

Mayor's CRO Ad Hoc Work Group Meeting Summary Notes

May 12, 2020

1. Agenda Review

Staff reviewed the agenda with the Work Group and discussed how to use Zoom. The Mayor made remarks. No changes were made to the agenda.

2. Review Group Purpose and Process

Staff shared the purpose statement for the group and the progress the group has made.

Purpose Statement:

The Community Climate Action Plan 2.0 (CAP2.0) is Eugene's roadmap to achieving the community climate action goals in the CRO as well as a climate resiliency plan. The purpose of the Mayor's CRO Ad Hoc Work Group is to provide guidance on how to modify the Draft CAP2.0 and to provide input on additional actions to add to the plan to fully meet the CRO goals. The Work Group will provide guidance on the following:

- The high-level topics, or themes, that should guide the document revision process
- Evaluation criteria for additional actions to add to the plan
- Additional actions to add to the CAP2.0 to achieve CRO goals, including some prioritization of the suggested additional actions
- CAP2.0 community engagement process moving forward

Process:

- Feb 12 – Work Group Meeting 1: Listening Session
- Mar 11 – Work Group Meeting 2: Themes + Additional Action Process

3. Preview of CAP2.0 Data

Staff provided a status update on the Triple Bottom Line analysis subgroup and incorporation of 12 themes create at the last meeting of the Mayor's CRO Ad Hoc Work Group. Staff presented data related to the pathway to the CRO, sector based versus consumption-based emissions information, and data visualization tools.

Member Discussion

- Wedge analysis discussion; identifying strategies in the present to achieve CRO goal.
- Concern about not having strategies in place to achieve CRO goal and getting behind in achieving goal years down the road; inquired if figures can show if we are where we need to be in our CRO goals in this moment.
- Discussion about graphs; discussion about carbon offsets and related methods.
- Appreciation for how graphs are laid out; 2030 goals and reductions still needed; concerns about NW Natural Gas franchise agreement and community vision next steps.

- NW Natural gas negotiations and expectation of reductions from negotiations; ad hoc member responsibility within workgroup and larger picture of that work within framework.
- Assigning responsibility to actions and reductions that remain unfinished/unmet.
- CAP 2.0 intended to spell out what is necessary and needed to reach CRO goals rather than forecast of actions and goals; does city's mission aligns with the goals and how gap will be addressed.
- Include historic emissions from 2010-2-17 for context; history of fossil fuel goals over last 12 years, current progress and lessons to be learned; Oregon's consumption based emissions increasing, actions addressing these should be prominent in plan; emission cuts over time will become more difficult as we get closer to CRO goals.
- Will 26 bundled actions allow us to hit reduction goals; turn thermometer upside down.
- Appreciation for tradeoffs discussed by Councilor Zelenka and Mayor Vinis; breaking out actions by similar scale and tradeoffs would be nice to have in CAP 2.0.
- Clarity sought by members may not be possible, re: IPCC gap strategy "technology to come".
- Need balance between modeling actions and filling in gaps with new technology.
- Consumption based emissions needs to be as clearly laid out for the public as sector-based emissions.

4. Break

5. Discuss Evaluation of Ideas for New Actions for the CAP2.0

Staff discussed homework assigned to ad hoc members to rank additional actions provided by the community from the recent Engage Eugene Survey, and challenges to completing the Additional Ranking Survey before the Ad Hoc Work Group Meeting. Staff addressed concerns about non-response bias and appreciation for Ad Hoc member participation in the discussion. Staff responded to questions from members related to the discussion. Mayor Vinis discussed thoughts about member thoughts and concerns related to action ranking.

Member Discussion: Each member was provided opportunity to speak about their personal challenges doing homework, or reasons for not completing the homework.

