership, recognizing that there are also costs, as well as benefits, to leadership and that a good strategy is one that does not go overboard. It should also be recognized that as part of the West Coast Governor's Greenhouse Gas Initiative, that California and Washington are showing leadership. Oregon, a part of the Initiative, can be a leader with the understanding that they are not alone.

Quantification. It would be useful to quantify how much the implementation of existing policy has already done to reduce GHG emissions. This would demonstrate how Oregon has already taken some actions that reduce GHG emissions. For example, in terms of vehicle miles traveled per capita, the region is approximately 20 percent below the national average.

I look forward to Metro Council discussion of this issue and policy and procedural direction.

Thank you.

DATE:	November, 2004
TO:	Andy Cotugno, Director, Planning Department
FROM:	Mike Hoglund, Director, Solid Waste & Recycling Department
RE:	Draft Oregon Strategy for Greenhouse Gas Reductions

Thank you for the opportunity to coordinate our comments with other Metro Departments on the Draft Oregon Strategy for Greenhouse Gas Reductions. Our department participated in the technical committee working on solid waste issues and has done a preliminary review of the draft report. Our initial comments are listed below.

1109040.02

I understand the you are seeking an extension to the comment period to give regional transportation advisory groups an opportunity to review the draft report. I support asking for the extension, as it could provide SW&R a better opportunity to discuss the draft report with other stakeholders in the solid waste and recycling community.

General comments

Overall, we believe the work related to solid waste in the draft report was a good first effort. The process was conducted on a very fast track, and we think additional work needs to be conducted on the recommendations. The draft report acknowledges that need, which we should echo in our comments. We also found that the technical subcommittee was well-run, committed to developing good data and soliciting the views of stakeholders.

We support the draft report's concept of a goal-setting process that provides signals to markets and is committed to starting with cost-effective solutions. This approach is consistent with how the Metro region set and has tried to reach its waste reduction goals. The report also incorporates strategies that our department could endorse – for example, taking an "investment" approach to calculating benefits from the recommendations. We would like to work with the Planning Department to suggest ways of incorporating these observations into Metro's comment letter.

Many of the recommendations are for programs or efforts that would apply to the state as a whole. We should make clear that our comments only pertain to how the recommendations affect the Metro area. Local control over solid waste matters is an important value in our state and we want to ensure that Metro is not viewed as prescribing its views on others.

We have grouped our comments in two sets: One covers the waste reduction recommendations, and the other the landfill and disposal related recommendations.

Comments on specific recommendations

1. Waste generation and recycling recommendations

The draft report contains one "Category I" and four "Category II" recommendations related to waste reduction.

Category I

MW-1: Achieve the waste generation and recycling goals in statute.

We support this and the accompanying recommendation in the draft report's text that "both sets of goals be achieved to the extent that they can be achieved cost-effectively."

We want to point out that most of the greenhouse gas (GHG)reduction benefits will accrue from meeting the state's waste generation goals, as opposed to the recycling goal: In 2025, 5.0 MMTCO₂E for the generation goal, versus 0.25 MMTCO₂E for meeting the recycling goal. The report acknowledges that the DEQ has not yet developed a waste generation plan that would meet the waste generation goals. The draft report states that there are not enough details to evaluate the cost nor feasibility of meeting these goals - the recommendation, therefore, can only be evaluated for its GHG reduction potential.

The draft report also recommends that the definition of "cost-effective" include "all costs including externalities" such as GHG. While we support efforts to set solid waste performance measures that look beyond just "tons of waste recycled", we believe additional analysis is required. This issue is being considered as part of our current regional solid waste planning process.

Category II

MW-4: Provide incentives to increase salvage of reusable building materials.

We understand that this proposal was developed, in part, based on the success Metro has had in assisting the development of reusable building material firms in its region. We can support this recommendation for the Region as there remain additional opportunities for more salvage, particularly for commercial building materials.

MW-5: Increase the "Bottle Bill" redemption value from 5-cents to 10-cents and expand the "Bottle Bill" to all beverages except milk, including juice, water, liquor, wine, tea, and sports drinks; and consider alternative redemption methods.

