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Tracking Oregon’s GHG Targets and Scenario Planning

By Stephanie Lawson Millar, ODOT and Mary Weber, DLCD

Let’s be honest, climate change can be a confusing and overwhelming issue, and we know from survey data that, while Americans are concerned about it, it is not at the top of their list of concerns.

However, the need to engage our communities, from local and regional elected officials and staff to the public, could not be more critical. Articles are printed daily about the effects of climate change on the world environment and economy. The New York Times recently chronicled the impact of climate change on world agricultural systems, noting that resulting spikes in food prices are worsening hunger for millions of people around the world and destabilizing political regimes in Haiti, Mexico, Uzbekistan, and the Middle East.

Closer to home, climate change also has the potential to seriously impact Oregon’s economy, environment, and cultural and social institutions. The State has documented declines in spring snowpack in the Cascades especially at low elevations, and earlier melting. This has increased the risk of spring flooding, while reducing summer stream flows and increasing water temperatures when both fish and farmers depend on those streams for water. Recognizing the potential seriousness of climate change, the State has focused significant resources to address...
GHG reduction, beginning with the Governor’s Advisory Group on Global Warming in 2004 to the current Oregon Sustainable Transportation Initiative (OSTI).

**Oregon Sustainable Transportation Initiative**

OSTI was created through policy initiatives recently passed by the Oregon Legislature to reduce GHG emissions. SB 1059 (2010) directed the Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT) and the Department of Land Conservation and Development (DLCD) to coordinate and consult with stakeholders, local governments, Metropolitan Planning Organizations (MPOs) and other state agencies to develop a state-level strategy to reduce greenhouse gases from transportation. Specifically they were directed to:

1. Jointly develop a Statewide Transportation Strategy to be adopted by the Oregon Transportation Commission

2. Set transportation related greenhouse gas reduction targets for areas served by metropolitan planning organizations to be adopted by the Land Conservation and Development Commission

3. Jointly develop a toolkit and scenario planning guidelines

4. Jointly inform the public about the costs and benefits of reducing GHG emissions from light vehicle travel.

HB 2001, the Jobs and Transportation Act, adopted during the 2009 session, covered a range of transportation related activities, including GHG. The legislation directed the Portland Metro region to undertake scenario planning and adopt a preferred GHG reduction scenario by 2013, and implement the scenario in regional and local plans. The legislation also directed Central Lane MPO, which includes Eugene and Springfield, to undertake scenario planning on or after January 2013, and to cooperatively select a preferred scenario. The Portland metropolitan area under the leadership of Metro is working on scenario planning now. Central Lane has also begun exploring GHG issues and setting the stage for its own scenario planning efforts.

OSTI is a dynamic effort, changing and evolving as we learn. Both policy and technical committees comprised of people throughout the state are engaged with the agencies in creating the different components. Much more information about OSTI is available on the OSTI website. Many of the State’s partners in the metropolitan areas can also provide information about greenhouse gas related topics.

Stephanie Lawson Miller is Senior Transportation Planner with the Oregon Department of Transportation. Mary Weber is the Climate Change Outreach Specialist with the Department of Land Conservation and Development.

By Mary Weber, Department of Land Conservation and Development

Many researchers and policy leaders have contributed to Oregon’s multi-pronged approach to reduce greenhouse gases. This article chronicles the evolution of policy initiatives to reduce greenhouse gases in Oregon.

2004 – Governor Appoints Advisory Group on Global Warming

The Governor recommends that the state set goals to reduce greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions. The advisory group found that about a third of Oregon’s total GHG emissions are from vehicle exhaust. The advisory group recommended two general areas that the state should examine as a way to reduce GHG emissions from light vehicle travel: (1) to reduce GHG emissions from consumption of fossil fuels by displacing conventional combustion engines with hybrid, electric, and other technological/fuel options, and (2) to guide land use development, especially in urban areas, towards development patterns and activities that will reduce GHG emissions, such as higher densities, improved transit options, mixed-use neighborhoods, and common wall dwelling designs.

2007 – Climate Change Integration Act

The 2007 legislature adopted HB 3543 declaring that it is the policy of this state to reduce greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions in Oregon pursuant to the GHG emissions reduction goals:

- By 2020, achieve GHG levels that are 10 percent below 1990 levels.
- By 2050, achieve GHG levels that are at least 75 percent below 1990 levels.

The Climate Change Integration Act also established the Oregon Global Warming Commission (OGWC) and Oregon Climate Change Research Institute (OCCRI).

2008 – Global Warming Commission and Big Look Task Force Recommend Targets

In 2008, the OGWC adopted a resolution recommending that the Land Conservation and Development Commission (LCDC) set GHG targets and benchmarks for use by local governments. The Big Look Task Force on Oregon Land Use Planning in its report to the legislature also recommended that the state set targets for how land use planning can reduce GHG emissions resulting from transportation.

2008 – CCIG Recommends Transforming Planning Processes

The Governor’s Climate Change Integration Group’s (CCIG) report, A Framework for Addressing Rapid Climate Change, recommends...
that the state immediately begin preparing for climate change and take action to transform the state's transportation and land use planning processes to reduce GHG emissions. The Governor's group also recommends that since electricity and transportation are the largest sources of the State's GHG emissions, that we need a dramatic increase in the rate at which we implement energy efficiency and non carbon-based energy sources, and develop a less carbon-intensive transportation system.

