

MINUTES FOR THE CLIMATE & ENERGY ACTION PLAN ad hoc COMMITTEE
Wednesday, October 5, 2016
Siskiyou Room, 51 Winburn Way

1. Call to Order

Councilor Rich Rosenthal called the meeting to order at 3:30 p.m.

Committee members Jim Hartman, Roxane Biegel-Coryell, Stuart Green, Isaac Bevers, Greg Jones, Louise Shawkat, Bryan Sohl, Cindy Bernard, and Marni Koopman were present. Staff member Adam Hanks and consultant Jeff Golden were present. Committee members Claudi Alick and James McGinnis arrived late.

2. Around the Room

Group did an around the room team building answering the question, ‘if you had to pick a color to describe the open house what would it be and why?’ In general, the group was concerned with low turnout but pleased with the discussions had by participants.

Claudia Alick arrived 3:35 p.m.

3. Public Input

Huelz Gutchen – stated he had recently send e-mails regarding double-bundle financing and asked the group to read them. He stated that the potential for carbon offsets to be used in order to make us 100% carbon neutral is obsolete, we need to have more creative ways to solve the problem.

Ray Mollett – thanked the group for the recent open house. He stated that he shares the concerns the group expressed regarding the low turnout and wondered if this was due to the nice weather, the day of the week it was held, or some other factor. He wondered if the committee has thought about what number of citizen participants is necessary to gain community consensus.

Joanne Eggers – stated that Tanya Graham of Geos Institute asked her to read a statement [the full statement is attached to these minutes].

Andrew Cubic – stated he attended the first open house in May and that it scared him into being part of the 10x20 supporters. He learned recently about the state’s electric proportionality of renewable mix and is asking the group to look at a standard mix. We shouldn’t allow the state to limit our use of or production of renewable energy. He stated that John Kennedy said that we choose to go to the moon and then we did. He hopes the committee chooses to aim high and then achieve it.

Robert Block-Brown – stated he agrees with the sentiments stated about the open house, there was good information and good organization but poor attendance. He talked with many people who just didn’t know about it. There was a poor job of advertising and outreach. He is hoping the group has a good way to collect information between now and the end of the process. He has

been working with Adam Hanks on parts of the draft ordinance. He recommends that the group propose creation of a position in the final ordinance. That position needs to be directly under the City Administrator. It needs to be that high level of a position so they can monitor all City operations. The plan and position don't work if the position isn't at a high enough level.

Allie Rosenbluth – stated that she is with Rogue Climate. She too is sad about the lack of attendance at the last open house. This may have been due to a communication error with who was in charge of outreach. She stated that she has concerns with the draft vision statement. There is nothing in the statement about social equity. She read aloud Rogue Climate's vision statement as an example of how to include social equity.

Michael Shore – stated he is scared by the lack of open house attendance and is concerned about how our Police and Fire departments would handle climate-related emergencies like a mega-fire. He stated that putting a chamber under your home to be safe from mega fires is important. He wonders if the City of Ashland has a plan in place to handle employee (in addition to community) safety during mega fires. He also wondered if there is an ability to change land use rules to include the ability to build structures to be safe and shelter in place in emergencies.

Jeff Sharpe – stated that the City is honored to have such a diverse and intelligent group working on the plan.

4. Public Input Summary

Jeff Golden, representing Cascadia Consulting Group, gave an overview of the public input received at and after the recent open house. Group discussed what Cascadia will be doing with the information received and whether Cascadia need anything additional from the group. Golden stated that Cascadia will continue to use the public input to prioritize actions and strategies. Group expressed concerns with using the input too greatly, as it there was such a small number of Ashland residents in attendance. Group discussed what might be missing from the public input. They agreed that social equity issues were likely underrepresented as most attendees seemed to be older, white, and relatively affluent.

Group discussed options for additional public input including discussions with specifically targeted groups, a "road show" to service organizations like Rotary, Elks, etc. or to local religious congregations, articles in the newspaper, and additional information on the City's web and social media pages.

Committee member McGinnis arrived 4:27 p.m.

Group requested that Rosenthal and/or staff member Hanks draft questions to aid in the October 15th discussion. Rosenthal agreed to this request.

Group discussed whether a statistically valid number of residents giving public input was necessary. Group determined that while getting input on the plan is still important, it is more important now to get support for the plan before going to Council. The plan is just the start of

this process, there is no way to make everyone happy but the group (and whomever continues this process) need to continue the conversation with the community. They need to continue to get input and support even after the plan is approved. McGinnis stated that it is the responsibility of this committee to make decisions in the best interest of the community. Koopman stated that at this point the group needs more targeted responses from those who have not yet been involved. Group agreed there has been input and discussion from those who already support doing a plan but what is lacking is hearing from those who are opposed or unsure about the need for a plan. Rosenthal requested that the group continue to offer suggestions on how to get the plan information out to those who have not yet been involved and staff will continue the already started process of targeting specific community representatives/sectors for input.

Jones requested that Cascadia inform the group as to their plans for advertising and future public input as agreed upon in their contract.

5. Vision Statement

McGinnis stated that during his small group discussion of actions and strategies they were concerned that the vision statement lacked specific focus. Hartman stated he would like to see the vision statement broken into simple action statements to motivate people and keep educating the public simple. Green stated that vision statements shouldn't include specifics - it should only be a zoomed-out view. Bevers stated any reference to social equity is missing from the current vision statement.

Group discussed ways to potentially word-smith the current statement but determined they did not have enough time for a full discussion at this meeting. Group agreed to send draft statement options to staff for inclusion in the next packet and to have this discussion at the October 15th meeting.

6. Next Meeting

The upcoming meeting schedule is as follows:

October 15, 9:00 a.m. – 12:00 p.m.

October 19, 5:30 p.m. – 7:00 p.m.

November 2, 3:30 – 5:30 p.m.

10. Adjournment

Meeting adjourned at 5:20 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Diana Shiplet, Executive Assistant

My name is JoAnne Eggers and I am a member of the Board of Directors of the Geos Institute, which helps local leaders make decisions about climate change that are good for people and nature. Tonya Graham, our Executive Director, was planning to talk with you today, but has been called out of town for a family situation and has asked me to deliver this message in her place.

