

CLIMATE MITIGATION AND GHG EMISSIONS DATA BUDGET NOTE RESPONSE

Date: 12/23/19
Department: COO & Research Center
Meeting Date: 1/7/20

Prepared & Presented by:
Aaron Breakstone x1823,
Sasha Pollack x6907
Length: 45 Min

ISSUE STATEMENT

Staff is reporting back to Council on proposals crafted in response to two FY20 budget notes introduced by Councilor Gonzalez:

- Note #3: Create a coordinated, regional strategy to mitigate climate change
The budget note directs staff to develop a work plan and identify employee capacity needed to create a coordinated, regional strategy to mitigate climate change, including but not limited to:
 - Create an inventory of current climate change mitigation work being done both at Metro and at partner jurisdictions
 - Evaluate opportunities for new climate mitigation work through Metro's external-facing programs
 - Work with local jurisdictions to determine their climate needs and identify ways in which Metro can support their work
 - Develop multi-jurisdictional benchmarks for greenhouse gas reduction in key timelines (e.g. 2030, 2050) and a regional strategies and a roadmap to meet those goals
 - Identify regional climate goals for the impacts of Metro's external-facing work and what progress looks like for Metro
 - Effectively communicate our strategy and our successes.
- Note #5: Ensure Metro has access to the best data on greenhouse gas emissions in Greater Portland
Council directs the Chief Operating Officer, in coordination with the Research Center to
 - Analyze the agency's data needs for inventorying the region's greenhouse gas emissions using both a sector-based inventory and a consumption-based inventory and
 - To create a proposal to address those data needs that identifies a variety of approaches and the costs associated with each approach.

ACTION REQUESTED

Staff is sharing resource estimates associated with these proposals for consideration of inclusion in the FY 20-21 budget.

IDENTIFIED POLICY OUTCOMES

One of the six desired outcomes for the region envisions that "the region is a leader on climate change, on minimizing contributions to global warming." Establishing a regional climate change mitigation strategy and an accompanying greenhouse gas emissions inventory data program to support it would amount to critical steps toward this desired outcome.

POLICY QUESTION(S)

What additional information does Council need in order to discuss climate mitigation and GHG data funding in the upcoming budget conversation?

POLICY OPTIONS FOR COUNCIL TO CONSIDER

Each of the two proposals is structured in the form of three alternatives. Climate Mitigation options are outlined in the table below and show which of the outcomes from the budget note would be achieved by option A, B and C. GHG Emissions Data is described with a narrative description of the three options.

Regional Climate Mitigation Strategy

Outcome	Already Achieved	A “Communication and Coordination”	B “Expanded Regional Effort”	C “Regional Climate Framework
Create an inventory of current climate change mitigation work being done both at Metro and at partner jurisdictions	X	X	X	X
Evaluate opportunities for new climate mitigation work through Metro’s external-facing programs		X	X	X
Work with local jurisdictions to determine their climate needs and identify ways in which Metro can support their work			X	X
Develop multi-jurisdictional benchmarks for greenhouse gas reduction in key timelines (e.g. 2030, 2050) and a regional strategies and a roadmap to meet those goals			Can do this <i>OR</i> regional goals	X
Identify regional climate goals for the impacts of Metro’s external-facing work and what progress looks like for Metro			Can do this <i>OR</i> regional benchmarks	X
Effectively communicate our strategy and our successes.		Additional communication will occur, may not be fully effective.	X	X
Pros		No new ongoing funds needed, closely connected to the newly created Resiliency program	Dedicated ongoing funding for a focused climate coordinator, some capacity to connect and build on internal Metro climate work and connect with partners to support their work	Would allow significant coordination not only within Metro but with our local, regional and state partners with the goal of creating and implementing a regional climate framework in the next five years
Cons		No new climate mitigation work or coordination with partners, will not be seen as meaningful by climate activists, could be seen as detrimental if it relieved pressure to accomplish new work.	Does not allow for strategic long term coordination that would lead to meaningful regional goals or strategy implementation.	Requires significant new and ongoing investments that would potentially take away from other Metro priorities.
Total FY 20-21 costs		\$70,000	\$340,879	\$504,564
Total Ongoing Spending		0	\$150,879	\$269,564

Greenhouse gas emissions data response:

1. Basic Option: The basic option would satisfy the requirements of the budget note and establish a robust GHG emissions inventory data program. It would entail the development of a new sector-based inventory by Metro staff that is compliant with either the US Community or GPC protocol. Given that the protocols are very similar and further deliberation is required, the choice of the preferred protocol does not impact the estimated level of effort and it is assumed that this decision would occur during development of the work plan. With respect to the consumption-based inventory, this alternative assumes the continuation of the arrangement that produced the baseline inventory for the 2030 Regional Waste Plan, whereby Metro staff compile input data and DEQ staff adapt the statewide inventory tool to the tri-county area.
 - Pro: quick start-up
 - Con: limited outward-facing technical support and coordination
2. Expanded Option: The expanded option would supplement the basic option with additional resources designed to produce a more durable program with farther reach. It assumes additional staff capacity for outward-facing technical support and coordination to assist partner jurisdictions with conducting and interpreting results of their own inventories. Additionally, the expanded option would include staff time to pursue formalization of the relationship with DEQ pertaining to the consumption-based inventory in the form of a memorandum of understanding (MOU) or an intergovernmental agreement (IGA). Furthermore, this alternative would allocate resources to enable exploration of advanced topics such as forecasting and the potential applicability of emerging data sources such as direct measurement of emissions using mobile sensors.
 - Pro: durable, demonstrates long-term commitment, engages partners
 - Con: greater burden to understand and explain multiple inventories
3. Consultant-led Option: The consultant-led option would rely on a consultant with subject matter expertise to conduct the majority of the technical work necessary to produce the sector- and consumption-based inventories. The consultant would develop the necessary software tools to calculate the inventories as well as preparing materials to present results. The consultant-led option would assume the same level of investment in staff knowledge building as the basic option and the same level of investment in technical support to local partners as the expanded option.
 - Pro: leverages existing expertise, allows Metro to focus on regional support
 - Con: less technical involvement, potential for Metro appearing less engaged

RECOMMENDATIONS

Within the regional climate change mitigation strategy proposal, to achieve all the goals of the Budget note, Council would need to adopt **Option C, “Regional Climate Framework”**, however, this option would require significant realignment of resources and potentially an abandoning of other council priorities.

Within the greenhouse gas emissions data proposal, the staff recommendation is the **Expanded Option**. This alternative is preferred by staff for its durability, its demonstration of a long-term agency commitment to supporting climate policy with solid analytics, and its commitment to engagement directed at partner agencies.

STRATEGIC CONTEXT & FRAMING COUNCIL DISCUSSION

This presentation directly responds to a Budget Note approved by council and proposes budget increases to expand and coordinate Metro’s climate mitigation and GHG emissions data work.

If council approved the above approaches the new cost would be as follows for new FTE and M&S (from various funding sources):

Climate Mitigation –

- \$504,564 for the 20-21 Budget year
- \$269,564 ongoing

GHG Data -

- \$300,000 for the 20-21 Budget year
- \$150,000 ongoing

Legal Antecedent:

- Metro Resolution 08-3971, “For the Purpose of Designating a Council Project and Lead Councilor for the Climate Change Action Plan,” adopted on August 21, 2008.
- Metro Resolution 08-3940, “For the Purpose of Affirming a Definition of a “Successful Region” and Committing Metro to Work with Regional Partners to Identify Performance Indicators and Targets and to Develop a Decision-Making Process to Create Successful Communities,” adopted on June 26, 2008.
- Established State GHG emissions targets Oregon HB 3543(2007)

BACKGROUND

Our region is calling for greater leadership on climate mitigation. Although Metro has adopted a climate goal for internal operations, incorporated climate leadership into its six desired outcomes, and implemented climate criteria into policies and programs across departments, it is clear that Metro has an opportunity to take the next step for climate action and catalyze a coordinated regional strategy. Investing in a coordinated climate mitigation program and an expanded GHG data program will help to do just that. Over the past 6 months staff have worked to respond to Council’s request to expand Metro’s work in these areas for consideration during budget negotiations.

ATTACHMENTS

Climate Mitigation

- Budget Note Response Form
- Metro Current Climate Work
- Metro Current Allocated Resources Memo

GHG Emissions Data

- Budget Note Response Form
- GHG Data Budget Note Supplemental Memo

- Is legislation required for Council action? ☐ Yes ☒ No