2009 – HB 2001 Initiates Scenario Planning

In Section 37 of the Jobs and Transportation Act, the legislature directed Portland Metro to develop two or more alternative land use and transportation scenarios which can accommodate planned population and employment growth while achieving a reduction in GHG emissions from light motor vehicles. Further, it said that Metro shall select one scenario and local governments shall amend their comprehensive plans and land use regulations implementing the plan consistent with the adopted scenario.

The Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT) and the Department of Land Conservation and Development (DLCD) were identified in the bill as the agencies to provide technical assistance and grants for conducting scenario planning. LCDC, through rulemaking, was charged with establishing a GHG reduction target for Portland Metro.

HB 2001 further sets the stage for scenario planning in metropolitan areas by requiring LCDC to adopt rules by January 1, 2013 that establish a process for the Portland Metro Area to cooperatively select a land use and transportation scenario and a process for the adoption of regional or local plans to implement the scenario. The legislature directed LCDC and ODOT to report to the House and Senate Interim Committees by February 1, 2014 with recommendations about how to extend the scenario planning requirements to other metropolitan areas with populations greater than 200,000.

Section 38 of the bill, also establishes a scenario planning schedule for the Eugene – Springfield metropolitan area, directing the Central Lane MPO to develop two or more alternative land use and transportation scenarios by January 2013.

2009 – HB 2186 Creates Task Force to Study Scenario Planning in Other MPOs

In 2009, the legislature established a Metropolitan Planning Organization GHG Emissions Task Force (Task Force) charged with studying scenario planning to reduce GHG emissions and making recommendations to the 2010 Oregon Legislature. The Task Force found that revising transportation and land use plans in metropolitan areas would be a necessary part of a broader statewide effort to achieve a reduction in GHG emissions from light motor vehicles (10,000 pounds or less). The Task Force identified several important attributes of scenario planning that were necessary for the effort to be effective and to provide flexibility to local governments reflecting the differences in metropolitan areas authorities, resources, geographic situations and aspirations. Further, the Task Force recommended that scenario planning should build on ongoing planning efforts, be iterative, phased, and finally be tied to the availability of adequate funding.

2010 – SB 1059 Moves Scenario Planning and GHG Target Reduction Forward

Based on the recommendations of the Task Force the 2010 legislature adopted SB 1059 which is a comprehensive bill aimed at reducing greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions from the transportation sector. The legislation named ODOT and DLCD as the lead agencies in implementing its requirements. ODOT and DLCD are to:

• Coordinate and consult with stakeholders, local governments, MPOs and other state agencies to develop a state-level strategy to reduce GHG emissions from transportation for adoption by the Oregon Transportation Commission

• Develop a toolkit to assist local governments and MPOs in reducing GHG emissions from
transportation through transportation and land use related actions and policies

• Develop guidelines for scenario planning and provide information and technical support

• Set transportation-related GHG reduction targets for areas served by MPOs for adoption by the Land Conservation and Development Commission.

2011 – Oregon Sustainable Transportation Initiative is Established

Two bills, HB 2001 and SB 1059, passed by the legislature in 2009 and 2010 lead to the creation of the Oregon Sustainable Transportation Initiative (OSTI). HB 2001, the Jobs and Transportation Act adopted during the 2009 session covered a range of transportation activities and program. Specific to GHG emission reductions, the legislature provided direction to the Portland Metro region to undertake scenario planning and adopt a preferred scenario by 2013 which meets LCDC’s GHG emissions reduction target. The legislation also directs the Central Lane MPO, which includes Eugene and Springfield, to develop modeling capability and to undertake scenario planning on or after January 2013.

The 2010 Oregon Legislature passed Senate Bill 1059, a statewide, comprehensive bill aimed at reducing GHG emissions from transportation. SB 1059 named ODOT and DLCD as the lead agencies in implementing its requirements. Combined, HB 2001 and SB 1059 led to the creation of Oregon Sustainable Transportation Initiative (OSTI).

OSTI is being done in consultation with the Department of Environmental Quality, and the Oregon Department of Energy. Policy and Technical Advisory Committees aid in the review and development of the work.

The main components include:

• **Statewide Transportation Strategy:** Sets Oregon’s vision for the transportation systems, vehicle and fuel technologies and urban form that will reduce light vehicle transportation sector GHG emissions. To be adopted by OTC upon completion.

• **Targets:** Established GHG reduction targets for light vehicles for metropolitan planning areas.

• **Scenario Planning Guidelines:** Guidelines being developed to help metropolitan areas with land use and transportation planning, including a step-by-step technical guide to addressing GHG emissions reduction targets.

• **Toolkit:** A searchable database of programs and actions that can be implemented to reduce GHG emission from light vehicles.

• **Public Education Plan:** A plan to inform the public about the costs and benefits of reducing GHG emissions from light vehicle travel.

2011 – Oregon Global Warming Commission (OGWC) Identifies Transformational Themes

OGWC releases the Road Map to 2020, a multi-sector report on climate change, and reports to the 2011 legislature that getting to the 2050
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Increased bicycle ridership will help to reduce VMT, and GHG emissions.
GHG reduction goals will not be achieved by incremental thinking and actions, but rather by transformational ideas. Transformational ideas such as in the 1970s, when we reconceived “energy efficiency” as comparable to a new electricity generating plant because it directly displaced the need for that plant’s output. The consequence of that idea has been regional efficiency investments saving ratepayers over $2 billion annually in avoided energy costs.