This committee and the City Council are facing some very important questions – the answers to which will set the trajectory for our local efforts to address climate change for many years to come.

The primary question at this point is how aggressive do we want to be in reducing greenhouse gas pollution in Ashland? On one hand it's a very simple question. Leading scientists tell us we need to get the atmospheric concentration of carbon down to 350 parts per million. That means initially becoming carbon neutral so we can stop the rise of that number. But that's not enough. Collectively we need to become a carbon sink, taking up more carbon than we emit. That is the global context within which this decision is being made.

Ashland citizens understand the danger of climate change and clearly are up for doing something serious about it. We can tell by how many people showed up at the Ashland Climate Challenge kickoff last November and the enthusiasm with which citizens are providing input to this process. As our ClimateWise team has traveled around the country helping communities address climate change, we have not often seen this level of local commitment and energy.

Few communities have set the goal of being carbon neutral in the U.S. To our knowledge, none have set the goal of being a carbon sink. Ashland could help anchor the bold side of this spectrum by setting either of these goals. We know there are concerns that we don't know exactly how to reach either of these goals or how to measure them. But someone has to figure it out. And Ashland ought to be part of that early scouting contingent brave

enough to go into uncharted territory and send word back to those who will follow. It's simply who we are.

Fortunately, human beings are good at the impossible. We have traveled to the moon. We jet around town in personal road rockets, some of which now pretty much drive themselves. We communicate with people all around the world in real time.

In the early 1900s, the Wright Brothers decided to build a flying machine that many people thought was simply not possible. But they set a goal and kept at it – even though keeping at it meant hurling themselves into the sky in a contraption that they knew they couldn't really control. They risked crashing many times to reach their goal. And then they shared what they learned so that those coming behind them could build on their success.

Fortunately, we don't have to be that brave. We don't have to put our lives on the line to reach this goal. But we should understand that their success was due to their courage in setting a make or break goal and their commitment to making it happen. They didn't say that in their spare time they would tinker around and see if they could build a flying machine. They said that they **WOULD BUILD** a flying machine. That's the kind of courage Ashland needs to exhibit in this decision.

Since not all communities will commit or be able to deliver on a bold goal, those with strong community support like Ashland need to set the pace. Let's set a bold, meaningful goal and show our commitment to it by passing an ordinance to make the Climate and Energy Action Plan fly.

That way, when our grandchildren ask us what we did once we knew about climate change, we can look them in the eye and honestly say that we simply did what needed to be done to protect their future.

MINUTES FOR THE CLIMATE & ENERGY ACTION PLAN ad hoc COMMITTEE
Saturday, October 15, 2016
Siskiyou Room, 51 Winburn Way

1. Call to Order

Councilor Rich Rosenthal called the meeting to order at 9:00 a.m.

Committee members Stuart Green, Louise Shawkat, Roxane Beigel-Coryell, Jim Hartman, Greg Jones, Marni Koopman and Claudia Alick were present. Staff member Adam Hanks was present. Committee members James McGinnis and Isaac Bevers arrived late. City Administrator Dave Kanner was in the audience.

Rosenthal outlined the agenda for the day. He stated there would be public input specific to each agenda item at the start of the item in addition to the regular public input time for items not on the agenda.

2. Public Input

Joanne Eggars – stated she was at the last open house and was struck by the greenhouse gas rates produced by consumer goods. She believes this should be among the top concerns for the group. She understands the challenges involved with taking on consumer goods but stated that we can't get where we need to go without addressing those issues.

Caren Caldwell – stated that there is a lack of social equity in the plan so far. The proposed solutions disproportionately effect low income. Transportation, heating and energy efficiency upgrades are all more costly for low income residents. She asked the group look at the GEOS report for assistance and guidance on how to address disadvantaged sectors who are rarely addressed. She stated there needs to be equity in participation by disadvantaged groups and there needs to be greater assistance in home upgrades for both low income residents and landlords. Lastly, there needs to be equity in green jobs – the group should encourage local training for job and family wages for new green jobs. [see attached testimony]

Hannah Sohl – stated she was recently at an energy conference and it was clear there that Ashland is looked to as a leader in solar power. She stated that this process is an important one and the group needs to take more time to consider how to get information to and from the community. The group needs to focus on how to get information regarding the next open house to more than just those people who are already involved. She encouraged the group to recommend the new position requested in the plan be an assistant city administrator, not just a staff level, position. Lastly, she asked the group take a greater focus on low income or disadvantaged groups while developing the plan.

James McGinnis arrived 9:12 a.m.

3. "10x20" Ordinance

Group discussed whether a cost benefit analysis of the ordinance is (or could be) part of the current Cascadia contract. Hanks stated no, it's not in their current contract and probably isn't entirely in their realm of expertise. The challenge at this point is that there are many ways to achieve the 10% reduction – Council needs better clarity in order to create an accurate RFP for a cost benefit analysis.

10x20 Public Input

Dave Helmich – stated he was one of the primary petitioners of the ordinance but there is not a unanimously held view of how to do the project. He believes the 10x20 ordinance does not entirely fall into the CEAP, that it should be managed separately. If the 10x20 ordinance is part of the CEAP and the 10x20 project fails, the CEAP plan fails too. Keeping them separate works better for the progress of both.

Jeff Sharpe – stated the ordinance was crafted to be achievable and it could be a vital resource to make the CEAP active and not just words on paper. There needs to be an FRP to organize the 10x20 plan with a direct connection to the city's grid (he described the PPA involved plan). In order to achieve the goals of the CEAP, the group should encourage immediate action on 10x20 and inclusion of it in the CEAP. [see attached testimony]

Isaac Bevers arrived 9:25 a.m.

Andrew Cubic – stated he has 25 years of experience in infrastructure implementation in California. The 10x20 project is significant and may take many years, but time is still of the essence. He is surprised that there is no dedicated project manager being hired yet for it. He asked the group to use whatever influence they have on the City for that position to be created.

