

Urban Natural Resources and Emergency Management Large Lever Shareholder Meeting Round 2

November 15, 2018

Room 402, Lane Community College Downtown

10 AM - Noon

In Attendance: Dustin Bengtson, Army Corp of Engineers; Karl Morgenstein, EWEB; Matt Rodrigues, City of Eugene; Dan Hurley, Lane County; Therese Walch, City of Eugene; Sharon Olson, City of Eugene; Josh Newman, City of Springfield; Eli Davis, PeaceHealth; Jeannine Parisi, EWEB; Ian Appow, City of Eugene

Climate Action Plan 2.0 Project Team: Chelsea Clinton, City of Eugene; Mark Nystrom, City of Eugene; Joshua Proudfoot, Good Company

Welcome, Introductions

Chelsea Clinton called the meeting to order and made opening remarks about the agenda and the program overall.

Chelsea provided background information about the CAP2.0 Plan. Please see the PowerPoint Presentation that is available on the CAP2.0 Webpage for more details on this project.

Then introductions were made.

Mitigation Analysis: Process, Results, and Questions

Josh Proudfoot, Good Company, presented the Mitigation Analysis Draft Results. To get more details on these results, please see the following documents available on the CAP2.0 Webpage. It was later noted that there was some “version control” and that an updated Mitigation Analysis Draft Report would be available. The updated version is the one currently (November 2018) available on the webpage.

1. The LLS Round 2 PowerPoint Presentation
2. The Eugene Community Climate Action Plan 2.0 Draft Mitigation Results

It was later noted that there was some “version control” and that an updated Mitigation Analysis Draft Report would be available. The updated version is the one currently (November 2018) available on the webpage.

Clarification was requested regarding the mitigation data on whether it City emissions, or community.—its community.

It was then asked if the 2010 emissions are considered accurate. Josh Proudfoot said we have high confidence in the data.

Questions were asked about population growth and geographic boundaries. The growth is based on PSU’s Population Center and the boundaries are the City of Eugene’s city limits. It was also suggested the team look at the Willamette 2100 (out of OSU) population estimates.

There were a few more questions about what actions were scaled and Good Company and City staff encouraged the LLS members to refer to the meeting materials and contribute more actions if they felt some were missing.

Break

Review Expected Conditions in Eugene and Large Lever Shareholder Actions

Dustin Bengtson, US Army Corp of Engineers, discussed the 13 dams in the Willamette Project and flood risk management. The Corpuses adaptive management of water flows in the Willamette Valley. The Corp has to manage the water flows for a wide variety of purposes. While safety is an important concern there are many other water quality issues. The Corp is looking at adaptive management due to Climate Change impacts such as cyanobacteria and nutrient loading due to increased fires.

There was a discussion about flow management. One of the biggest factors in the downstream flow is the number of listed species in the basin. A question was asked about how the Corp coordinates with other agencies that have their own regulations. Dustin said the other agencies get involved when there are deficit years but during normal years other agencies know what the Corp is doing.

Josh asked about additional storage due to the loss of snowpack. Dustin suggested that we read the [Willamette 2100](#) study from OSU. He also stated that most of the storage comes from spring rain, rather than snowpack. However, the idea of building new storage is beyond his job description. There may be changes due to risk mitigation but that would be a big decision and a big project. Fish passage is the biggest concern so adding storage could be problematic.

Josh also asked about climate change impacts on the endangered species act but we ran out of time before we were able to discuss it.

Josh Proudfoot reviewed the future conditions and adaptation information. Please refer to the PowerPoint presentation for details.

Equity Panel and Public Outreach

Chelsea asked the LLS Shareholders to review the HIP and TBL actions attributed to their actions to see if they are complete and if anything needs to be added or removed. A few comments were added:

- The FEMA Biological Opinion regarding development in the flood plains. The “BiOp” will have impacts regarding future planning in the Eugene area.
- The Eugene/Springfield Natural Hazzard Mitigation Plan should be included in the CAP2.0 analysis.

Josh asked about the level of coordination between emergency management agencies. Matt stated that there probably could be better coordination but simply holding another meeting is probably not the best answer. The organizations need more space to explore how to better coordination. Josh followed up with a question regarding emergency management and climate change and Matt suggested that the climate change information should be injected into the existing meeting structures (rather than another standalone meeting) due to lack of staff capacity.

It was suggested that there should be more information regarding the City of Eugene’s green infrastructure plans in the CAP2.0 Analysis. GoodCompany agreed to scale any information provided.

Chelsea Clinton discussed the Equity Panel. The City uses a Social Equity Lens for all the processes that it does. The PowerPoint presentation outlines the guiding questions. Chelsea also if there are outreach questions.

Closing Thoughts

Chelsea asked the group for any closing thoughts or questions:

- The connections between flood plains, climate change, and urban forests are important. Communicating with the community regarding the value of trees rather than just the property value of their homes.
- The data is daunting but encouraged that our organizations are aligning. It's difficult to translate the work that EWEB is doing to actual behavioral change. What is the general public willing to do to adapt but the people who show up to meetings are the ones who are already willing to change.
- How do we use this information to inform both policy managers and the public? We need to go to the public where they are at and ask them what are your needs in the context of the problem?
- What does the public know, what they need?
- It was enlightening to find out that the City of Eugene is responsible for less than 1% of the emissions.
- The team should not use lingo when we are reaching out to the public. A Spark presentation may be helpful.
- The team should try to understand what each of these HIPS/TBLs mean to the equity panel.
- The team should try to tie into a regional network to scale up our actions.

Meeting Adjourned