

Mayor's Climate Recovery Ordinance Ad Hoc Work Group

Self-Introductions and Opening Remarks

The Mayor's Climate Recovery Ordinance Ad Hoc Work Group met on February 12, 2020. The first order of business was to do self-introductions. Mayor Vinis then made opening remarks.

Process: Sharing Worst Outcomes

Next participants were asked to share their worst possible outcome of the process. These were recorded on small cards and shared with the rest of the Work Group.

Name	Comment
Councilor Semple	Big fights. No progress. End of Earth.
Councilor Zelenka	Bogged down in the details trying to rewrite the plan and don't come up with a plan.
Dan Hurley	That we will reopen the plan for major revisions and spend years in process before measurable actions are taken.
Daniel Borson	Good ideas get shot down by nay-sayers and we don't think creatively.
Eliza Kashinsky	Months go by where we talk about what we need to do and we don't end up with a plan that we can actually implement that achieves the goals.
Eugene Organ	Develop a plan that doesn't meet the needs of people with disabilities and of low-income populations.
Ingrid Kessler	Plan: Take no further action whatsoever. Group: Advocate only for our own point of view without truly hearing others.
Jon Kloor	CAP is adopted as is. No changes made.
Joshua Skov	CAP2.0 doesn't get more concrete; No additional resources or buy-in; no additional momentum or enthusiasm; process degenerates into a seething puddle of acrimony and frustration
Kaarin Knudson	Process without responsibilities to follow through on difficult actions; Don't address integrated nature of climate action.
Kelly Hoell	City of Eugene's emissions stay stagnant or go up. Today: People leave angry and the folks in the community who care about climate change splinter into different factions leading to the City emissions staying stagnant or going up.
Kristie Hammitt	1. Unable to come together and hear and learn from each other. No fun. People don't feel safe. CAP2.0 doesn't identify plan improvements.
Lex Worden	There is no way to hold the City or third parties responsible to the plan, the plan is a way for city to feed good about its effort without a way to track and hold itself accountable. I also worry that this plan will not focus enough on issues of equity. Social justice and climate justice are inseparable.
Linda Heyl	Process descends into chaos and work doesn't get done. No completed CAP results.
Matt McRae	Three months and additional resources used and ending with a plan that is too ambiguous to be implemented.

Matt Rodrigues	That lack of consensus will delay meaningful action and foster division.
Matt Schroettnig	Goals that build to ? The impacts (unintended) of success, and goals that don't bring with them the resources necessary for success.
Mayor Lucy Vinis	Fail to agree on a plan forward.
Pablo Alvarez	Not meeting the CRO goal, or meeting it only in theory not practice and having a large group of people even more frustrated with the public process than they already are - disenfranchised people are unempowered people. An unempowered public is one that succumbs to fear.
Sarah Medary	We try to make it perfect, take too much time and don't get to action. Work that requires us to pull together to make true impacts, pulls us apart.
Tiffany Edwards	Inability to work together collaboratively resulting in no action and further frustration. Having a community completely divided and unable to see or respect one another's perspectives.
Zach Mulholland	Pass a plan with no actual policies /funding changes put in the place. For this process: talk and not actually change anything.

Process: Sharing Best Outcomes

The participants were then asked to record and share their best possible outcomes of this process.

Name	Comment
Councilor Semple	Everyone listens. We find innovative ideas leading to an exciting, inclusive, compelling plan. Earth is saved.
Councilor Zelenka	Agreement on what should be included in the plan and that the plan meets our ghg reduction goals with real quantifiable actions.
Dan Hurley	An actionable plan with broad community support that rapidly reduces our emissions and serves as a model for other communities.
Daniel Borson	We have a climate plan that is effective, equitable, actionable, and there is commitment to fund all of the city-wide measures in the plan. Eugene becomes a truly sustainable city for generations to come.
Eliza Kashinsky	Equitable and effective plan that is then followed up on with funding, policy, and that achieves goals. It's flexible enough that it can change if its not achieving the outcomes.
Eugene Organ	A plan that is equitable and understood by residents of Eugene and is agreed to by residents.
Ingrid Kessler	We are ready to implement clear measurable steps to achieve our goals and that we have agreed on specific steps to put our plan in action.
Jon Kloor	Community goals achieved (50% reduction of fossil fuels by 2030 and 7.6% annual ghg reduction) through voluntary actions ultimately creating a model for other cities to follow.