James Stephens – stated he concurs with most of the statements so far. He thinks 10x20 and CEAP should be parallel efforts. The 10x20 project helps the group meet plan goals because local, renewable energy production will automatically lower our greenhouse gas emissions. He believes the future will be based in electricity and that it should be generated from renewable resources that don't increase greenhouse gas numbers. He stated that this is not just solar or hydro production but will be from unknown technologies which should fit into the CEAP.

Tom Marvin – stated that one factor the group can't forget is the business of renewable electricity. We buy from BPA and 85% of it is hydro based but there is no direct line from the hydro power plant to us. BPA puts energy into the Northwest power grid with lots of other groups and sources. Our electricity can come from any of those sources. With population increases, our electric use over the next several years the demand for electricity will only go up. He believes that other groups will demand any electricity we produce. [see attached testimony]

Huelz Gutchen – stated there are two kinds of PPAs possible, one across the freeway (solar-farm) and one in town (solar on rooftops/brownfields). There is a double-bundle financing method for the version in-town. Most of this would be paid for by the Federal government. He

believes the City needs to hire two experts in this field right now. The City needs to get more creative with its financing. It's better to hire these two people now and learn about all the details necessary later. He believes that the job of managing the 10x20 ordinance belongs in the Planning Department since that department adds more greenhouse gases with new buildings than we will ever make up for with 10x20.

Group discussed two questions; 1) In addition to the questions/topics in the packet, what more does Council need to consider? and 2) Where/how should 10x20 be incorporated in the CEAP?

Some topics for consideration the group discussed included:

- 1) The effect of 10x20 on low-income community members
- 2) Have increases in electric demand (such as those from an increased number of electric vehicles) been considered?
- 3) Will (or how will) creation of our own power affect our current BPA contract? In what ways will it affect our costs from BPA?
- 4) 10% of what? Based on when? 2016? Do the calculations re-set each year?

Group determined that as this started as a parallel process, it can't be completely incorporated into the CEAP. It needs to be mentioned in the plan, and maybe should be listed as one of the first (or in-process) actions, but 10x20 can't be handled entirely in the CEAP process.

McGinnis asked Dave Kanner where he thinks the 10x20 ordinance would fit in and what resources are likely to be allocated? Kanner stated he would like the 10x20 in the CEAP so that it can be prioritized by the group along with any other proposed action. Discussions regarding how much city residents (including low income) can handle (increases to electric rates will inevitably come with 10x20 and other CEAP-related projects) need to occur in the CEAP process.

Rosenthal asked Kanner what next steps he envisions for the 10x20 ordinance? Kanner stated that the first step is to get ordinance clarification. There are many options for how to calculate and how to implement, so what is the end target? What are the resources necessary (and what resources do we have available)? He ultimately envisions a single, management-level position to handle both CEAP actions and 10x20 implementation. The challenge is providing enough resources to handle both.

Group raised concerns about one staff member handling both CEAP and 10x20, as they are two very different skill sets. They also expressed concerns that focus on 10x20 will slow down implementation of the CEAP.

Alick/McGinnis m/s that the "10x20" ordinance be referenced in some way in the final Climate and Energy Action Plan. Discussion: Group discussed ways in which it might be referenced and why there should be no reason for the City to hold off on 10x20 action before the CEAP is finalized.

Voice Vote: All Ayes. Motion Passes.

4. Goals and Targets Ordinance

Rosenthal reviewed the changes to the ordinance made by the Legal Department. Group discussed the timeline - with legal review, publication requirements, and Council agenda availability the Ordinance likely won't have first reading until January. They discussed whether because that is so close to the CEAP going to Council if they shouldn't just go on the same agenda. There wasn't group consensus as to if having them together was a good idea.

Goals/Targets Ordinance Public Input

Collin Ellis – urged the group to take the most aggressive goal/target they can take. Stated that if they don't they aren't really addressing the problem. He stated that he wants this city to be a leader in the country on this issue and without an aggressive goal, the group isn't doing its job.

Hannah Sohl – Thanked Hanks for his work on the draft ordinance and stated that it doesn't have to be an either/or situation for carbon neutral/science based targets. The most recent version of the Eugene ordinance (which has been updated since the version in the packet) has a robust public accountability built in. It is important to include consumption in the goals. The first focus can and should be on sector based emissions but later focus can shift to consumption. She encouraged the group to have annual, sector-based updates and to follow Eugene's model by having a goal of carbon neutral by 2047 with 8% reductions each year based on best-available science.

Group discussed ways to combine an 8% reduction with consumption, which still can't accurately be tracked. They discussed the possibility of having the reductions measured on a three-year average, to account for typical fluctuations in project timelines, financing, etc.

Group discussed how to adapt the plan as science-based targets change so frequently (what's an appropriate target today may be wildly different than one 5-, 10-, 20-years from now.) How to we keep the debate reasonable, and effective?

Hartman/Koopman m/s to propose an ordinance with a goal consistent with achieving a 350 parts/million reduction by 2100. This means an 8% average annual reduction of all greenhouse gas emissions, including those from consumption of goods and food. Discussion: Hartman stated that all three greenhouse gases are accelerating – we need to decelerate now. He acknowledges that this is a big goal but thinks it can be achieved in small chunks. Koopman stated that using the Eugene ordinance as a model we know that we can include lots of other goals, not just an 8% reduction goal. We need to embrace that this is going to be very hard. Green stated that the goal should probably call out a baseline date to prevent future ambiguity. We also need to acknowledge that no matter how well we do here, we can't solve the entire world's problems.

Green/Hartman m/s to amend the motion to include a baseline date in-line with the greenhouse gas inventory of 2015.

Voice Vote: all ayes. Amendment to motion passes.

Group discussed if “moving average” needed to be in the reduction requirements, determined that this can will likely happen naturally, especially if the plan is reviewed annually.

Beigel-Coryell raised concerns over including consumption in the goal – not only will this require major policy changes but will require the entire community to buy into lifestyle changes. She also raised concerns over whether or not cities with action plans will be sued for not being able to reduce in areas with no measurement ability (consumption has no real measurement ability other than general regional data). Rosenthal stated that he isn't really sure how from a policy standpoint this will work but he still thinks that it is important to recognize the importance of the goal to the group.

