

**Boston Climate Action Plan Update Process**  
**Fourth Leadership Committee Meeting**  
**Tuesday January 26, 2010 - 9:00 am -12:30 pm**  
**Raytheon Amphitheater, Northeastern University**

**Meeting Summary**

This is a summary of the 4<sup>th</sup> Leadership Committee meeting. Following the summary are the detailed meeting notes; the agenda is attached at the end of the document. Please go to the Boston CAP website to see all the documents distributed prior to the meeting as well as the slide presentations from the meeting:

[http://www.cityofboston.gov/climate/committee\\_meetings.asp](http://www.cityofboston.gov/climate/committee_meetings.asp)

**I. Welcome**

Robert Gittons, Vice President for Public Affairs of Northeastern University welcomed us to Northeastern. James Hunt, City of Boston, then opened the meeting by commending work to date by the Leadership Advisory Committee, Community Advisory Committee, City consultants, and members of the community. He then pointed out that the City has secured significant funds to assist the energy efficiency/climate plan efforts, and is working with the state to secure additional Federal funds. As the Mayor enters his 5<sup>th</sup> term he is looking to take bold, transformative action.

**II. Mitigation Measures and Goal**

The City's consultants briefly presented a quantitative assessment of the mitigation program options previously suggested by the Leadership Advisory Committee and its various working groups. This mix of expanding and new programs will provide an approximate 23% reduction in Boston GHG by 2020. The floor was then opened to the Leadership Advisory Committee for questions and comments, which produced the following suggested program additions:

- A specific commercial lighting retrofit measure, which would require the installation of more efficient lighting during commercial space remodels and tenant changeovers
- Encouraging and accounting for individual behavior change that will contribute to additional GHG reductions beyond measures in other programs (e.g., utility programs), such as increased attention to vehicle maintenance, temperature settings, etc.
- A careful review of the VMT reduction programs to ensure accurate consideration of all opportunities and appropriate accounting of the GHG reduction impacts
- Including general but strong language about the critically important role of the MBTA system to Boston

**Important Reminder from Jim Hunt**—we are making recommendations to the Mayor. Once he decides on what he is going to move forward, the City will develop more

concrete details and timelines and include them in the Climate Action Plan to be released later this year. Also, many recommendations are for legal or regulatory changes that require public hearings or other public participation (e.g., for stretch code or building labeling). We did this two-step process with the Green Building Task Force.

### **2020 Goal**

The Leadership Advisory Committee was asked what level of reduction goal it would like to recommend to the Mayor. Given that the presented mitigation list will achieve 23% and that additional measures such as behavior change will add to this, the Committee agreed that a goal of 25% reduction of GHG by 2020 should be recommended (subject to the final mitigation calculations and any additional feedback from the CAC and public workshops).

### **III. Adaptation Strategy**

The City provided a brief presentation on the climate change adaptation recommendations that have been developed by the Adaptation work group. The point of adaptation is to prepare for changes in climate that are expected and that we likely have little to no control over even if we start to reduce GHG substantially and soon. Strategy discussion with the Leadership Advisory Committee provided the following comments:

- Uncertainty about the magnitude of expected changes is less than the uncertainty of the timing of those changes (e.g. we should plan for sea level rise but build in flexibility about when specific steps are taken)
- The strategy needs to more specifically reference:
  - Public health impacts
  - Food supply, other supply chains, and trade
  - Equity and social systems impacts
  - Economic/and financial impacts

The Leadership Advisory Committee agreed that the Adaptation Strategy is on the right track and at about the right level of detail.

### **IV. Community Engagement**

Members of the Community Advisory Committee presented the plans for short and long term community engagement. The short term strategy revolves around 5 workshops (one for High School aged young adults, and 4 neighborhood based) taking place in the next two months to solicit feedback on the draft mitigation and adaptation strategies, 2020 goal, and public engagement strategies from the community. The longer term strategy will involve more social marketing and targeted outreach to provide residents with tools and information to reduce their impacts, and to provide on-going feedback to the City.

The Leadership Committee suggested the community engagement workshops should allow for attendees (residents) to suggest new measures in addition to commenting on the measures already selected by the LC. They also suggested that adaptation issues should play a relatively small role in the community workshops.