We support this concept. It has been described as "modernizing" Oregon's bottle bill to include the many new types of containers that have become part of the waste stream since the bottle bill was enacted over 30 years ago. Our comment here is also consistent with SW&R's previous submittals to Council about a potential bottle bill that might come before the State Legislature next session.

This legislation could remove a large number of glass containers from residential curbside collection systems, helping reduce the contamination of recycled paper by glass that is currently taking place.

Memo from Mike Hoglund to Andy Cotugno November ____, 2004 Page 3

MW-6 Develop statewide recovery infrastructure for consumer electronics waste, with shared responsibility among producers, retailers, NGOs, and government.

We support this concept and have been participating in the legislatively established (SB 867) state advisory committee to develop such a recovery infrastructure for consumer electronics.

MW-7 Change land-use rules to allow commercial composting on land zoned High Value EFU (exclusive farm use).

We support the concept of increasing the number of locations where compost facilities could be located, but will comment that there needs to be a regulatory "level playing field" for compost facilities in rural and urban locations. We agree with the draft report that we need a system of facilities that protects the environment.

2. Disposal and landfill recommendations

Overall, we found the four recommendations regarding landfills (MW-2, 3, 9 & 10) provided a good overview of technically feasible methods of addressing landfill GHG issues. The draft report also appears to have taken appropriate consideration of how these recommendations would be reconciled with existing regulations.

MW-2 DEQ should develop guidance to clarify alternative final cover performance at larger landfills: Demonstrate control of gas emissions comparable to geomembrane cover.

We believe we can support the concept, but would like to see more information about the specific costs and increased tip fee that could result at affected landfills which take waste from the Metro region.

MW-3 Provide incentives for larger landfills to collect and burn minimum percentage (65 percent to 80 percent) of methane generated.

MW-10 Evaluate methane emissions from closed landfills and options to reduce such emissions.

Both these recommendations seek to increase the reduction of GHG from landfills. We are inclined to believe that the MW-3 recommendation could potentially provide more GHG reduction opportunities than the MW-10 as it is dealing with newer wastes.

MW-9 Continue landfill regulation with additional reporting and analysis.

No specific comment at this time.

MW-8 Increase public awareness to discourage on-site burning of garbage, especially fossilcarbon materials.

No comment yet; we are reviewing what relevance this specifically has for the Metro region.

110904c-03

FY 2005-06 Solid Waste & Recycling Budget Council Work Session November 9, 2004

Agenda

1.	Identifying direction: issues, opportunities, priorities	Hoglund
2.	Where we're starting from: the current budget	Anderson
	□ The FY 2004-05 program budget	
	Performance measures	
3.	Discussion	Hoglund/all

Agenda Item 1. Identifying Direction: Issues, Opportunities, Priorities

Starting assumptions:

- □ No major new program initiatives
- □ No major financial problems

FY 2005-06 Department themes:

- □ No new resources
- Meeting Department objectives
- Constant process improvement
- □ Responding to the Strategic Plan

Today's discussion:

- □ Existing programs and activities
- Public services and outreach
- □ Environmental and entrepreneurial leadership
- Disposal system planning
- \Rightarrow Examples have been drawn from issues and opportunities identified October 21.

Solid Waste & Recycling Department Issues, Opportunities and FY 2005-06 Priorities

Dublic Services

Current Programs & Activities

Meeting recovery objectives

- □ Food waste
- □ Construction & demo
- Business recycling
 - Expanded education
 - Mandatory MRFing

Efficiencies

- Paint storefront for engineer
- □ Planner for St. Johns superv.
- Disposal vouchers
- St. Johns
- □ RSF credits
- Sheriff's contract (illegal dumpsite cleanup and investigations)

Agency Coordination

□ ENACT

& Outreach			Leadership	
Cı	istomer Service	National Initiative		
	Hazardous waste		E-Waste	
	Transfer stations		Paint Stewardship	
	School & Adult Education			
	Recycling Information Center			
L	1			
Public Services			ate Legislation	
- 7	Facility regulation		E-Waste	
/-	Disposal vouchers			
	Enhancement committees			
	Coordinating regional			
Rivers & Streams link)				
Public Outreach			atex Paint	

Planning processes: RSWMP, disposal system planning

Business plan New business development

Environmental

Disposal System Planning

Public Role

- Transfer station ownership
- □ Transport contract/mode
- □ Meeting "10%" obligation

Regulatory Decisions

- □ Wet waste allocations (caps)
- □ Rates/franchise system?
- □ New transfer station(s)?