- Information was too much; not comfortable assigning a rank or number out of respect to community members.
- Bundles are already in CAP 2.0 (actions contributed are already actions in CAP 2.0); afraid to reprioritize actions already prioritized.
- Amount of data was daunting and needed more time; didn't like the format.
- Expressed trust for staff to move new actions forward; agreed that is easy to unintentionally elevate one item over another when important.
- Did not allocate time to complete in time; agreed that ranking doesn't weigh as heavily as getting as much done as possible.
- Felt conflicted about process trying to rank actions; conceptualized tasks in two ways: scaled ranking by "biggest impact, mid-range impact, too-difficult-for-city-to-take-

leadership-on” but no sense of scale for achievability of some actions; concerns around feasibility of some actions; struggled using rubric.

- Had overlooked member survey completion; wanted more information and conversation with others about actions before ranking them.
- Expressed conflict with ranking bundles and adding bundles; reiterated comments made by others about difficulty to rank actions already represented in CAP 2.0 compared to those that are new; wants to prioritize actions within the bundles; did not feel input was meaningful.
- Did not see survey in instructions; shared concerns regarding how information about ranking was going to be used and overstepping boundaries as a representative of any agency.
- Missed survey in email; too much information to get through in the time given; trade off of time given to this compared to how input could be used was not best way to spend time for ad hoc members.
- Didn't see survey in email; felt there would be mission drift using the rubric but appreciated the evaluation criteria; used own methods for prioritization.
- A lot of information to go through in a short time frame; echoed comments about conflict with ranking different approaches to engage data and ideas collected from community; need more data about actions before prioritizing.
- Kept in mind work as a representative for an agency while ranking and struggled with high level of actions and lack of data about impacts of actions; spoke to need to engage community to move actions forward.
- Inquired about impacts of prioritizing and ranking.
- Inquired if all bundles could be included; inquired about Ad Hoc member involvement moving forward with individual actions.
- Business owner considerations related to feasibility of enacting all actions; expressed appreciation for prioritization opportunity.
- Spoke to ranking considerations – scale, cost, social equity; need to address ownership of actions moving forward.
- Inquired if action “ownership” would be represented in the future.
- Echoed comments about prioritization and action “ownership”; expressed desire to attach a name for action completion to achieve the action.
- Additional conversation about “ownership” and difference between voluntary ownership and ownership by policy.

6. Q&A with Josh Proudfoot, Good Company

Josh Proudfoot with Good Company addressed thoughts about how to go about ranking additional actions including scale, time feasibility, cost and co-benefits related to social equity, public cost and upcoming technology. Josh addressed challenges tackling consumption-based emissions including issues with addressing behavioral changes and the use of economic development and neighborhood associations to address environmental and cultural changes need to change consumption patterns. Josh addressed questions from Ad Hoc members, below.

Member Questions + Discussion

- Spoke to synergy related to consumption -based emissions and community engagement; spoke about need for a climate advisory board over next 10 years related to community engagement, represented in the CAP 2.0 to help bring down consumption.
- Spoke to previous work related to consumption- based actions.
- Inquired about role of local government to track consumption based inventory as well as city purchasing methods for lower carbon alternatives to high intensity products that the city purchases; spoke about other ways local governments can address environment locally and by state; city promote reuse and manufacturing; city can enable construction of smaller homes.
- Inquired of Josh if building electrification, bikes and EV's are priority.
- Inquired of next steps and how to use Josh's recommendations.

7. Next Steps and Closing

Staff provided information about next steps and dates and addressed next steps with additional action ranking. The CAP 2.0 will be released in early July to give credence to community and give space for staff to incorporate feedback. Staff answered questions from Ad Hoc members. Mayor Vinis made final remarks. Staff expressed appreciation for participation and encouraged Ad Hoc members to send feedback as available.

Member Questions + Discussion:

- Inquired if members can get clarity about how actions are going to be used versus reprioritizing what is already in the plan; doesn't want to rework prioritization without big picture in mind.
- Inquired about when members will get a look at next draft of CAP and if they will receive it before going before council.
- Inquired about how ill additional actions will be incorporated into final document.