Group acknowledged that much of the ability to meet this goal requires State and Federal actions or actions by other entities that we have no control over. Group still felt it was an important statement goal nonetheless.

Voice Vote: All Ayes. Motion (with amendments) Passes.

Hanks asked the group what the city operations goal should be? He stated that he left as a placeholder the city operations goal from the originally proposed ordinance from Rogue Climate. Group discussed whether any city operations goal needs to be in-line with the year (2028) the BPA contract is up. They determined it wasn't entirely necessary to do so.

Green/Beigel-Coryell m/s to adopt the city operations goal as written in section 9.40.030 of the draft ordinance. Discussion: Hartman would prefer to have a more aggressive goal.

Hartman moved to amend the years in the goal to 2025 and 2045. Amendment to motion died for lack of a second.

Discussion continued: Group discussed whether the goal needs to be more clearly stated as to how it relates to the 8% reduction goal just approved. Jones wondered if there needs to be verbage limiting the amount of reductions achieved through offsets but group determined that they can't limit that as we can't yet track consumption.

Voice Vote: All Ayes. Motion Passes.

Koopman stated that she would like to see the minimum reporting schedule lowered from 5-year to 3-year milestones. Group determined that they need to make a clear distinction between reporting and milestones. They reiterated the desire for annual reporting, and determined there needs to be a different timeline for potentially course-correcting milestones.

Koopman/Alick m/s to replace five-year target milestones with three-year target milestones in section 9.40.040 of the draft ordinance and accept the plan sections as presented to include accountability with implementation plan. Discussion: Koopman stated that Eugene's newest ordinance has a section with triple-bottom-line considerations. Group discussed whether having annual targets every three years is necessary or would this just be used to do larger course corrections. They agreed that this means a Greenhouse Gas Inventory every three years with the understanding that an 8% average reduction will vary from year-to-year but should average out over a three-year timeframe.

Voice Votes: All Ayes. Motion Passes.

5. Next Meeting

Group agreed that a continued discussion of the implementation plan and the vision statement should be on the next agenda. They also discussed the possibility of keeping a list of questions or topics needing to be discussed. The first items on that list include: social equity and the effect of the plan on tourism.

The upcoming meeting schedule is as follows:

October 19, 5:30 p.m. – 7:00 p.m.

November 2, 3:30 – 5:30 p.m.

10. Adjournment

Meeting adjourned at 12:05 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Diana Shiplet, Executive Assistant

Testimony before CEAP Ad Hoc Committee
October 15, 2016

Caren Caldwell
124 Ohio Street, Ashland, Oregon 97520

541-621-0663

Reference: Geos Institute, Ashland. "Climate Change Vulnerability in Ashland and the Rogue Valley", September 2016

Topic: Urgency of incorporating Vulnerability Report into Climate Plan

Highlight: Equity findings in Vulnerability Report

Comments:

I am Caren Caldwell.

Good morning. Thanks for this opportunity to address your committee, the very existence of which is a game changer in this era of climate change. Local communities doing climate planning is awesome and exciting! Thank you for taking on the job!

I want to talk about the social equity aspects of climate planning.

Impacts from climate change as well as proposed solutions disproportionately affect Ashland's low-income residents and workers of Ashland.

Low-income people spend a higher percentage of their income on transportation in the form of older, less efficient cars, and on housing and energy in the form of older, less energy-saving houses and appliances. They also have fewer resources to invest in energy saving measures. They are living in a precarious state made more precarious by climate change.

Rogue Climate supports the development of a climate and energy action plan that will not exacerbate these impacts, but will prioritize social equity for low income people on a par with other goals like climate mitigation and adaptation, environmentally sound public policy, clean air and water, public health, and economic vitality.

I draw your attention to the report of the Geos Institute, Ashland. "Climate Change Vulnerability in Ashland and the Rogue Valley", September 2016.

The report concludes by noting that a recent review of climate change plans (Geos Institute, In Review) showed that some topics are not receiving adequate attention in Ashland's climate planning process. Even though climate change affects all sectors of our communities, disadvantaged populations are one of the sectors rarely addressed.

Who are we talking about?

- Elders, who are sensitive to heat, and especially low-income without family nearby
- Outdoor workers and seasonal workers, most of whom have low incomes
- Seasonal and service industry workers (forest, ski area, restaurant, theater, hotel, etc.)
- Homeless populations, people lacking in transportation options
- Low income populations and families/single parents with young children
- People with respiratory illness, heart conditions or mental illness

The Geos Vulnerability report found that low income is a common stressor among all socioeconomic groups that were vulnerable to climate change. Having a low income in addition to health problems, racial biases, job type, and age greatly exacerbates the impacts of climate change.

To meet the challenge faced by our low income residents and workers, Rogue Climate urges your team to incorporate three kinds of equity planning into the overall Climate and Energy Action Plan.

One, equity in participation by disadvantaged populations.

We must proactively discuss equity and disadvantaged populations in all City planning processes. Measure the impacts of climate adaptation and mitigation on the most vulnerable. The City of Eugene accomplishes this goal by establishing a social equity committee.

We can also train people with relationships in different communities (Latino communities or churches for example) to do outreach on energy, water, heat impacts, and other issues; and provide opportunities for people with low incomes to become educators and leaders.

Two, equity in home energy upgrades.

We need to implement financial strategies for low income home owners to upgrade energy systems; and provide incentives for landlords to invest in energy upgrades, air conditioning, comfort, and air quality in rental units.

Three, equity in green jobs.

As mitigation plans are implemented, we can expect new green jobs to be created locally. We need to leverage public and private funding to create those green jobs and provide training opportunities that benefit local residents and workers, including low income people and underserved groups; and we need to uphold high road standards for new jobs that provide secure family wages.

Thank you.

10.15.16 CEAP ad hoc committee public input- Jeff Sharpe, 557 Fordyce 97520

Good morning, and thanks again to each of you for your work on this important plan.

The 10x20 ordinance has been crafted to be a truly impacting first step for our city, achievable if quickly started, and showcase once completed.