One transformational theme recommended by the OGWC is to “leverage the inherent carbon efficiencies of cities density and good urban design lend themselves to carbon efficient travel (transit; biking; walking) and places to live, shop, work and play. Designing “complete communities” that integrate these uses into landscapes and amenities will add to public health and quality of life values as it improves carbon efficiency.”

2011 – GHG Reduction Targets Adopted

At its May meeting, LCDC Adopts GHG Reduction Targets for Metropolitan Areas recommended by the Target Rule Making Advisory Committee and informed by the Agencies Technical Report.

Going Forward

• 2012 – By January 2012, Metro must develop two or more scenario which meet the GHG reduction targets.

• 2012 – By February 2012, ODOT, DLCD and Metro must report their progress in developing land use and transportation scenarios to meet targets.

• 2013 – By January 2013, LCDC must adopt rules providing guidance to the Portland metropolitan area on a process for selecting a preferred land use and transportation scenario and a schedule for amending local plans to carry out a preferred scenario.

• 2013 – On or after January 2013, the Eugene-Springfield MPO is to begin scenario planning.

• 2014 – By February 1, 2014, LCDC and ODOT shall report to the legislature on progress.

For more information about the OSTI program or to access the reports and legislation outlined in this article go to the project website at: State of Oregon: Oregon Sustainable Transportation Initiative (OSTI) http://www.oregon.gov/ODOT/TD/OSTI/.

Mary Weber is the Climate Change Outreach Specialist with the Department of Land Conservation and Development.
Metropolitan Greenhouse Gas Reduction Targets

By Mary Weber, Department of Land Conservation and Development and Stephanie Lawson Millar, Oregon Department of Transportation

Oregon’s six metropolitan areas now have targets for reducing greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions from the transportation sector. The targets, adopted May 19, 2011 by the Land Conservation and Development Commission (LCDC) are designed to work together with scenario planning to guide metropolitan areas as they try to meet the State’s GHG reduction goals.

The State’s focus on GHG emissions reduction targets and scenario planning are the result of two bills, HB 2001 and SB 1059, adopted by the 2009 and 2010 legislatures respectively. The legislature directed LCDC to determine how much emissions from light vehicle travel would have to be reduced for the state to be “on track” to meet its 2050 goal. Among the factors LCDC had to consider was vehicle technology, fuels, and the vehicle fleet mix. The Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT), Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ), and Oregon Department of Energy (ODOE) helped to provide information about how changes to these factors might contribute to achieving a reduction in GHG emissions.

In June 2010, LCDC appointed the Target Rulemaking Advisory Committee (TRAC) to help set targets and develop the required administrative rule. LCDC chair John VanLandingham was appointed the TRAC chair and was joined on the committee by elected officials from metropolitan areas across the state, as well as representatives from key state agencies and other stakeholder groups. The TRAC met seven times to review statute, consider technical information and ultimately recommend targets to LCDC. Based on its review of the technical information provide by ODOT, DEQ, and ODOE in the Agencies’ Technical Report (ATR), the TRAC reached the following conclusions about the legislatively mandated considerations:

To meet the State’s 2050 GHG reduction goal of 75%, GHG emissions need to be reduced 52% by 2035.

Expected improvements in vehicle technology, fuels, and changes to the vehicle fleet should accomplish most but not all of the needed GHG reduction. The TRAC recommended the following assumptions about improvements in the vehicle technology, fuels, and vehicle fleet be used in setting the targets:

- Average vehicle mileage will increase to about 60
mpg in 2035;

• There will be continued improvement in low carbon fuels, and;

• A modest decline in the percentage of light trucks (pickups and SUVs) in the vehicle fleet is expected.

Based on consideration of these factors, the TRAC recommended that GHG reduction targets for the state’s metropolitan areas be set at a range of 17% to 21% per capita as measured from 2005 emission levels. Only Portland Metro is required by HB 2001 to develop scenarios to meet the targets.

The adopted rule also incorporates recommendations from the TRAC on a number of other issues related to scenario planning:

• Targets are expected to be met through a combination of state and local actions.

• LCDC is required to review the rule by June 2015 and at regular intervals thereafter to consider new information and the results of scenario planning.

• Success of scenario planning depends on state financial and technical support.

The target rule recognizes that the GHG reduction targets are part of an iterative process to determine the most effective ways the state and local governments can reduce GHG emissions and meet the 2050 goal. The reduction targets reflect the best available information today and will be a guide for an initial round of scenario planning, the results of which will inform both state efforts and reconsideration of the rule by LCDC in 2015.

Stephanie Lawson Miller is Senior Transportation Planner with the Oregon Department of Transportation. Mary Weber is the Climate Change Outreach Specialist with the Department of Land Conservation and Development.
Scenario Planning for GHG Reduction

By Mary Weber, Department of Land Conservation and Development and Stephanie Lawson Millar, Oregon Department of Transportation

Long-range planning in Oregon is about to get more interesting for Oregon’s metropolitan areas. In 2009, the Oregon Legislature passed HB 2001, the Jobs and Transportation Act. HB 2001 requires Metro and Central Lane MPO to conduct scenario planning. Scenario planning is a way to identify activities that will help regions explore options to reduce greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions from light vehicles. Scenario planning isn’t new in Oregon, but using it to estimate reductions in GHG emissions from improvements in transportation technology, mode choices and land use changes offers a new twist.