## V. Draft Report Outline

The City and consultants will work with the Leadership Committee to produce two documents: an approximately 70 page detailed report and a more accessible 16 page summary for wider distribution. Initial comments from the LAC include:

- Needs to be explicit about the timeline (rollout) of different measures
- Needs to be explicit about which measures are residential and which are for commercial businesses
- Needs to be explicit about which measures individuals can do and which measure will be the responsibility of the City
- Ultimately this is a document to make recommendations to the Mayor, and needs to be written to engage the Mayor

## VI. Next Steps

Additional details of the January 26<sup>th</sup> meeting can be found in the Meeting Notes section below, including a full list of follow-up items. Immediate next steps from the meeting are:

- The City and its consultants will finalize the list of mitigation measures and perform final calculations for the achievable 2020 goal. In particular this will involve a review of the VMT reduction measures and consideration of behavior change impacts and a lighting retrofit requirement.
- The City and its consultants will update the adaptation strategies based on the LC feedback
- The City and its consultants will begin to work with the LC to draft the Recommendations Report
- The City, its consultants, and the Community Advisory Committee will finalize the agendas and materials for the upcoming Community Engagement meetings and will begin to hold the meeting (starting February 27 thru March).

**Boston Climate Action Plan Update Process**  
**Fourth Leadership Committee Meeting**  
**Tuesday January 26, 2010 - 9:00 am -12:30 pm**

**Meeting Notes**

***Welcome/Start Ups***

Welcome from Robert Gittons, Vice President for Public Affairs

- Northeastern happy to welcome this group; its work is important
- National association of universities committed to developing climate/environment action plan; Northeastern's plan is in final development stage
- Recently opened new residence hall that is LEED certified, and another building that is in the process to receive the LEED Silver rating
- Even with the focus on growth and development on campus; smaller total carbon footprint than we had in 1990.
- Princeton Review has put us on the Green Honor Roll—15 of 600 surveyed.
- Committed to supporting your efforts to ensure we have an environment that is safe and productive into the future
- Thanks to committee and to the Dukakis Center for good work

**Welcome from James Hunt, City of Boston**

Mindy Luber is at forum in Davos, Switzerland today; has been briefed on materials we'll be reviewing today.

Good news:

- Commend consultants, whole host of work coming together nicely, along with Renew Boston planning efforts.
- Renew Boston Advisory Committee kick off meeting in December; great coordination with utility partners and state partners/DOER, Commissioner joined us at the meeting
- Thanks to many who have been participating in subcommittees since last meeting
- Partnered with state to file competitive grant with US Dept of Energy for Renew Boston; we have already receive \$6.5 million, this would leverage 20+ million additional dollars; focused on Blue Hill Ave. corridor—stressed area, underserved area from energy conservation point of view; met with DOER last week, and working with MA Congressional delegation in support of that application

Bad news:

- Many of us are deeply disappointed about what happened in Copenhagen; had hoped world leaders would be able to hammer out an agreement that showed the need for global leadership on climate change; what ended up was not nearly enough, even for the beginning; what resonates is how important local and state

efforts are; importance of this committee's work, what we're doing regionally with RGGI

Back to good news:

- Mayor was sworn in January, fifth term, following a month at home recovering from knee surgery
- Looking to make transformative change in all the areas of his responsibility; reminds us about our bold agenda, plan to bring transformative change

## **Reminder about decision making process**

On Process Issues (e.g., meeting dates, location):

- Co-chairs will decide--soliciting advice from
- Committee members as needed and time allows.

On Substantive Recommendations:

- Will seek consensus (defined as unanimity) of Committee members where possible, but will note 2 or more options on issues where consensus is not attainable indicating which members support which option.