The ordinance could also prove a great benefit to CEAP for ~~preparation~~ of vital sections addressing renewable energy production. It is hoped CEAP will be remembered as the Climate and Energy ACTION plan, not just an Academic Plan, and at this point in time, this committee appears to be in a unique position for stimulating ~~real~~ action.

Today I am asking you consider recommending that the Mayor and Council direct immediate development and publishing of an RFP soliciting proposals for the installation of a 10 to 15MW renewable energy utility, with direct connect to the city distribution system, to be completed and on-line by the end of 2020.

A Dec.1 Response may be desired to assure our CEAP has opportunity to integrate this valuable information, and to give a realistic baseline to measure other options against.

This RFP can be easily, and inexpensively produced, and will in no way obligate the city to any additional investment, time or commitment. What it will do is garner some incredibly valuable information, providing real-world possibilities for ordinance fulfillment, as well as strong validation of cost and timing information I'm sure we want to be part of the finished plan.

Our communication with larger EPCs (Engineering, Procurement, Construction contractors) that would be possibly interested in responding to such an RFP have suggested that there are PPA flips approaches that may prove likely workable for the city, without requiring city investment beyond a PPA (Power Purchase Agreement), likely with all power produced being sold to the city (PPA directly with Ashland).

One of the primary deciding factors for the City will likely be the PPA kWh cost, and possible timing of flip to the City, proposed by the respondents.

A common theme in those discussions was the need for them to see the City was truly interested in pursuing a project, and not just political broadcasting.

Current solar plant size recommendations vary from 15MW for fixed, down to 10MW for tracking PV installations.

We have been investigating Ashland's industry-proven renewable energy options for many years, with wind and irradiation monitoring, system pilot projecting, and estimating full project development and construction for specific area wind and solar options.

All of this work has been provided open-source to encourage innovation, and will be considered beneficial to responding EPCs. We know of several respected EPCs that will be interested in responding to such an RFP.

In order to achieve the goals of this admirable energy security and community impacting ordinance, we urge immediate and effective gathering of current, relevant information; which requires immediate, meaningful action. Here's hoping we motivate the citizenry to make CEAP an effective instrument for change, and not just a bookend in the city archives. 10x20 has the potential to be a robust, impacting showcase project for our City.

Thank you! Upward and Onward! J#

AFTER EXPOSITIONS 10x20 IS OUR ONLY LOCAL RPS

CASCADIA IS NOT QUALIFIED OR EXPERIENCED IN 10x20

For CEAP

10/15/2016

Ashland's Energy Sources

1. The City of Ashland Electric Utility (The City) purchases 98-99% of the community's net electricity consumption from Bonneville Power Administration (BPA).
2. The City generates 1-2% of the community's net electricity consumption from a City owned and operated hydro generator located near Reeder Reservoir.
3. The electricity that is purchased from BPA is predominantly from hydroelectric generation (85% hydro, 10% nuclear, 5% undetermined (open market purchases- most recent calendar year predominately wind).

This has nothing to do with the electricity being used in Ashland. If we canceled the BPA contract for some reason and started to purchase power from PacifiCorp, the electricity we would get here would be the same as we are now receiving—50% contaminated by fossil fuels and with no end in sight. The large utilities are under state mandate to have reformed to deliver 50% clean electricity to their customers by 2030. There is no schedule for full cleanup.

4. Large scale hydroelectric generation is defined as a clean and renewable energy source by the US Department of Energy, US Energy Information Administration, US Environmental Protection Agency, and Oregon Department of Energy.
5. The current contract with BPA expires Sept 30, 2028.
This is 8 years after the year 2020!
6. The current total cost of wholesale power, including delivery and demand charges, is just over four cents per kWh.

That is an average cost which must be calculated based on current usage. And if we use less than our allotment (which was very conservatively projected years ago) for example by conservation or by internal generation, the total price to the City is the same so our cost per kWh will actually rise as we conserve. See 5. above. This must be corrected in some way either by a contract modification or other means.

Ashland's Renewable Energy Requirements

1. The State of Oregon requires that all electric utilities comply with renewable portfolio standards (RPS) that impose specific portions of the total power generation or purchases by utilities to be from renewable sources.
The ordinance was not intended for compliance with any other law. If it works out that its benefits can be used, that is all to the good. There is no regulating utility that would prevent development of an additional 10%.
2. RPS levels are different for investor-owned utilities (Pacific Power and PGE) and consumer owned utilities (includes municipal utilities, public utility districts and cooperatives).
3. As a municipal utility, the City has no additional RPS requirement until 2025 when the requirement is 5% (see future section for ORS exclusions)
4. The RPS regulations exclude "existing hydro" (prior to 1995) as a qualifying resource in meeting a utilities RPS requirement. The RPS allows upgrades to existing hydro as a qualifying resource in meeting the RPS requirement.

Ashland's Renewable Energy Acquisition

1. Efficiency improvements to existing hydro are RPS qualifying and the City receives its proportionate share through the issuance and transfer of RECs from BPA hydro system efficiency improvements.
2. The City has a supplemental contract with BPA for the purchase of an equivalent of 6% of its total electricity needs through BPA's Environmentally Preferred Power (EPP) program as renewable energy credits (RECs).

3. The current BPA EPP contract expires Sept 30, 2016.
4. Customer-owned solar systems are not RPS qualifying because the customer owns the associated RECs, not the City.

RECs are fungible. That is their whole point. They have nothing to do with the "cleanliness" of our own consumption.

5. The City's local hydroelectric generation is not RPS qualifying as it is "existing hydro" (in use prior to 1995). Efficiency improvements to the hydro generator could qualify.

Ashland's Future Renewable Energy Requirements

1. The City's state-mandated RPS requirement increases to 5% by the end of 2025.
 1. The City has "banked" RECs in anticipation of future RPS needs.