Scenario planning allows metropolitan areas to explore how a variety of actions might impact our future and help us reach our goals. Scenario planning is an opportunity for metropolitan areas to engage in a “vision level” strategic plan to support plan updates. Scenario planning for GHG emission reduction evaluates combinations of factors such as land use, technology, and transportation system alternatives. Through this exploration, participants can:

1. Identify policy themes, actions and programs,
2. Begin to plan for anticipated growth, and
3. Develop strategies to optimize outcomes by comparing different choices and potential consequences.

Scenario planning helps to figure out “what it would take” to significantly reduce GHG. It is also an opportunity to address other community goals and emerging issues such as energy independence. Local governments will work through a cooperative process to develop scenarios. The Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT) and the Department of Land Conservation and Development (DLCD) are providing support through the development of Scenario Planning Guidelines, a GHG Reduction Toolkit, the GreenSTEP model (see GreenSTEP) and technical advice and support.

Portland Metro has already begun its scenario planning efforts and is working with ODOT and DLCD through an iterative process. Central Lane is starting to outline their process. Outside Portland Metro and Central lane, scenario planning is voluntary but encouraged. A reference case, based on a forecast of where existing policies and plans are likely to lead, serves as a basis for comparison.

A Scenario Planning Technical Advisory Committee has been meeting with DLCD and ODOT staff since November 2010 to help create scenario planning guidelines which will be used by other metropolitan areas. The draft framework for the scenario planning guidelines outlines six steps:

1. Reach agreement on a scenario planning process
2. Establish evaluation criteria

3. Set up for scenario planning and evaluation tools

4. Create base and reference case

5. Develop and evaluate alternative scenarios

6. Select a preferred scenario

State and local staff identified a number of challenges with conducting scenario planning. For example, tools are still being developed. There are also numerous political issues that MPOs, counties and cities must address to engage policy makers, stakeholders, and the public. Finally there is recognition that the scenario planning process is not linear but rather iterative and is a political process and technical exercise.

A draft of the Scenario Planning Guidelines is anticipated in August 2011, with a final version by the end of the year. For more information please visit Scenario Planning and Scenario Planning Guidelines or contact Bob Cortright, 503.373.0050 x241 or via email at bob.cortright@state.or.us.

Stephanie Lawson Miller is Senior Transportation Planner with the Oregon Department of Transportation. Mary Weber is the Climate Change Outreach Specialist with the Department of Land Conservation and Development.
Six Case Studies of Land Use and Transportation Scenario Planning in Oregon

A number of regional planning efforts have helped to inform the development of the scenario planning guidelines. The background report, Alternative Land Use and Transportation Scenario Planning Analysis: A Review of Six Case Studies in Oregon (December 2009), prepared by Fregonese Associates describes six major scenario planning efforts in the state:

Making the Land Use, Transportation and Air Quality Connection Study (LUTRAQ) grew out of a proposal by Washington County and the Oregon Department of Transportation to build a Western Bypass in 1988. What began as opposition to the bypass project evolved into a comprehensive planning effort to analyze five alternatives to accommodate growth projections on the west side of Portland. The project helped develop state-of-the-art transportation modeling to better forecast travel behavior associated with land use patterns and was instrumental in encouraging the development of integrated land use and transportation development scenarios across the country. LUTRAQ was the first time a land use alternative was included in a Draft Environmental Impact Statement for a new highway project. The project advanced modeling innovations and assisted in the planning and evaluation of the Westside light rail.

The Metro 2040 Growth Concept is the Portland metropolitan region’s 50-year strategy for managing growth. The successful adoption and implementation of the 2040 Growth Concept formed a policy foundation that led to more efficient use of land, redevelopment, high transit use, and reduced regional vehicle miles traveled in the Portland metropolitan region. The successful implementation of the 2040 Growth Concept was aided by state requirements to review the 20-year land supply for accommodating the projected household and employment growth within the urban growth boundary. In addition, Metro has a unique home-rule charter that allows the regional government to direct, fund, and mandate growth management at the regional level with the Regional Transportation Plan and locally through its Urban Growth Management Functional Plan.

The Eugene-Springfield Metropolitan Area Transportation Plan, referred to as TransPlan, guides regional transportation system planning and development in the Eugene-Springfield metropolitan area. TransPlan includes provisions for meeting the transportation demand of residents over a 20-year planning horizon. The process began in 1992 and the plan was adopted in 2001. During Phase 3 of the process, which began in 1995, six alternative plan concepts were reviewed. Though TransPlan was adhering to a state and federally required update process, it went beyond those requirements to look at quality of life, land use, and economic opportunity. It was the goal of TransPlan to provide a transportation system with seamless connections between modes, several mode choices, and to create a transportation system that relied less on the automobile. TransPlan is expected to decrease vehicle miles traveled per capita by eight percent and increase non-auto trips by 29 percent compared to future trend conditions over its implementation cycle.