Other

Enhancement fees

Issues and opportunities summarized from October 21 budget discussion. Examples discussed today in green italic

Solid Waste and Recycling Department FY 2004-05 Program Budget Discussion Draft - November 9, 2004

Mission:	۷	Vaste Reduction			SW&R					
Programs: Revenues & Costs	Solid Waste Reduction	Hazardous Waste Reduction	Education & Outreach	Disposal Services	Private Facility Regulation	Illegal Dumpsites	Landfill Stewardship	Facility & Asset Management	Department Total	
Direct Program Revenue & Costs										
Direct Revenue										
Enterprise	60,000	884,500	2,500	28,766,723					29,713,723	
Other				392,430	15,000				407,430	
Subtotal	\$60,000	\$884,500	\$2,500	\$29,159,153	\$15,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$30,121,153	
Direct Costs	004 455	0.007.040	004 000	4 404 000	504 540	50.004	511.000			
Meteriolo & populaço	694,455	2,287,218	824,638	1,491,890	521,546	58,904	541,828	392,488	6,812,968	
Grants	1,477,270	2,041,202	400,000	20,000,403	80,277	375,551	358,800	106,835	32,333,998	
Subtotal	\$3.397.996	\$5,128,480	\$1.313.238	\$28.332.938	\$601,823	\$434,455	\$900.628	\$499 323	\$40,608,882	
	8.4%	12.6%	3.2%	69.8%	1.5%	1.1%	2.2%	1.2%	100%	
Net Direct Program Revenue (Cost)	(\$3,337,996)	(\$4,243,980)	(\$1,310,738)	\$826,215	(\$586,823)	(\$434,455)	(\$900,628)	(\$499,323)	(\$10,487,729)	
minus: Allocated Costs (Administration & Sup Debt service Intra-Departmental Interfund transfers Subtotal	port) 375,783 <u>687,237</u> \$1,063,020	232,141 782,365 840,681 \$1,855,187	176,373 322,554 \$498,928	2,089,271 639,819 1,371,621 \$4,100,711	118,654 	58,696 53,599 \$112,295	180,361 \$49,209 \$429,570	34,325 	2,321,412 2,366,376 3,910,668 \$8,598,456	
Total Program Bougnus (Cost)	104 404 040)	(\$0.000.407)	(\$4,000,000)	(\$2.074.407)	(0050 547)	(0540 350)	101 000 100	(6000.07.0)		
Total Program Revenue (Cost)	(\$4,401,016)	(\$0,099,107)	(\$1,809,866)	(\$3,274,497)	(\$956,517)	(\$546,750)	(\$1,330,198)	(\$668,374)	(\$19,086,185)	
<i>plus:</i> Allocated Revenue Grants, transfers, taxes	23.1%	32.0%	9.5%	17.2%	5.0%	2.9%	7.0%	3.5%	100%	
Misc. (interest, etc.)	50,868	76,773	19,659	424,143	9,009	6,504	13,482	7,475	607,914	
Subtotal	\$50,868	\$76,773	\$19,659	\$424,143	\$9,009	\$6,504	\$13,482	\$7,475	\$607,914	
equals:										
Net Revenue Requirements	(\$4,350,148)	(\$6,022,394)	(\$1,790,007)	(\$2,850,353)	(\$947,508)	(\$540,246)	(\$1,316,716)	(\$660,899)	(\$18,478,271)	
					\$18,396,913					
				and less allocation from Metro General Fund						
Figures exclude CIP capital.				Equals : net contribution to (draw from) Solid Waste Fund Balance						

Solid Waste and Recycling Department FY 2004-05 Program Budget Discussion Draft - November 9, 2004