## ***Mitigation Measure Recommendations and 2020 GHG Reduction Goal***

### **Outcomes for today**

- Agreement on “draft final” mitigation recommendations Considered “draft final” because we want to show them one more time to the CAC and gather input from the community during the workshops before they are finalized
- Agreement on “draft final” 2020 GHG reduction goal
- List of ideas for how to package mitigation strategies

### **Mitigation Strategies**

#### **A few headlines:**

- There is no “silver bullet” – see slide with anticipated GHG reduction by program
- 2/3 of getting to our goal involves things that are already in the law. Will require vigilance to be sure they are all implemented.
- ¾ will depend on the federal government and state government implementing what's in their jurisdiction, ¼ in City's control
- 46% of the action is in the hands of residents when you consider transportation as part of the residential; remaining reductions will come from commercial sector
- Top 5 programs for getting GHG reduction
  - Utility Efficiency Programs (Electric) / Renew Boston
  - CAFÉ/Pavley
  - Renewable Portfolio Standard
  - Utility Efficiency Programs (Gas) / Renew Boston

- Energy Efficiency Retrofit Ordinances – *this is the only new one we are recommending that's in top 5*
- Top 5 programs for Boston specifically—new things for Boston to do
  - Energy Efficiency Retrofit Ordinances
  - VMT reduction through mass transit and parking
  - Oil heat efficiency program (at similar level to state-wide utility programs for electricity and gas)
  - Benchmarking and labeling
  - Car sharing

## Discussion

See slides for presentation of draft mitigation strategies and expected GHG reductions for each, GHG reduction goals

### **Q: Baseline assumptions assume some level of residential and job growth through 2020?**

- A: We agreed earlier that baseline for Boston emissions would be flat. Program by program, we didn't need a job-driver for growth; in new construction, we looked at 10 year historic average; used that going forward.
- Initial assumptions about flat GHG emissions growth was based on work both the state and Boston had done; vigorous meetings to ensure those assumptions were defensible

### **Q: Since there are so many existing programs in this, if the programs keep the GHG emissions flat while city grows, are we double counting (i.e. existing programs are the reason the GHG emission projection stays flat through 2020; are we counting those programs again as part of our reduction measures)?**

- Short answer is no, we are not double counting. We made careful assumptions about existing program impacts versus the incremental impacts of existing and expanding programs between now and 2020. We only counted the incremental impacts when calculating mitigation measure emissions reductions.
- This was a big issue that we walked through with the state, program by program. For example, for utilities, we asked “what can we assume is in the baseline based on current spending (\$30 million now, \$80 million by 2020)”? State was using simple trend line; for some programs, we had to make other kinds of estimates. If things are ramping up in the baseline already, you have to let it keep ramping. We think our assumptions are ok, and we're in synch with the state
- Jim: 2 things jumped out looking at the analysis. (1) We initially agreed on 20% reduction goal, but would see if we can get to 25%. With these assumptions, I'm confident we can reach higher. (2) We gloss over the existing programs. The utility program is critical to where we want to go. A total of 9% of our goal is wrapped up in existing energy efficiency programs, plus oil heat efficiency programs. But just because Boston rate-payers are paying in doesn't mean the money is being spent here. We have to make sure that we are aggressively going after what we pay in and getting the maximum out of the programs. I'm confident

we can help the utilities meet their statewide goals. *And* we have to make sure they pay attention to Boston

**Q: What is the thinking at state or city re: timelines?**

- State just hired a consultant who is doing the same exercise at the state level; we have not yet met with them. That should be done before our next meeting

**Q: Is there a commitment to look at them continuously, on ongoing basis?**

- Haven't gotten there yet; but Boston is required to revisit and update the Climate Action Plan every three years. This is the first update since 2007, and another will occur in 2013.

**Q: Where does water treatment/waste water fit in?**

- "Other" category. Pretty small relative to the rest.
- One of the issues is that Boston doesn't own a water treatment plant, the MWRA does. We pay rates at Deer Island but the numbers don't show up in Boston's GHG numbers. Same for transportation trips or food production made outside Boston.
- Carl: We do include water treatment energy use and emissions in the Boston GHG emissions inventory, and it does work out to be a very small fraction of total emissions
- Note: MWRA is involved in substantive energy efficiency and environmental improvements as well. With Jim's help and others, they have gotten to a good place.