Salem Futures was a long-range planning effort that began in 1998 to develop an integrated land use and transportation plan to guide future development in the City of Salem. The planning effort developed a series of land use and transportation alternatives. Through modeling and analysis, the city staff recommended a preferred alternative scenario for adoption. Ultimately, the city council adopted a set of policies that resembled the base case scenario during the update of the city’s comprehensive plan in 2009. Despite never implementing the preferred alternative which called for a significant expansion of the Salem-Keizer Urban Growth Boundary, Salem is experiencing infill and redevelopment due in part to a policy tool that has been in place for 30 years, an urban service area designation. The urban service area focuses growth in the central city where existing infrastructure can support new development, and outside the boundary developers must pay for new infrastructure as determined by the city.

The Central Lane Region 2050 began in 1999 out of a desire to manage increased growth in the region, especially outside of the Eugene-Springfield metropolitan area. The planning process took approximately seven years and analyzed possible development scenarios. The project resulted in the creation of tools for local jurisdictions and produced strong technical work, but ultimately the negotiations broke down and a regional planning strategy was never adopted. As a result, there has not been a strong regional vision to guide policy in the region since the last comprehensive plan 20 years ago. The jurisdictions involved in the process did not share a common perception of the benefits of participation, and the length of the process made it difficult to sustain involvement and commitment. The jurisdictions needed incentives or enforcement to remain engaged in the process. The region is now shifting towards local planning rather than a regional approach.

The Bear Creek Valley Regional Problem Solving process began in 2000 when the Rogue Valley Council of Government was awarded a Regional Problem Solving (RPS) grant from the Oregon Department of Land Conservation and Development. The Bear Creek Valley RPS process is now in the final phase of completion with seven of the eight participating jurisdictions expected to adopt local land use policies and ordinances in accordance with the regional agreement by 2010. The RPS effort shows how a region can take state mandated goals and work together to reach agreement on local implementation strategies. This sense of local control through regional collaboration appealed to the participants. The considerably long process resulted in discontinuity among participants, as elected officials changed hands, and other participants moved in and out of the negotiations. Continuing education of participants, evolving leadership, and serious commitment including millions of dollars in direct and indirect dollars were needed to move the process along. Specific targets and a timeline for completion would have also helped move the process forward.
The Statewide Transportation Strategy

By Stephanie Lawson Miller, Oregon Department of Transportation

The Statewide Transportation Strategy (STS) is a long-range vision to help guide the state’s efforts to meet its goal of reducing greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions from the transportation sector. The strategy is being developed through scenario planning at the state level. It will describe the general characteristics of transportation systems, vehicle and fuel technologies and land use patterns anticipated to be necessary to meet the goal of reducing GHG emissions by 75% from 1990 levels by 2050. The strategy will include recommendations for new policies, or significant changes to existing policies, which can be integrated into existing transportation planning processes.

Just like in scenario planning, factors (or “levers”) are used in modeling various scenarios, in this case at the state level. By increasing the relative influence of different scenario input factors, the model can suggest which policies and actions will have the greatest impact in achieving the State’s GHG transportation reduction goals.

The emerging scenarios will be evaluated based on such things as:

- Travel and System Performance
- Energy Consumption and GHG Emissions
- Economic Impact
- Land Use and Natural Resource Impacts
- Public Health Impact
- Infrastructure and Implementation Costs
- Potential Implementation Risks

In total the STS process asks and answers the following questions:

1. What will the future look like in terms of fuel prices, technology, fleet and so on?
2. What can we do to reduce GHG through transportation: e.g. pricing incentives, transit infrastructure and so on?
3. What can we do to reduce GHG in land use: e.g. through mixed use development, tightening UGBs and so on?
4. How will those changes impact our future state: e.g. economy, travel, costs, health, GHG emissions and other issues of importance to Oregonians?

The STS will not set hard and fast targets or rules, but rather it will plot a general course of action for achieving goals based on current knowledge, analysis, and reflection. It is one step in an iterative management process, which will involve evaluation of the relative success of policies and actions put into place to reduce emissions, and the improvement of methods and tools for evaluating prospective actions to reduce emissions. The STS is anticipated to be ready for adoption by the Oregon Transportation Commission (OTC) in June of 2012.

Stephanie Lawson Miller is Senior Transportation Planner with the Oregon Department of Transportation.
Greenhouse Gas Reduction Toolkit

By Stephanie Lawson Millar, Oregon Department of Transportation

There are lots of things that local governments are already doing which reduce greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions whether they realize it or not. The purpose of their efforts is more likely to be focused on good transportation and land use planning, energy efficiency, sustainability, livability or other goals but have the co-benefit of reducing GHG emissions. Finding out what more can be done to reach the GHG reduction goals, or doing what we are already doing better, will help communities to implement the goals of GHG emissions reduction.

As part of the Oregon Sustainable Transportation Initiative, a GHG reduction Toolkit is being developed. The Toolkit will include three parts:

1. A database that can be queried by local governments to come up with a variety of actions and programs, designed to be implemented locally, that reduce greenhouse gas emissions from light vehicles;

2. An inventory of some available modeling and analysis tools that can help in Scenario Planning; and

3. Information on outreach tools to inform the public about GHG reduction efforts.

The Toolkit is being assembled by ODOT and DLCD staff and a consultant team from Cambridge Systematics, with the aid of an ad hoc technical advisory committee comprised of participants from throughout the state. Five open-mic style webinars have been held since January to brief and engage the ad hoc technical advisory committee and other interested parties. These webinars have been well attended by advisory committee members working on OSTI and local government representatives. The meetings have generated helpful ideas and input to the consultants.