So, the City doesn't need them or any more of them? What is the purpose of the RPS discussion in re: 10 by 20?
 3. The City will have acquired enough RECs by 2025 to meet the 5% requirement through the year 2039. During the years post 2025, the City will continue to acquire enough RECs to meet the RPS requirement through 2048.
 4. The Council has adopted a local ordinance (dubbed 10 by 20) that requires the generation or acquisition of new, local and clean electricity equivalent to 10% of the community's electric consumption by 2020 (individual terms not yet defined).
 5. The Oregon RPS recognizes certain exceptions to the RPS (exemption from 5% requirement). The exceptions that apply to the City are:
 - a. "Acquiring the additional electricity would require the electric utility to substitute qualifying electricity for electricity from an energy source other than coal, natural gas or petroleum." ORS 469A.060 (1) (b), amended {HB 1547}

10 by 20!
 6. "A consumer-owned utility is not required to comply with a renewable portfolio standard to the extent that compliance would require the consumer-owned utility to reduce... purchases of the lowest priced electricity from Bonneville Power Administration..." and "applies only to firm commitments for BPA electricity that the Bonneville Power Administration has assured will be available to a consumer-owned utility to meet agreed portions of the consumer-owned utility's load requirements..."

ORS 469A.060 {3}, amended {HB 1547}

This is one of the reasons the Friends were formed. The State took Ashland off the hook but citizens were demanding action to begin to make the transition to clean power. The only way to accomplish that was to generate it locally for direct connection to City facilities, precluding dilution in the dirty PacifiCorp stream.

Policy Questions

1. What are the primary objectives of the ordinance and in what order of priority?
 - a. Independence from the regional electricity grid?

More independence. It seems impossible and is probably not wise policy to strive for total independence. 10% was selected because it is practical and will not require batteries.
 - b. Emergency access to electricity due to regional grid failure?

A small move toward a more resilient local power system. This should not be the last addition to the system.
 - c. Carbon mitigation locally?

Yes. And for Ashland's bit for the world. The Friends believe in Global Warming. How about you?

d. Carbon mitigation regionally?

2. Should the ordinance be developed to utilize the State of Oregon RPS structure as defined in Oregon Revised Statutes (ORS) as the template and model to implement the 10 by 20 ordinance?

3. Should the ordinance be developed with its own set of definitions, standards and eligible resources separate from the State RPS structure?

If necessary. The ordinance as adopted is very simple. 10% new, clean, local and renewable. All those adjectives act as one. And that was and should be the ongoing intent. Its definitions are to be found in the dictionary!

4. If separate from the State RPS, should the local supplemental RPS include or exclude the state RPS mandates, i.e. cumulative or additive?

5. Should the clarified goals and intent of the ordinance be incorporated into the Climate and Energy Action Plan (CEAP) or remain as a stand-alone ordinance?

Stand alone. The ordinance is not in conflict with the CEAP in any way.

6. How does the ordinance fit in with the other goals of the CEAP? Should it take precedence both financially and in priority or should it be reviewed and evaluated equally with the other strategies and actions within the plan?

The way this is phrased implies that it may be in conflict in some way. It is not. 10 by 20 is not part of "the plan".

Ordinance Content Questions

1. What are the definitions of the following:

a. New

i. As of what date?

Built or acquired from the date of adoption of the ordinance and as caused by the City, as is implicit and explicit in the ordinance.

ii. New generation or newly acquired by the City Electric Utility?

Either way. But all the adjectives must apply. That is the black letter law as it stands. It does not say "new or local or clean or renewable."

b. Clean Resources

i. Renewable energy as defined in ORS?

OK.

ii. City specific definition?

OK.

iii. Does that include energy efficiency, demand response?

That is not what was adopted or implied. Efficiency and conservation do not enter into complying with the ordinance.

c. Cause to be produced

i. Limited to City owned/operated generation facility?

Not necessarily. Could be PPA or even a local BPA enterprise if we could talk them into it.

ii. Purchase of qualifying electricity from others?

OK as long as it is delivered clean. Realistically not likely except as a PPA.

iii. Purchase of RECs

Absolutely not. The citizens are interested in using cleaner energy and they may have to pay a little more for that under 10 by 20. That cost is relevant to the taxpayer and ratepayer.

d. Local

If it gets here with those four adjectives, "local" can be defined any way chosen. It seems likely the only way to accomplish that is for the generation to occur fairly locally and be directly transmitted to a substation(s) here.

i. Within City limits?

ii. Within Rogue Valley?

iii. Within Ashland's regional balancing authority (PACW)?

iv. Within Northwest Power Pool territory?

e. 10% of electricity used in the City

This is a nonsensical question. All current renewably generated electricity is intermittent. Solar when the sun shines, wind when it blows, hydro when it flows. The only meaning that would possibly apply would be annual actual (projected to 2020) consumption by any reasonable standard that measures electrons flowing is the proper measure.

i. Annual consumption (as defined by state RPS standard)?

ii. Peak day demand?

iii. Average daily demand?

iv. Peak day consumption?

v. Average daily consumption?

vi. Other benchmark of electricity use?

2. What does "from and by 2020" mean?

Well, our lawyers thought it was clear. Pick one but don't waste a lot of time on it. It may change once the preliminary scheduling and alternatives analysis is complete. This is not relevant at this time.

a. Is that January 1, 2020 or December 31, 2020?

3. Should the ordinance contain any financial caps or limits relating/compared to the acquisition cost of other wholesale electricity products?

And how would those caps or limits be set at this early stage? Would you say that the cost of the replacement power must be less than 4 cents? Would that be the average cost over a possible 20 year financial life of a project. This is not relevant now. The Council must be trusted to make a good fiscal decision when much more is known.

CITY OF ASHLAND

Ashland Housing and Human Services Commission Minutes September 22, 2016

CALL TO ORDER

Chair Boettiger called the meeting to order at 4:30 pm in the Siskiyou Room at the Community Development and Engineering Offices located at 51 Winburn Way, Ashland OR 97520.

Commissioners Present:	Council Liaison
Gina DuQuenne	Rich Rosenthal
Rich Rohde	
Joshua Boettiger	SOU Liaison
Tom Gunderson	Megan Mercier, absent
Sharon Harris	
Sue Crader	Staff Present:
Heidi Parker	Linda Reid, Housing Specialist
Michelle Linley	
Commissioners Absent:	Carolyn Schwendener, Staff Secretary
Tom Buechele	

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Two corrections were made to last month's minutes. (Council Liaison report - *Not the Chamber Board*) Rohde/Gunderson m/s to approve the minutes of the August 25, 2016 Housing and Human Services Commission meeting with corrections. Voice Vote: All Ayes, minutes were approved with corrections.