Joshua Skov	Consistent with 1.5 degree warming; -focus on key action areas where City has levers (policy, investment); -make climate justice/equity and climate action one and same; - as a group, give clear guidance to Council and Exec staff to inform policy and investment.
Kaarin Knudson	Process leads to collective sense of the benefit of action and the will to follow through with action. Climate responsiveness is integrated in every policy conversation and informs those decision continually. WE see and benefit from our investment in program and feel proud.
Kelly Hoell	Minimize suffering. We see each other as teammates. We find many ways to work together to achieve the emission reduction levels science says we need while improving health and quality of life for all in the process.
Kristie Hammitt	Efficient, inclusive, process that builds trust and confidence in commitment to implement identified actions and achievable goals.
Lex Worden	The plan is able to have measurable and transparent points of accountability. The plan recognizes that social equity is inseparable from climate justice. The plan ensures the involvement and support of disenfranchised groups such as the Kalapuya Ilini tribe, the homeless communities, and the black and brown communities of Eugene.
Linda Heyl	We get clarity about how the work will get done and form subgroups to work between now and the next meeting on sections of the plan so that we have a stronger draft to react to and perfect, coming into the next meeting.
Matt McRae	This group works together to provide clear and actionable input that results in an actionable plan that helps us. Improve social equity while radically reducing greenhouse gas emissions.
Matt Rodrigues	The process brings us together is implementable and integrates social justice and advances our broader community goals.
Matt Schroettinig	Plan goals that are achievable and promote better individual and large lever shareholder accountability, while working to integrate the impacts of climate change on our many communities.
Mayor Lucy Vinis	We agree on specific improvements to the plan that hold us all accountable to achieve measurable outcomes and meaningful public engagement, that we are united in the sense of purpose in the work ahead.
Pablo Alvarez	That we surpass the CRO goals and that instead of focusing on resource allocation to minimize suffering, we can in turn focus on the maximization of thriving communities.
Sarah Medary	You feel good about the plan, can support it, and line up at public forum and say yes, let's get going. You each feel seen, valued and heard thru the process. We build trust.
Tiffany Edwards	A thorough and mutual understanding of the full scope of the issue, its impacts, and implications; and complete alignment on a solution that leads to meaningful action.

Zach Mulholland	Adopt a climate action plan that meets the City's ghg reduction goals that has broad community awareness and support.
-----------------	---

Staff Presentations: Process and Content Overview

Jason Dedrick gave an overview of the CAP2.0 process and answered questions. Chelsea Clinton provided an overview of the CAP2.0 including the process of developing the CAP2.0, the forecast for carbon emissions in 2030, and the Additional Actions the City of Eugene is doing to narrow that gap. She answered questions from the Work Group as well.

Small Group Discussions and Work Group Themes

The Ad Hoc work group then formed four break-out groups that held facilitated discussion. Each group were presented with the questions what things do you like about the plan? And are there any components of the plan that are missing or should be changed? *(Comments organized by group can be found in the appendix of this document.)*

What do you like about the Plan?

Clear and accessible. Good education material.

- Clear metrics and images
- Accessible language (to some groups). It was not technical enough for some.
- Balanced use of texts and images
- Good non-technical language
- Easy to read/accessible
 - Spanish?
 - Provide links to weeds
- Explaining complex concepts in an accessible way
- Easy to look at graphic layout
- Good content, appreciate the work
 - High level community education
 - How are we going to meet the CRO goals
- Graphics – useful for education material

Equity Actions

- List of equity actions
 - Want them to be funded and staffed
- Equity piece
- Equity being considered
- Recognition of historically underserved
- Equity panel and incorporation of equity aspects

Realistic actions

- Like that the sector-based is realistic*
- Control vs influence
- Actions are things people or organizations said they would do

- Trying to be realistic
- Attainable goals – implement

Data/Graphs

- Quantification of gap
- Waterfall graph and explanation
- Actions based on solid data/research

Stakeholder Involvement

- Stakeholder involvement and equity considerations
- Inclusive plan development process

Consumption-based Accounting

- Like consumption based-accounting. Raises awareness. (But not doing anything)
- Using consumption-based inventory and approach

Other Comments

- Climate adaptation/resilience components
- Good baseline based on voluntary contributions by large lever shareholders
- Useful public education
- City could with partners, 10-year plan to help people transitioning
- Breadth of strategies
- List of 12 additional strategies
 - Want them to be funded and staffed
 - Some need equity considerations
- Attempt is comprehensive
 - Focus on TBL
 - Equity is being considered
 - Sections on how to adapt and education
- 3-bucket approach could be made to work
- Good starting point

What would you change or add to the Plan?

The plan needs more detail.