**Q: VMT calculations—were those numbers scrubbed carefully, so many different assumptions about the transit profile in 10 years.**

- We tried to calculate the bike and car sharing numbers as accurately as possible. Then we asked what we think is a reasonable reduction of VMT by 2020 from all VMT reduction programs; took out bikes and car sharing, then set an overall goal for VMT and subtracted the bike/car sharing numbers from that and assigned the rest to parking, mass transit and other programs.
- Coordinated with transportation planning staff and their models that project VMT growth over next 20 years. Looked as though .25% growth in VMT per year for the next 8-10 years. Looking at bikes, car sharing, talking with folks at Transportation Dept., we thought it was a reasonable goal to decrease .75% from the baseline, compared to current projection of .25% growth per year (1% change per year for 10 years).
- Rick: Concerned about the .25%/year projection, seems low based on historical trends and data about vehicle purchases.
- Yes, but we got the numbers from Central Transportation Planning Staff, which also gave us the emissions.

Metropolitan Area Planning Council (MAPC) spent time working through an alternative model.

- More on this later.

**Q: Concern about taking transportation wholly out of commercial side because workplaces are important to influencing commuter behavior**

- For format of recommendations we could put commuting on commercial side; for this display of the data, it includes the portion of commuting of Boston residents to jobs in Boston
- This inventory does not include driving to city limits for commuters from outside of Boston. Frustrating methodology issue because towns in region may/may not have the infrastructure or capacity to influence commuting behavior in same way.
- Can find a way to reflect that in report; complicated to show regional impacts
- Could reflect reductions

**Q: There was no discussion of “hot spots”/areas of congestion. Do we want to look again and address reducing congestion (i.e. look again at hot spots/traffic congestion; state, employers, Boston have a responsibility for dealing with those)?**

## **GHG Reduction Goals**

### **Headlines:**

- Under Green Communities Act, the state has to set a goal between 10 and 25% GHG reduction by 2020. They are working on setting a goal.
- We initially agreed to 20%, asked if we could do better.
- 20% is on a straight line projection to 80% by 2050.
- Our program package gets us to about 23% by 2020

### **Discussion of package of strategies and goal:**

**Q: Green lease—would think it would be bigger than cool roofs. Was a number attached?**

- The thinking was that because there is so much rental housing and commercial space, that we will not be able to get the participation in the utility programs without strong efforts. Thinking of green leases as an enabler of that, so not counting those numbers separately as well

**Q: Important for the document to unpack the goals and make transparent what we’re expected to accomplish and how we’re doing against the targets.**

- We can do that; for example the numbers we’ve calculated assume number of buildings that will be improved by utility programs. We could put in targets
- With Renew Boston Advisory Committee, we’re running through state numbers, will be able to articulate number of commercial, residential, small business buildings. Will be working on this in next Renew Boston Advisory Committee

**Q: Re: Stretch Code—We had discussed increases in lighting; trying to level playing field between landlord/tenant and owner occupied buildings. Any update on % share for each? Ways to make it more palatable.**

- Would like to see a lighting standard in commercial buildings—even if it’s a recommendation to the state. Also, “you touch it, you upgrade it.”
- Have not yet crunched the numbers. That’s a little different than an energy efficiency ordinance
- Did include some language to address this: building code recommendations include working with state to make the Stretch Code more equitable.
- Absent the state doing that, does the City have the ability to create ordinance? Does that run afoul of state authority?
  - Can do zoning but not building codes
- Retrofit language—different triggers: tenant turn-over for some things; different for HVAC. That would allow us to front load the savings.
- Consider for tenant retrofit, a list of things that building owners and tenants will have to confront and deal with.
- Even if some things are linked to when buildings are sold, need offsetting investment, particularly in commercial sector; look at the utility programs to find the resources? It’s worth being clear about tenant retrofits, utility retrofits, and HVAC retrofits. Acknowledge the challenges. Don’t want to go too far without talking to people who own some of the buildings; understand them.

**Two different principles—(1) If you touch it, you upgrade it (2) encouraging people to do things they would not otherwise do without a retrofit ordinance.** The second one is tougher politically but we don’t have the first one yet as a law.

- Might be worth having the first one, similar to ADA requirements. Important to express these as 2 different ideas, even if not separated in the charts. Second one would need caps to protect investments.
- Energy retrofit ordinance has value, but need to be careful to craft it so it will make progress and get buy in from building owners.
  - Assumption that we can agree as much as possible here to programs and design elements; if the City is going to do an ordinance, there will be a whole additional public process to solicit comments

**Q: Organizing principle for the report and recommendations; there seem to be 3 categories of things:**

1. Existing programs we don’t have to do anything about, e.g., CAFÉ and Pavley
  2. State level programs that City can enhance in meaningful ways, e.g., requirement of solar ready roofs
  3. New things that are completely in the City’s control, we’re recommending that Mayor consider these.
- For expanded programs, need to emphasize the important role Boston can and needs to play, e.g.