Appendix A

FY 2004-05 Program Budget Summarized by Costs and Revenue

Mission:	۷	Vaste Reduction			SW&R					
Programs:	Solid Waste Reduction	Hazardous Waste Reduction	Education & Outreach	Disposal Services	Private Facility Regulation	lllegal Dumpsites	Landfill Stewardship	Facility & Asset Management	Department Total	
Cost Direct Program Costs Allocated Costs (Admin & Support)	\$3,397,996 \$1,063,020	\$5,128,480 \$1,855,187	\$1,313,238 \$498,928	\$28,332,938 \$4,100,711	\$601,823 \$369,694	\$434,455 \$112,295	\$900,628 \$429,570	\$499,323 \$169,051	\$40,608,882 \$8,598,456	
Total Budgeted Cost	\$4,461,016	\$6,983,667	\$1,812,166	\$32,433,650	\$971,517	\$546,750	\$1,330,198	\$668,374	\$49,207,338	
Revenue Direct Program Revenue Allocated Revenue	9.1% \$60,000 \$50,868	14.2% \$884,500 \$76,773	3.7% \$2,500 \$19,659	65.9% \$29,159,153 \$424,143	2.0% \$15,000 \$9,009	1.1% \$0 \$6,504	2.7% \$0 \$13,482	1.4% \$0 \$7,475	\$30,121,153 \$607,914	
Operating & Non-Operating Revenue*	\$110,868	\$961,273	\$22,159	\$29,583,296	\$24,009	\$6,504	\$13,482	\$7,475	\$30,729,067	
					Revenue minus cost equals: Net Budget Revenue (Cost)					
* Excluding Regional System Fee revenue.	egional System Fee revenue.					ie (at \$15.09/ton)	\$18,396,913			
					ste Fund Balance	(\$81,358)				

Appendix B FY 2004-05 Employees (Full-Time Equivalents)

Programs	7.67	30.05	11.33	19.15	5	1	6.5	4	85
							Offic	e of the Director	4
						Support	(administrative	and secretarial)	7.5
							Disast	ter debris, safety	1
							Business, fin	ance, budgeting	9
							Total	Department FTE	106.20

Solid Waste and Recycling Department FY 2004-05 Program Budget Key to Using Template



Solid Waste & Recycling Department Performance Indicators

"Internal" Indicators (Management Information)

Departmental

- Regional recovery rate (DEQ)
- Per Capita Recovery (tons)
- Per Capita Disposal (tons)
- Metro Recycling Information phone inquiries
- Households served by hazardous waste program
- Student/adult participants in waste reduction classes (also in WR&O indicators)
- Solid Waste Revenue Tons
- Variance between tonnage forecast and actual tonnage

Administrative (Office of the Director, Financial Management & Analysis)

- Percent of elected officials information requests meeting requested completion date
- Percent of ordinances and resolutions submitted for review by other departments three working days before filing deadline
- Number of presentations made before civic, neighborhood, and professional groups
- Percent of Councilors rating the overall performance of the Department "very good" and "good" in annual review
- Percent of public information requests responded to within two working days
- Percent support service job orders meeting time request
- Percent of financial status reports completed and distributed on time

Business & Regulatory Affairs

- Percent of illegal dumpsites cleaned up within two working days of being reported
- · Issuance of Metro solid waste authorizations within code-required periods
- Conduct 200 quality inspections per inspector at regulated solid waste facilities
- Timely and appropriate enforcement actions taken at all private solid waste facilities

Environmental & Engineering Services

- Hazardous waste direct cost per pound, net
- Average payload (tons) for waste transport
- Average wait times (minutes) at Metro transfer stations for automated transactions
- Average wait times at Metro transfer stations for non-automated transactions
- Scalehouse transactions (non-automated) per scalehouse staff FTE
- Number of hours of total shutdown at transfer stations from haz. waste incidents
- Number of injuries to Metro transfer stations customers per 50,000 transactions
- Injury and Illness Rate f staff at Metro transfer stations and hazardous waste sites
- Percent of Metro transfer station customers responding to customer survey who rate the quality of service as "service quality exceeds expectations"
- Percent of projects where contracted engineering costs are 20% or less than construction costs

- Percent of projects completed in the FY as scheduled within the adopted CIP
- Percent of completed projects within 110% of CIP cost estimates
- Percent of SWIS, thrift, and City of Portland reports produced on time
- Percent of time landfill gas is provided when needed for energy recovery at Ash Grove Cement Co.