- The current draft looks more like a set of strategies than an action plan. It requires people to read the appendices to understand some of the specifics included in the plan. Thus, the language of the current draft is very accessible to most but does not provide the depth of information people with more technical knowledge would like to find in an action plan.
- The plan should explain the assumptions behind each strategy. This will provide clarity and avoid the perception of “greenwashing” language and imagery.
- Not enough focus on ‘How and why’,
- List of programs and policies needed to reach over-arching goals
 - Goals for each sector
 - Then add targets (e.g. how many EV’s each year)

- Each sector has targets and plans to reach
- Orange bar needs an action plan
- Add McKenzie Curve
- Actions lack specificity (timeline, resources, sub targets, tracking progress, how do we know if we succeed?)
- Not clear whether actions will be described further in implementation plan
- Incorporate clear timelines for plan and specific actions (e.g. TSP, etc.)
- Integrate Equity Panel recommendations into CAP and other City work/not clear how these are used
- Lots of good education, but detail/tech in nature, use, and tools
- Beef up tool, details in plan
- Large omissions – lots
- Have the team/group be able to detail the omissions/ have the opportunity to
- No objectives, timelines, metrics for evaluation, success, accountability/responsible people (e.g. standard pieces of project management)
- Education material – should be more detailed
- Implementation planning, not addressed
- The plan should accommodate expected changes at the state and federal levels (regulations, programs, etc.)
- Implementation timelines and cost estimates should be provided for each action/strategy.
- Consumption based emissions goal left out

Additional Topics to Include

- Lacks small actions individual community members can make
- No guidance for how large membership groups can engage their members
- Need to include consumption-based
- Need to incorporate additional strategies that impact consumption/affect behavior
- Does not address the need for behavioral change
- Communications/education plan

Prioritization

- Going to need to prioritize
- Need focus/clarity about what actions to do
- Prioritization
- Big goals – but how take incremental steps to get there

Integrate the CRO Internally at the City and Through Other Work Community-Wide

- Help connect the dots between various moving parts/components of CRO implementation
- City can mandate how it acts internally
- Have city staff be more integrated
- In level of COE organization for everyday work if all staff
 - COE staff /internal work (e.g. COE fleet)
 - External community work

Plan Shows a Path to fully meet the CRO

- Plan doesn't fully meet the CRO goals (needs to)

- List everything that needs to be done
 - Could empower the community
- Strategies need to reach CRO goals are not in the plan
- No goals are aspirational (wrong to avoid) definitive goals are necessary, start here then how get there

Funding Strategy

- Funding mechanisms need to be identified
- Get actions to cost portion then invest accordingly
 - Least cost planning, taking co-benefits into account
 - Need to overlay equity and cost/benefit
- Need to be able to identify new strategies to fund
- Revenue tool – not only greenwashing
- Local investment funds
- Be able to get more ‘bang for buck’
- Most reduction for investments
- Budget priorities
- Climate versus homeless – doesn’t have to be one or the other
 - E.g. pg 27 address housing
- No budget – not addressed

Accountability /Metrics

- The plan lacks enforcement and accountability details. The group would like to see more specifics on how the strategies and actions will be accomplished.
- More accountability for large lever shareholders and their actions
- How lacking success will be measured (metrics)
- Ask partners to do the same tracking/metrics+ info as City
- No mechanism to hold large lever shareholders accountable for implementation
- No mechanism to enforce subplans are working/implemented
- Feedback loop – reports, dashboard – for community
- NO sense of how actionable/reasonable components of the plan are (subplans)

Stronger Connection to Housing, TSP

- It should be explained how the plan aligns with Envision Eugene (High-density housing along transit corridors).
- Not all the possible City levers are included (Zoning)
- TSP implementation not sufficient- bike/ped master plan should support broader transition
- Housing – underdiscussed because it is such a big part
- Misses opportunity to capture diverse housing in the plan, like alternative, small homes (HB 2001)
- Inter-related considerations – bring it all together
 - E.g. more population, transportation
- Look at holistically – e.g. what it takes to run a city
- State laws changed around housing

Process Concerns

- It would be good to wait for TSP and NWN process to be finished, so they can be included in the plan. This will avoid the use of general language and estimates about the benefits of those two processes.
- The iterative process for the adoption of the plan should be made more explicit.
- Commit to how often plan will be revisited/revise
- Ability to adjust (staff expertise) as science evolves
- Next steps are not clear/no new actions that we are not already doing
- Not a stretch plan/reiterates what we are already doing
- The 12 additional strategies are not yet in the plan
- Disappointing in lack of consideration of offsets, invest in, have ability to invest in offsets, efficiency investments
- Northwest Natural Smart Energy – look at carefully, not definitive carbon reduction