Toolkit Components

The types of programs and actions described in the toolkit include a variety of strategies to help communities meet their goals, such as land use strategies, street design, and marketing programs to promote bicycle and pedestrian activity. The toolkit database is being designed to incorporate new actions and programs as technology and programs evolve.

For each identified tool, the toolkit includes a full description of the given action or program and estimates based on existing research and literature of the following:

- Effectiveness of the action or program in reducing GHG emissions, expressed as a range of GHG reduction percentages.
- Cost-effectiveness of the action or program.
- Time required to implement the action or program.
• Time required for the action or program to become effective.

• Degree to which certain strategies require authority to implement beyond the authority available at the local government level.

• Information about the types of actions or programs that compliment each other and can yield synergistic or enhanced effects, for which the range of values can be reliably estimated within the allotted time of this project.

**Range of Actions and Programs**

The categories of Actions and Programs in the draft Toolkit include:

• Pricing strategies, such as adjusting local parking pricing rates. On the statewide level, an example would be moving to a statewide Pay As You Drive (PAYD) insurance system.

• Land Use and Smart Growth Actions and Programs such as infill development funding and incentives or school placement siting guidance (because strategic decisions on where to build schools impact students ability to bike or walk safely).

• Nonmotorized Transportation which includes expected things like bike and pedestrian facilities, but also Complete Streets policies and traffic calming.

• Public Transportation, such as reducing fares, providing more service, and improving transit speeds by allowing signal priority.

• Transportation Demand Management, including Eco-driving training, car sharing and transportation management associations.

• Fleet composition, which includes state level policies which could impact average vehicle age and the mix of vehicle types.

• Operations/ITS, which includes things like traffic signal optimization and arterial management, especially on the local level.

• Capacity Expansion/Bottleneck Relief for congested roadways.

• Ideas to improve the efficiency of the Multimodal Freight system including air, marine, rail and truck freight systems.

A draft of the Toolkit is anticipated in August 2011 with a final version in October. For preliminary information about the types of actions and programs that will be in the toolkit, visit the OSTI Toolkit website.

Stephanie Lawson Miller is Senior Transportation Planner with the Oregon Department of Transportation.
The GreenSTEP Model

By Stephanie Lawson Millar, Oregon Department of Transportation

The GreenSTEP model was developed by ODOT, at the request of the Oregon Global Warming Commission, to assess the effects of a variety of policies and other factors on transportation sector greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions. The initial focus for GreenSTEP development has been to model the GHG emissions resulting from household use of light duty vehicles (e.g. autos, SUVs, pickup trucks, vans). Additional modules are being developed to model GHG emissions from other modes, long distance travel, and freight.

GreenSTEP is an innovative new model that was built to support strategic planning (i.e. scenario planning) at the state and metropolitan area levels. It fills needs that are not filled by standard urban travel models. Whereas urban travel models are concerned with forecasting traffic volumes on specific roadways in urban areas, GreenSTEP is concerned with total household vehicle travel, energy consumption and GHG emissions regardless of where the travel occurs.

Because GreenSTEP is a new type of model, its development has been (and is being) peer reviewed by panels composed of state, national and international travel and emissions modeling experts. GreenSTEP has been recognized nationally by the U.S. Department of Transportation (USDOT) and by the American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials (AASHTO).

The GreenSTEP model estimates vehicle ownership, vehicle travel, fuel consumption, and GHG emissions at the individual household level. The model is designed to operate in this way in

Factors that affect GHG emissions from the transportation sector.
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order to account for how different policies and other factors (e.g. gas prices) can have synergistic effects on vehicle travel and emissions. For example, the members of a household living in a denser mixed-use neighborhood will tend to walk more and drive less; and because they tend to drive less, will be more likely to purchase an electric vehicle. In addition, estimating the effects of policies at the household level makes it possible to evaluate the equitability of the costs and benefits of different policy proposals.

With GreenSTEP it is possible to analyze the effects of dozens of factors on vehicle travel and GHG emissions. In order to manage this complexity and to avoid working with a bewildering number of scenarios, factors that are similar to one another are typically organized into categories. The following categories and their constituent factors are being used to help organize scenario development for Oregon’s Statewide Transportation Strategy for GHG Reduction (STS):

- **Urban**: urban growth, mixed-use, transit, parking, bicycles
- **Pricing**: fuel and carbon taxes, VMT tax, PAYD insurance
- **Marketing**: travel demand, management, eco-driving
- **Roads**: capacity, incident management
- **Fleet**: vehicle age, vehicle type, car sharing
- **Technology**: MPG, PHEVs, EVs, fuel type, power source

**How GreenSTEP is Being Used**

GreenSTEP is currently being used to analyze scenarios for the STS and will soon be used to assist metropolitan area scenario planning as well. GreenSTEP has also been used in the analysis required by HB 2001 and SB 1059 to assist the Land Conservation and Development Commission (LCDC) with the development of metropolitan area light vehicle GHG reduction targets.