Waste Reduction, Planning & Outreach

- Percent of callers to Recycling Information survey who respond that they found the information provided very useful
- Number of students reached in waste reduction elementary and secondary schools
- Percent of RSWMP milestones identified as completed in the annual State of the Plan Report
- Percent of residents engaging in home composting and grass cycling
- Percent of local government targeted and non-targeted assistance grant applications reviewed within 6 weeks of being submitted

"External" Indicators

Office of the Director

Increase Number of New Applicants for Community Enhancement

Financial Management & Analysis

- Private Facility Review
- Forecast Accuracy

Regulatory Affairs

- Number of Facility Inspections
- Percent of Formal Enforcement Actions Upheld on Appeal to Hearings Officer
- Percent of Illegal Dumpsites where Action was Taken within Two Days of Discovery

Environmental & Engineering Services

- Percent of Actual Project Costs vs CIP Estimates
- Compliance with Permits/Energy Contract
- Hazardous Waste Net Cost Per Pound
- Net Cost Per Incoming Paint Gallon
- Injury & Illness Rate
- Customer Satisfaction with Facility Staff
- Percent Increase in Latex Paint Sales

Waste Reduction & Outreach

- Calls to RIC & Hits on Website
- Caller Satisfaction with RIC Information
- Students Reached in Elementary and Secondary School Presentations
- Regional Recovery Rate
- Recovery Rate Progress by Initiative

Page 1

110904c-04 To: Metro Caurail For Dr de Benner

At a mer

Proposed Amendments to Statewide Planning Goal 14 October 20, 2004 (NOTE: New text is underlined and deleted text is in strikethrough).

GOAL 14: URBANIZATION

To provide for an orderly and efficient transition from rural to urban land use, <u>to</u> <u>accommodate urban population and urban employment inside urban growth</u> <u>boundaries, to ensure efficient use of land, and to provide for livable communities.</u>

Part 1: Urban Growth Boundaries

Urban growth boundaries shall be established <u>and maintained by</u> incorporated cities, counties and regional governments to provide land for urban development needs and to identify and separate <u>urban and</u> urbanizable land from rural land. <u>Establishment and change of urban growth boundaries shall be a</u> cooperative process among cities, counties and, where applicable, regional governments. An urban growth boundary and amendments to the boundary shall be adopted by all cities within the boundary and by the county or counties within which the boundary is located, except for the Metro regional urban growth boundary established pursuant to ORS Chapter 268, which shall be adopted or amended by the Metropolitan Service District.

Land Need

Establishment and change of <u>urban growth</u> the boundaries shall be based upon considerations of <u>on</u> the following factors:

(1) Demonstrated need to accommodate long range urban population growth requirements consistent with <u>LCDC goals</u> <u>a coordinated 20-year population</u> <u>forecast;</u>

(2) The need for <u>land to accommodate</u> housing, employment opportunities and <u>livability other urban uses</u>, including public facilities, streets and roads, <u>schools</u>, parks and open space; and

(3) The efficient use of land within the existing urban area. Prior to expanding an urban growth boundary, local governments shall demonstrate that land needs cannot reasonably be accommodated on land already inside the urban growth boundary.

1

Boundary Location

The location of the urban growth boundary and changes to the boundary shall be determined by evaluating alternative boundary locations. The boundary location choice shall conserve agricultural and forest land by giving these lands the lowest priority for inclusion in an urban growth boundary, consistent with ORS 197.298, and shall also be based on considerations of the following factors:

(1) Accommodation of identified land use needs in an efficient manner:

(2) (3) Orderly and economic provision of for-public facilities and services;

(3) Natural landscape features, natural hazards, and the conservation of natural resources;

(4) Maximum efficiency of land uses within and on the fringe of theexisting urban area.

