

# **GHG Emissions Data Budget Note Response: Council Report Back**

January 7, 2020

# Key Directives

Regional GHG emissions inventory data program

Regular updates

Sector-based and consumption-based inventories

# Why 2 inventory types?

Sector-based is informative, established, intuitive, easily aggregated, but...

A large share of “our” GHG emissions are indirect and occur elsewhere

→ *also need consumption-based*

More complete understanding of region’s contribution to climate change

→ *more opportunities for action*

# Guiding Principles

1. Serve current/programmed Metro GHG emissions estimation needs
2. Maximize alignment with GHG emissions estimation activities at partner agencies
3. Ensure validity of methods

# Proposal Features

3 alternatives: basic, expanded, consultant-led. All...

- Are tri-county in scope
- Supply *both* sector-based and consumption-based inventories
- Comply with either US Community or GPC protocols

# Anticipated Beneficiaries

Regional Mitigation Strategy

Regional Transportation Plan

Regional Waste Plan

Regional Barometer

Local partners

# Basic Option

Sector-based inventory: Metro staff,  
annual updates

Consumption-based inventory: DEQ staff,  
3-year updates

Provides internal technical support

Makes data available via By the Numbers  
and/or RLIS

Includes start-up consultant assistance

# Basic Option

## Benefits

- Aligns with state methodologies
- Quick start-up

## Risks

- Relies on DEQ goodwill for consumption-based inventory
- Potential staff turnover
- Lack of regional coordination



# Expanded Option

*Recommended by staff; part of FY20-21  
RC data program proposal*

Builds on Basic, increases staff expertise

Adds capacity for outward-facing  
technical support and coordination

Formalizes arrangement with DEQ

Explores advanced topics

→ forecasting, emerging data sources

# Expanded Option

## Benefits

- More durable than Basic
- Demonstrates long-term commitment
- Engages partner jurisdictions

## Risks

- Potential staff turnover
- Potential for conflicting numbers

# Consultant-led Option

Consultant does majority of strategic/technical work

Assumes levels of staff expertise and external support/coordination capacity similar to Expanded option

# Consultant-led Option

## Benefits

- Leverages consultant expertise
- Allows Metro staff to focus on regional coordination and support

## Risks

- Metro less involved in technical details than in Basic and Expanded
- Potential for appearing less engaged
- Higher ongoing costs

# Resource Estimates

|                   |          | Basic     | Expanded  | Consultant-led |
|-------------------|----------|-----------|-----------|----------------|
| <b>FTE</b>        | One-time | 1.0       | 1.5       | 1.0            |
|                   | Ongoing  | 0.5       | 0.75      | 0.75           |
| <b>M&amp;S</b>    | One-time | \$22,500  | \$22,500  | \$35,000       |
|                   | Ongoing  | \$2,500   | \$2,500   | \$25,000       |
| <b>Total Cost</b> | One-time | \$222,500 | \$322,500 | \$235,000      |
|                   | Ongoing  | \$102,500 | \$152,500 | \$175,000      |

\* Estimates include 25% contingency

**oregonmetro.gov**



# Discussion / Questions

- Questions?
- Beyond existing efforts, what role should Metro play on Climate Mitigation in the region?
- What else do you need to inform your budget discussion?

# Outreach

- Oregon DEQ
- Oregon DOE
- Oregon DOT
- City of Portland BPS
- US EPA
- Good Company
- Metro



# Research

- Oregon DEQ statewide sector-based and consumption-based inventory report and appendices (May 2018)
- City of Portland BPS Multnomah County inventory report (Sept. 2019)
- Metro 2010 inventory materials
- U.S. Community Protocol (July 2019)
- GPC (Dec. 2014)

## Comparison of Oregon's 2015 sector- and consumption-based greenhouse gas emissions



Source: DEQ, May 2018