Community Engagement Concerns

- Make the community engagement process more explicit. One person questioned if equity panel included people with lived experiences versus White people representing marginalized groups.
- Engagement Plan
- Get Equity woven into the prioritization (+ climate) of all city actions
 - how will bodies like planning commission factor this into decisions
- Be clear how we want the community to engage in CAP2.0
 - Provide seamless ways for the community to engage/participate in CRO implementation plan
 - Ways to engage that work for different part of community
 - Community education component
- How do we get the community aware about the plan and involved in its implementation?
 - Consider revisiting ideas from original ad hoc group
- Get the public outreach needed to help council make informed decisions
 - Cost/ton
 - Scale of actions
 - Tech feasibility

Resiliency

- Lacks a resiliency plan
 - Vulnerable populations
- Adaption strategy
 - Add rooftop/rain capture (add to plan)
 - De-central measures,
 - Community/backyard food production

ECC Commitment, Integration

- The commitment of ECC organizations should be made more explicit and detailed.
- Large Lever shareholders were not asked for stretch plan – what other actions would they take?
- It should be made clear the spheres of action (City, ECC, Community)

Small Group Reporting and Next Steps

The small group facilitators shared a brief overview of the small group discussions. City staff then reported that these notes would be delivered and next-steps would be shared in the coming weeks. The meeting was then adjourned.

Appendix 1: Small Group Discussions Notes

Participants were broken into four small groups and had facilitated discussions about the positive aspects of the existing CAP2.0 document and the improvements that are needed. The participants were given color codes, and each had their own facilitator. The notes from each group are summarized below with the facilitator in parenthesis.

Red Group (Fabio)

Positives:

- Clear metrics and images
- Accessible language (to some groups). It was seen as not technical enough for some. See below
- Breadth of strategies
- Stakeholder involvement and equity considerations
- Balanced use of texts and images
- Good starting point
- Good non-technical language
- Breadth of strategies

Improvements needed:

- The current draft looks more like a set of strategies than an action plan. It requires people to read the appendices to understand some of the specifics included in the plan. Thus, the language of the current draft is very accessible to most, but does not provide the depth of information people with more technical knowledge would like to find in an action plan.
- It should be made clear the spheres of action (City, ECC, Community)
- The plan lacks enforcement and accountability details. The group would like to see more specifics on how the strategies and actions will be accomplished.
- The iterative process for the adoption of the plan should be made more explicit.
- The commitment of ECC organizations should be made more explicit and detailed.
- Implementation timelines and cost estimates should be provided for each action/strategy.
- It should be explained how the plan aligns with Envision Eugene (High-density housing along transit corridors).
- It would be good to wait for TSP and NWN process to be finished, so they can be included in the plan. This will avoid the use of general language and estimates about the benefits of those two processes.
- The plan should explain the assumptions behind each strategy. This will provide clarity and avoid the perception of “greenwashing” language and imagery.
- The plan should accommodate expected changes at the state and federal levels (regulations, programs, etc.)
- Make the community engagement process more explicit. One person questioned if equity panel included people with lived experiences versus White people representing marginalized groups.

Black Group (Jason)

Positives

- Like consumption based-accounting. Raises awareness. (But not doing anything)
- Like that the sector-based is realistic*
- Control vs influence
- List of 12 additional strategies
 - Want them to be funded and staffed
 - Some need equity considerations
- List of equity actions
 - Want them to be funded and staffed
- Actions are things people or organizations said they would do
- Quantification of gap
- Easy to read/accessible
 - Spanish?
 - Provide links to weeds
- Waterfall graph and explanation

Improvements needed:

- Lacks small actions individual community members can make
- No guidance for how large membership groups can engage their members
- Engagement Plan
- Not all the possible City levers are included (Zoning)
- List of programs and policies needed to reach over-arching goals
 - Goals for each sector
 - Then add targets (e.g. how many EV's each year)
 - Each sector has targets and plans to reach
- Funding mechanisms need to be identified
- Get actions to cost portion then invest accordingly
 - Least cost planning, taking co-benefits into account
 - Need to overlay equity and cost/benefit
- Get Equity woven into the prioritization (+ climate) of all city actions
 - how will bodies like planning commission factor this into decisions
- Lacks a resiliency plan
 - Vulnerable populations
- Plan doesn't fully meet the CRO goals (needs to)
- More accountability for large lever shareholders and their actions
- List everything that needs to be done
 - Could empower the community
- Orange bar needs an action plan
- Communications/education plan
- How lacking success will be measured (metrics)
- Need to include consumption-based
- Commit to how often plan will be revisited/revise
- Ability to adjust (staff expertise) as science evolves
- Ask partners to do the same tracking/metrics+ info as City