GreenSTEP is the primary analytical tool being used to test various scenarios for the STS. The scenario development and analysis is being done in several iterations (rounds) to maximize what can be learned from the scenario testing process within time and budget constraints. To date, one round of modeling has been completed and reviewed with the STS Policy and Technical Advisory committees. A total of 144 scenarios were modeled in this first round. The scenarios to be modeled in the second round will be defined based on committee feedback and what was learned from the first round.

As previously mentioned, GreenSTEP has also been used to provide information related to the development of metropolitan area targets for...
reducing GHG emissions from light vehicles. The bills that directed LCDC to develop metropolitan GHG reduction targets also directed ODOT, DEQ and ODOE to prepare estimates and recommendations regarding light vehicle GHG emissions including:

- Estimates of metropolitan area light vehicle emissions in 1990;

- Forecasts of light vehicle emission rates in 2035 considering potential changes in vehicle technology and fleet characteristics;

- Recommendations for the reduction of metropolitan area light vehicle emissions from 1990 levels by 2035; and

- Estimates of VMT that may be accommodated in 2035 given the GHG reduction recommendations and the potential vehicle fleet characteristics in 2035.

A metropolitan area version of GreenSTEP is currently being developed by ODOT and Metro. Metropolitan GreenSTEP will allow metropolitan area planners to evaluate prospective policies as at a much finer level of geographic detail than is currently available with GreenSTEP. Planners will be able to estimate the travel and GHG effects of land use patterns and transportation services that vary by neighborhood in the metropolitan area. To do this, models and software are being created to interface GreenSTEP with sketch planning software (Envision) and a simplified version of Metro’s residential location model.

GreenSTEP will continue to be used and extended to assist with the development of the STS. It will also be an important tool to assist metropolitan area scenario planning.

Stephanie Lawson Miller is Senior Transportation Planner with the Oregon Department of Transportation.
OAPA Legislative Update

Jeannine Rustad, OAPA Legislative and Policy Advisory Committee Chair

It was anticipated that the central theme of the 2011 Legislative Session would be the budget. While there have been several bills dealing with difficult budget issues, the legislative session has presented bills concerning serious issues, including economic development, wineries and other uses on agriculture and forest lands, public participation and transportation planning. The following is an outline of some of the major issues and bills.

Economic Development

The primary bill on this front is Senate Bill (SB) 766 – one of the Governor’s priority bills. The purpose of the bill is to

• Authorize designation of regionally significant industrial areas.

• Establish an Economic Recovery Review Council and authorize the council to perform expedited site reviews for proposed industrial development projects that have state significance. Continuously appropriates moneys in fund to council for purposes of performing expedited site reviews.

OAPA was among the few initial voices in opposition. This opposition was centered on the opinion that the bill would do little to accomplish economic development, in that it failed to tackle the real issues needed to maintain a healthy industrial land base – infrastructure funding, Brownfield clean up, and site assembly. As the bill moved through the legislature, OAPA submitted additional comments addressing the technical aspects of the bill. Despite growing opposition to the bill, the bill passed and was signed by the Governor.

Two bills relating to economic development that did not gain traction this session include:

OAPA also identified seven categories in which bills are classified and considered and OAPA LPAC recommendations are based. These categories are: Urbanization Issues, Land Use Procedures, Rural Issues, Energy, Regional Planning Issues, Equity in Land Use Planning, and Destination Resorts.
SB 792, which proposed to authorize Crook, Deschutes, and Jefferson Counties to plan and designate high-value employment sites pursuant to qualifying regional economic opportunity plan; and SB 771, which would have authorized local governments to enter into cooperative agreements to plan for regional economic development and designate sites that are suitable for development of employment opportunities.

**Wineries and other uses on farm and forest land**

Wineries and other uses on farm and forest land are front and center and have gained increase attention near the final days of this legislative session. Significant bills LPAC monitored and continues to track include:

- **SB 829** – Would have replaced 2010 legislation (SB 1055) and allowed a large winery (wineries that produce 150,000 gallons of wine or more) to be established as a matter of right. However, the preferred method for dealing with large wineries is contained in SB 960. This bill did not pass. The issue of large wineries (specifically, the “King Estates” facilities) was taken care of in HB 3280. OAPA had opposed this bill, as the language was broader than that found in HB 3280.

- **SB 960** – In addition to addressing large wineries, this bill also dealt with agri-tourism by providing for conditional approval of temporary promotional events on EFU land. The bill would limit the time, scope, and duration of events. OAPA, through LPAC, has been collaborating with other organizations to attempt to reach a compromise on the bill during this session (or, in absence of a compromise, continue to work on a proposal to bring forward in 2012). OAPA has pressed for changes to the bill that will help ensure that farm operations can conduct events that support but do not harm commercial agriculture. This bill passed and was signed by the Governor.

- **HB 3280** – Is another bill dealing with wineries on farmland and is the most hotly contested bill. As with other bills, OAPA has been working with 1000 Friends and the Oregon Winegrowers Association in an attempt to find agreement. Unfortunately, actual negotiations for this bill were not open to all interested parties, including OAPA. OAPA did send a letter urging a “no” vote to all members of the House and Senate on the basis that the bill: (1) creates special rights and privileges for wineries not available to other farms; (2) discriminates between types of farm property owners and among counties; (3) significantly expands non farm related commercial events and entertainment into EFU zones; and (4) is unenforceable, confusing and uncoordinated with other legislation. The bill passed the House and Senate and has been signed by the Governor.