PUBLIC FORUM

No one was present to speak.

The Commissioners welcomed new member Michelle Linley and City Councilor Rich Rosenthal who was subbing for Pam Marsh.

HOUSING CRISIS FORUM NEXT STEPS UPDATE

Rohde reported the materials that came out of the forum have been summarized and the next step is to prioritize the direction in which to take. The Committee has recently done an exercise in strategic mapping looking at all the players in affordable housing in Ashland and the decision makers. Some of the priorities outlined are; funding of the Housing Trust Fund, removing barriers for tiny houses, renter's rights including a ninety day notice and looking at some of the homeless issues. Reid commented the committee recognizes some organizations are going to want to put all their energy into priorities locally while other organizations are needing to serve in a larger more regional effort. If anyone is interested in attending the meetings they are held every Wednesday at 1:30 pm at the Pony Espresso café located in the Washington Federal Building on Lithia Way.

CONSOLIDATED ANNUAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION REPORT

Reid gave an overview of what the CAPER report is. This is a document required from the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development's (HUD) Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) fund program. In the City's five year consolidated plan for the use of CDBG funds the City sets goals for what type of projects they would like to fund. The CAPER reports the accomplishments generated by the activities funded in program year 2015 and how those activities allow the City to make progress in meeting the outcomes and goals identified in the 2015-2019 Consolidated Plan. Reid brought attention to the fact that the City actually funded four projects in the 2015 year grant cycle; The Maslow Project, St. Vincent DePaul, Ashland Supportive Housing and Habitat for Humanity. Habitat for Humanity was not able to expend their funding as they did not find enough home owners to participate in their program. The money was given back to the City. That money can be re-awarded mid-stream but would need to go through award process again.

The Commissioners discussed the CAPER making some grammatical changes.

Harris/DuQuenne m/s to approve the CAPER with changes. Voice Vote: All Ayes, motion passed unanimously.

LIAISON REPORTS DISCUSSION

Porta Potty Sub-committee update – Harris spoke with Parks Director Michael Black regarding the placing of a porta potty on the Bear Creek Greenway/Bike path. The sub-committee is interested in placing a porta potty in the downtown area somewhere around Ace Hardware/Food Co-op area. They would also like to see one at the south end of town by Shop-n-Kart. Mr. Black has no problem with locating one on the bike path and offered to meet with someone from the sub-committee to discuss the best possible place to put it. The HHS commission agreed they still need to get approval from the Council as well as a funding source. Harris and DuQuenne will arrange a time to meet with Mr. Black and do a site visit.

Joint H&HS & Planning Commission meeting – At a prior H&HS meeting it was suggested to have a joint meeting with the Planning Commission at one of their study sessions. There are a lot of land use pieces to some of the priorities that this group has, stated Reid. It was decided to meet with the Planning Commission at their October 25, 2016 Study Session at 7:00 pm at the Council Chambers. Reid will type up a brief summary of the Planning land use activities this group has been working on and email it to the Commissioners. It was also decided it is still necessary to have the regular H&HS Commission meeting in October.

Council – Rosenthal reported that the resolution for the winter shelter is on the City Council agenda for their Tuesday October 18, 2016 meeting. The emergency shelter was a discussion item at their Study Session and Council directed staff to look into the concept of contracting with an outside organization to help with the program. This coming Sunday from 3:00 to 5:00pm is the second climate and energy action plan public open house at SOU Stevenson Union. Potential strategies will be outlined on how to reduce our carbon footprint.

Staff – Parker and Reid attended the Homeless Task Force meeting on Tuesday in which local law enforcement spoke to the group regarding the homeless populations. Medford, Central Point and Ashland were represented. Each community pointed out they see very different populations of homeless in their communities. Chief O'Meara acknowledged that Ashland has a larger population of transients who do not necessarily want services or jobs; they are living here as a choice. Central Point police Chief Allison pointed out the population in Central Point is very different. It tends to be transitional families who are going from housing to homelessness for one reason or another. They see a large number of families sleeping in their cars and often experience issues of domestic violence. Medford Chief Sparacino emphasized they primarily see peoples with mental illness and/or drug addiction and homeless veterans.

Parker conveyed that she disagreed with Chief O'Meara's description of the homeless in Ashland. As a volunteer if you go to the homeless shelter in the winter you will find people with mental illness as well as some who have been abused, stated Parker. None of those people in the shelter are opposed to having shelter. Parker commented that mischaracterization of who the homeless are makes it difficult to have compassion for people who are choosing homelessness rather than people who are there for other reasons; bad choices through no fault of their own, poverty or abuse. Everyone agreed they all need to work together.

Reid announced that Assistance Chief Warren Hensman is putting together a mental health training for the Community. It is currently scheduled for October 19, 2016 at the Presbyterian Church. The date may change.

GENERAL ANNOUNCEMENTS SEPTEMBER 22, 2016 METTING AGENDA ITEMS

Quorum Check – Everyone should be present

UPCOMING EVENTS AND MEETINGS

Next Housing Commission Meeting – 4:30-6:30 PM; October 27, 2016 in the Siskiyou Room at the Community Development & Engineering Department located at 51 Winburn Way.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 5:55 p.m.

Respectfully submitted by Carolyn Schwendener

CITY OF ASHLAND

Ashland Housing and Human Services Commission Minutes October 27, 2016

CALL TO ORDER

Chair Boettiger called the meeting to order at 4:30 pm in the Siskiyou Room at the Community Development and Engineering Offices located at 51 Winburn Way, Ashland OR 97520.

Commissioners Present:	Council Liaison
Gina DuQuenne	Pam Marsh
Rich Rohde	
Joshua Boettiger	SOU Liaison
Tom Gunderson	Megan Mercier, absent
Sharon Harris	
Tom Buechele	Staff Present:
Heidi Parker	Linda Reid, Housing Specialist
Michelle Linley	
Commissionrs Absent:	Carolyn Schwendener, Clerk
Sue Crader	

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Harris/Rohde m/s to approve the minutes of the September 22, 2016 Housing and Human Services Commission meeting. Voice Vote: All Ayes, minutes were approved as presented.