- Get the public outreach needed to help council make informed decisions
 - Cost/ton
 - Scale of actions
 - Tech feasibility
- Add McKenzie Curve

Yellow Group (Pavel)

Positives:

- Explaining complex concepts in an accessible way
- Climate adaptation/resilience components
- Easy to look at graphic layout
- Actions based on solid data/research
- Good baseline based on voluntary contributions by large lever shareholders
- Inclusive plan development process
- Equity panel and incorporation of equity aspects
- Using consumption-based inventory and approach

Improvements needed:

- Next steps are not clear/no new actions that we are not already doing
- Need to be able to identify new strategies to fund
- Not a stretch plan/reiterates what we are already doing
- The 12 additional strategies are not yet in the plan
- Strategies need to reach CRO goals are not in the plan
- TSP implementation not sufficient- bike/ped master plan should support broader transition
- NO sense of how actionable/reasonable components of the plan are (subplans)
- Does not address the need for behavioral change
- No mechanism to hold large lever shareholders accountable for implementation
- No mechanism to enforce subplans are working/implemented
- Large Lever shareholders were not asked for stretch plan – what other actions would they take?
- Actions lack specificity (timeline, resources, sub targets, tracking progress, how do we know if we succeed?)
- Not clear whether actions will be described further in implementation plan
- Need to incorporate additional strategies that impact consumption/affect behavior
- Integrate Equity Panel recommendations into CAP and other city work/not clear how these are used
- Feedback loop – reports, dashboard – for community
- Incorporate clear timelines for plan and specific actions (e.g. TSP, etc.)
- How do we get the community aware about the plan and involved in its implementation?
 - Consider revisiting ideas from original ad hoc group
- Be clear how we want the community to engage in CAP2.0
 - Provide seamless ways for the community to engage/participate in CRO implementation plan
 - Ways to engage that work for different part of community
 - Community education component

- Help connect the dots between various moving parts/components of CRO implementation

Green Group (Michelle)

Feelings:

- Clarity – about what? Know goal, but how in 10 weeks
- Out time is used well- time is valuable
- Enthusiastic, motivation

Positives:

- Attempt is comprehensive
 - Focus on TBL
 - Equity is being considered
 - Sections on how to adapt and education
- Trying to be realistic
- Attainable goals – implement
- Recognition of historically underserved
- Equity piece
- Equity being considered
- 3-bucket approach could be made to work
- Useful public education
- Graphics – useful for education material
- Good content, appreciate the work
 - High level community education
 - How are we going to meet CRO goals

Improvements needed:

- Consumption based emissions goal left out
- City could work with partners, 10-year plan to help people transitioning
- No goals are aspirational (wrong to avoid) definitive goals are necessary, start here then how get there
- Disappointing in lack of consideration of offsets, invest in, have ability to invest in offsets, efficiency investments
- Revenue tool – not only greenwashing
- Local investment funds
- Adaption strategy
 - Add rooftop/rain capture (add to plan)
 - De-central measures,
 - Community/backyard food production
- Northwest Natural Smart Energy – look at carefully, not definitive carbon reduction
- Not enough focus on 'How and why',
- Lots of good education, but detail/tech in nature, use, and tools
- Beef up tool, details in plan
- Going to need to prioritize
- Be able to get more 'bang for buck'
- Most reduction for investments
- City can mandate how it acts internally
- Budget priorities

- Climate versus homeless – doesn't have to be one or the other
 - E.g. pg 27 address housing
- Have city staff be more integrated
- In level of COE organization for everyday work if all staff
- COE staff /internal work (e.g. COE fleet)
- External community work
- Large omissions – lots
- Have the team/group be able to detail the omissions/have the opportunity to
- No objectives, timelines, metrics for evaluation, success, accountability/responsible people (e.g. standard pieces of project management)
- Education material – should be more detailed
- No budget – not addressed
- Implementation planning, not addressed
- Need focus/clarity about what actions to do
- Prioritization
- Big goals – but how take incremental steps to get there
- Housing – underdiscussed because it is such a big part
- Misses opportunity to capture diverse housing in the plan, like alternative, small homes (HB 2001)
- Inter-related considerations – bring it all together
 - E.g. more population, transportation
- Look at holistically – e.g. what it take to run a city
- State laws changed around housing