- **HB 3654** – Modifies criteria for siting wineries in exclusive farm use zone. The bill authorizes siting of winery in forest zones and mixed farm and forest zones. It also modifies authorized activity of winery sited in resource zone. Authorizes conditional approval of events or activities on tract of resource land that are incidental and subordinate to farm use of, or production of wine on, tract. The last action on this bill was a hearing before the Rules Committee on May 19. The bill did not pass.

Other rural issues that OAPA has weighed in on include: HB 3408, which modifies provision authorizing placement of irrigation property by certain special districts or corporations as outright permitted use on land zoned for EFU; and HB 3290, which modifies the application of farm income standard adopted by LCDC for establishing primary and accessory dwelling customarily provided in conjunction with farm use in areas zoned for EFU. OAPA had suggested making irrigation reservoirs conditional uses. HB 3408 passed allowing reservoirs as outright uses, with a limiting clause not allowing parks or other recreational structures and facilities associated with an irrigation district. HB 3290 passed, thus allowing a farm operator to satisfy the income standard by earning the required amount or more of farm income: (1) in at least three of the last five years; (2) in each of the last two years; or (3) Based on the average farm income earned on the
tract in the best three of the last five years.

**Department of Land Conservation and Development Procedural Bills**

DLCD has four bills that were adopted and signed into law:

- **HB 2129** – Modifies the process for local governments to make changes to acknowledged comprehensive plans or land use regulations.

- **HB 2130** – Modifies provision regulating periodic review of comprehensive plans and regional framework plans. The bill clarifies ambiguities concerning procedural requirements for DLCD review by clarifying what constitutes the record on review, adding a “raise it or waive it” requirement on reviews and clarifying the scope of DLCD review. As introduced, the bill included expedited review by the Court of Appeals. However, that provision was removed based on its fiscal impact.

- **HB 2131** – Modifies the criteria for establishment and review of needed housing within UGBs.

- **HB 2132** – Modifies the provisions of the pilot program that authorizes transfer of development rights between properties in areas designated as sending and receiving areas.

**Attacks on public participation**

Early on in the legislative session, OAPA expressed its opposition to several bills that would have had a chilling effect on public participation. Fortunately, none of the bills passed. These bills include:

- **HB 2181** – Provided for prevailing party attorney fee recovery (but only if the prevailing party is the applicant before the local government).

- **HB 2182** – Required that a petitioner to LUBA post a deposit to cover attorney fees and costs if the petitioner does not own the property adjacent to the property subject to the land use decision.

- **HB 2610** – Proposed to limit standing in cases dealing with needed housing, industrial development within an urban growth boundary, and aggregate mining to those who (1) own, lease or rent property within 1,000 feet of the use or (2) can establish their property will be adversely economically affected in excess of $5,000.

- **HB 3245** – Required that a person seeking to appeal a land use decision or limited land use decision to LUBA must be adversely affected by the decision.

- **SB 186** – Introduced a compromise bill, this bill would have limited right of appeal to those in the county or adjacent county of action or public agencies.

**Transportation Planning Rule**

This session saw two significant attacks on the Transportation Planning Rule (OAR 660-012-0060) – SB 672 and 795. In recognition that the Land Conservation and Development Commission and Oregon Transportation Commission have agreed to undertake rulemaking to deal with many of the issues that spurred these legislative proposals, SB 672 did not pass and SB 795 was amended to direct the rule making. More on the TPR rulemaking process can be found at www.oregon.gov/LCD/Rulemaking_TPR_2011.shtml.

**Regional Planning**

While there were several bills introduced relating to regional planning, the one bill that initially gained traction but got caught up in negotiations over other bills is HB 3615. This bill would have allowed Jackson, Josephine, and Douglas Counties to petition LCDC to establish regional definitions for agricultural and forestland for the purpose of statewide land use planning. LPAC submitted testimony in opposition on the basis that: (1) ORS 215.788 (Chapter 873), approved in 2009, already provides a means to achieve the objectives of the bill (this provision has never been used); and (2) significant fiscal impacts – notably, DLCD’s budget will be reduced by
approximately $6 million, including a reduction in DLCD’s Local Grants Program by $640,000. LPAC urged that this reduction be considered in light of the funds ($600,000) allocated in this bill. The bill did not pass.

Renewable Energy

One bill aligned with OAPA’s policy on Energy – SB 554. SB 554 would have created a Task Force on Renewable Resource Generation and Transmission Development Areas. Despite a determination that the bill would have little fiscal impact on the budget, the bill did not pass.

Budget

Both the Land Use Board of Appeals (LUBA) and DLCD will experience steep budget cuts for the upcoming biennium. HB 5034 passed and will reduce LUBA’s budget to 1979 levels, with the opportunity to review next year if case load increases. HB 5032 also was approved and will reduce DLCD’s budget by approximately $6 million, including a reduction in DLCD’s Local Grants Program by $640,000.

The 2011 Legislative Session is scheduled to wrap up at the end of June. To see LPAC’s work, visit http://www.oregonapa.org/LPAC-. Additional information on specific bills can be found at http://www.leg.state.or.us/mag/home.htm.

Jeanine Rustad is the Chair of the OAPA Legislative and Policy Advisory Committee and a Planner at the City of Hillsboro.