PUBLIC FORUM

No one was present to speak.

DEBRIEF ON JOINT PLANNING/HOUSING AND HUMAN SERVICES MEETING

The Commissioners who attended the joint meeting gave an overview of what they took away from that meeting. Commissioner Buechele remarked the meeting was very helpful acknowledging he especially like reviewing the report from Guy Tauer, the Regional Economist from the Employment Department. Linley also said how much she learned from that report. She appreciated the breakdown of the demographics in the Rogue Valley including the income levels in Ashland. Rohde said the best thing the meeting accomplished was a good working relationship with the Planning Commission. The Planning Commission seemed very positive about the issues addressed by this Commission, i.e.; Tiny houses and Accessory Residential Units.

City staff would like the Planning and HHS Commissions to select two representatives to serve on a public participation advisory group to advise on the development and implementation of a citizen engagement plan as part of the Comprehensive Plan Element update process.

City Senior Planner, Brandon Goldman, gave a background report on the Comprehensive Plan Element Update Housing Element. Goldman explained the City is getting ready to update the Comprehensive Plan Housing element. Both the HHS Commission and the Planning Commission will have an active role in making recommendations to the City Council. Another component of that is Citizen Participation to engage everyone affected by housing to see what they think are the priority goals. An advisory group composed of both Commissions will help staff develop an engagement plan to take before the Planning Commission then start the process of the Citizen Engagement part, explained Goldman. The Planning Commission has identified two members of that group and it was encouraged that this group choose two volunteers.

Goldman went on to explain what the Comprehensive Plan is. The Comprehensive Planning is an attempt to establish guidelines for the future growth of a Community. The document is official in nature meaning that it is

designed to be adopted into law by some form of local government. The document then serves as a policy guide to decisions about community development.

Throughout the entire Comprehensive Planning process, citizen input should be obtained, stated Goldman. Some suggested ways of doing this were;

- Hold a series of open forums or meetings
- Distribute news releases explaining what is being worked on and inviting written comments.
- Public adoption process citizen input helps to determine the goals and objective of the plan.

After a discussion Commissioners Harris and Linley volunteered to be on the advisory committee.

DEVELOP A STRATEGY FOR IMPLEMENTING THE HOUSING TRUST FUND

Councilor Marsh explained that she is concerned the Council is lacking an understanding of what various funding levels for the Housing Trust Fund could produce. Marsh expressed the importance of making extremely tangible recommendations to the Council. Marsh proposed the question, What are the various levels of funding and how would we use those to produce housing? It's important to show the Council what they could actually attain. One concern is that when affordable housing is offered how can it be reassured it will remain affordable. Marijuana and potentially the excise tax are two opportunities for funding. Marsh explained this Commission's job is to give a clear blue print of what they can accomplish. It was suggested to engage some housing developers and see what would attract them to Ashland.

Commissioners Buechele, Gunderson and Rohde agreed to be part of a subcommittee to put together a menu of funding levels and projects. The subcommittee will work with Reid.

PRESENTATION BY 90 DAYS SOUTHERN OREGON

Evan Lasley, Regional organizer for the Oregon AFL-CIO and prior Housing Commission liaison spoke. Mr. Lasley shared he was here today to talk about the campaign to establish the ninety day notice for no cause evictions for rent increases. As the housing rental crisis worsens it affects everyone from workers to lower income workers, stated Lasley. Families are on the edge of homelessness due to the cost of housing which is pricing them out of their community. This is not a problem specific to Ashland but a state wide crisis, said Lasley.

It was inquired as to why landlords might give a no cause eviction to their tenants. Linley commented in her experience a history of bad behavior can often be the reason a landlord wants to evict especially if they are disrupting the peaceful enjoyment of the other residences. Parker mentioned she had been a mediator for landlord tenant disputes in the courts. She explained there is a legal mechanism that can be used. If a tenant is misbehaving for any reason a landlord can file an eviction for cause. If the tenant disputes the right of the landlord to evict them it goes to mediation. The mediator sits with the tenant and landlord and develops very specific language on how the tenant has to behave. The document is totally and legally enforceable. It is clearly written and a judge must sign it. Some of the commissioners stated that though this process is well intentioned, it does not always work as designed.

In conclusion Lasley would like to move the notification from thirty days to ninety days for the vast majority facing the situation when it occurs through no fault of their own. Lasley distributed an ordinance adopted by the City of Milwaukee relating to renters protection. See exhibit A at end of minutes. For working families this is the compassionate thing to do, said Lasley.

The commissioners agreed to support this as a direction and leave the development of it to those who are currently working on it.

Rohde/Buechele m/s that the Housing Commission supports the development of a ninety day notice to address the critical rental issues we have in Ashland. Voice Vote: All ayes, motion passed.

LIAISON REPORTS DISCUSSION

Porta Potty Sub-committee update – DeQuenne and Harris met with Jason from the Parks and Recreation Department and spoke with Mike Morrison on the phone regarding the placement of the porta potty. They will be meeting with Mr. Morrison tomorrow at 1:00 pm to discuss some possible sites. Possible locations are Ace Hardware or the railroad park at the north end of town and Bimart/Shop-N-Kart at the south end. Harris said they need to do the ground work and come up with possible sites before presenting to the Council. Funding also needs to be addressed.

Reid reminded the Commission that Mr. Morris does not have the authority to authorize the funding for the porta potties. She encouraged the Commission to seek direction from the Council before moving forward, put together proposal to bring before the council.

GENERAL ANNOUNCEMENTS SEPTEMBER 22, 2016 METTING AGENDA ITEMS

Quorum Check – Everyone should be present

UPCOMING EVENTS AND MEETINGS

Next Housing Commission Meeting – 4:30-6:30 PM; October 17, 2016 in the Siskiyou Room at the Community Development & Engineering Department located at 51 Winburn Way.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 5:55 p.m.

Respectfully submitted by Carolyn Schwendener