(4)(5) Environmental, energy, economic and social consequences; and,

ion in his is in the second of (6) Retention of agricultural land as defined, with Class I being the highestpriority for retention and Class VI the lowest priority.

(5)(7)-Compatibility of the proposed urban uses with nearby agricultural and forest activities occurring on farm and forest land outside the UGB.

The results of the above considerations shall be included in thecomprehensive plan. In the case of a change of a boundary, a governing bodyproposing such change in the boundary separating urbanizable lands from ruralland shall follow the procedures and requirements as set forth in the Land Use-Planning goal (Goal 2) for goal exceptions.

Any urban growth boundary established prior to January 1, 1975, which includes rural lands that have not been built upon shall be reviewed by thegoverning body, utilizing the same factors applicable to the establishment orchange of urban growth boundaries.

Establishment and change of the boundaries shall be a cooperative processbetween a city and county or counties that surround it.-

Part 2: Urban Area Planning

Conversion of Urbanizable Land to Urban Land

Land within the boundaries shall be considered available over time for urban uses. Comprehensive plans and implementing regulations shall:

(1) Manage the division and use of urbanizable land in a manner that maintains its potential for efficient urban development until public facilities and services are provided and the land converts to urban use; and

Page 2

(2) Ensure the timely and economic provision of public facilities to urbanizable land in order to maintain an adequate supply of serviced urban land for urban development needs.

Land within the boundaries separating urbanizable land from rural landshall be considered available over time for urban uses. Conversion of urbanizableland to urban uses shall be based on consideration of:

(1) Orderly, economic provision for public facilities and services;

(2) Availability of sufficient land for the various uses to insure choices in the market place;

(3) LCDC goals or the acknowledged comprehensive plan; and,

(4) Encouragement of development within urban areas before conversion of urbanizable areas.

Efficient Land Use and Livable Communities

Comprehensive plans and implementing regulations for lands inside urban growth boundaries shall encourage the efficient use of land and the development of livable communities.

Part 3: Unincorporated Communities

In unincorporated communities outside urban growth boundaries counties may approve uses, public facilities and services more intensive than allowed on rural lands by Goal 11 and 14, either by exception to those goals, or as provided by commission rules which ensure such uses do not adversely affect agricultural and forest operations and interfere with the efficient functioning of urban growth boundaries.

Notwithstanding the other provisions of this goal, the commission may by rule provide that this goal does not prohibit the development and use of one single-family dwelling on a lot or parcel that:

(a) Was lawfully created;

(b) Lies outside any acknowledged urban growth boundary or unincorporated community boundary;

(c) Is within an area for which an exception to Statewide Planning Goal 3 or 4 has been acknowledged; and

(d) Is planned and zoned primarily for residential use.

<u>Note</u>, "Guidelines" currently included under Goal 14 would be unchanged. **Goal Definitions***

URBAN LAND. Land inside in an urban growth boundary except for urbanizable land.

Urban areas are those places which must have an incorporated city. Such areasmay include lands adjacent to and outside the incorporated city and may also:

(a) Have concentrations of persons who generally reside and work in the area, and

(b) Have supporting public facilities and services.

URBANIZABLE LAND. Land inside an urban growth boundary planned for urban use but that, due to the present unavailability of urban facilities and services, or for other reasons, either:

(a) Retains the zone designations assigned prior to inclusion in the boundary; or

(b) Is assigned other interim zone designations that maintain the potential for urban development until such time as urban facilities and services become available.

Urbanizable lands are those lands within the urban growth boundary and which are identified and

(a) Determined to be necessary and suitable for future urban uses_

(b) Can be served by urban services and facilities,

(c) Are needed for the expansion of an urban area

RURAL LAND. Rural lands are those which are Land outside the urban growth boundary and are that is either:

(a) Non-urban agricultural, forest or open space lands or,

(b) Other lands suitable for sparse settlement, small farms or acreage homesites with no or hardly any minimal public services, and which that are not suitable, necessary or intended for urban use, or.

(c) Land in rural unincorporated communities.

* Note: The Goal Definitions are not included in Goal 14, but they are adopted as part of the statewide planning goals and guidelines and provide definitions for terms used in the goals.

197.