- e.g., Renew Boston is a major enhancement of a utility program; similar for transit;
- Add more explicit language around Article 37

**Q: Needs to show something about behavior change.**

- Maybe engagement plan needs to be included here, not completely separate. Understanding that we're asking citizens of Boston to own line items in the recommendations. E.g., NY plan has # pounds of reduction per citizen.
- Could the citizen behaviors get us from 23% to 25%?
- Important to figure out how to engage all residents, businesses. CAC's role to design that strategy

**Q: Cool roof—what data is that based on? New England/northern climate data?**

- Yes; references will be cited in the Master Spreadsheet

**Q: Low Carbon Fuel Standard—is that advanced fuels?**

- It's technology and fuel neutral; and based on "life cycle" analysis

**Q: Time line: if Mayor chooses not to adopt all of these recommendations, we will already be behind schedule. Should we have some BHAGs (Big Hairy Audacious Goals) that can't be ignored?**

- Worried that we're close to being on target, need to be ahead of target in the early years. Do we need to have some things that are harder?
- Would not underestimate the difficulty of what's here. Having City focused on energy efficiency programs; leverage green economy aspects. That will be huge. There are political challenges on the commercial buildings side.
- Do you think the Mayor will accept all of this?
- Jim: He has asked you all to serve because he respects your insight and expertise; charged us at the beginning of this process to be bold; inauguration focused on transformational change. It will be incumbent on us to say what to move on early; let's begin the process.

***"Calling the Question"***

**Are there any programs related to buildings that we should not be recommending? Anything missing?**

- Would add two caveats re: labeling
  - We should tie to national standards, not adopt a different standard
  - We have a lot of tenants that pay their own electricity; building owner needs access to utility bills or it won't work in Boston; will have to deal with tenant side as well as owner side [*Note: This was raised around commercial buildings but is also true for residential buildings.*]
- Guest: We don't have much wiggle room for any of these as it relates to public comment process; are there other items that have been left off the list that we should be adding to give the numbers more of a cushion? Should we add something so that there's enough if something gets crossed out?

- So far, we have not taken that approach. Can't think of anything we took off the table that we thought was a good idea.
- If Mayor rejects some of the measures, the goal will have to change as well.
- Need a reality check. Should not just recommend things that "just get us there."
- Remember that this is a goal for 10 years, expect that other things will come along during that time; also, not an expectation that all are implemented beginning next year. Some of them are anticipated for 2015.

**Are there any programs related to transportation that we should not be recommending? Anything missing?**

- Note earlier conversation about looking again at VMT assumptions
- Stronger re: Mass transit: We need to be as strong as possible in making sure City does play a forceful role as advocate for upkeep of MBTA. This is the crux of our transportation portfolio. A lot of the process to push for better transit is multi-year, complicated. Line that up with Renew Boston focused on Blue Hill Ave... focus on bus service on that corridor; City should become a real force to advocate for debt relief;
- Again, organize around existing/enhancing/new. Make sure we have something new about bikes
- Break out parking as its own program; consider as an enhancement—recommendations to make those programs more effective
- Car sharing as a formal City strategy is new. Highlight that.
- Transit (i.e. MBTA) needs to be its own conversation. Highlight centrality of transit in City's strategy. Not because City controls, but because one of our key recommendations has to be that City plays role in advocacy as stakeholder. Everything else we do pushes people to walk, bike, take transit to get out of their cars. If transit does not work, all of our 'push' strategies will fail.
- Employer strategies –don't make big difference in carbon footprint of city but does make a huge difference in region; City needs to make that clear to employers.
- Boston Transportation Dept has articulated a visionary set of goals/actions. Consider putting their 2020 plan into this report. We may want to be clear about recommending jurisdictional issues. E.g., Boston lost seat on Board of MBTA. Do we want to recommend restoring that seat? Let's consider that.
- Impact of commuters on GHG in Boston—they contribute differently and significantly to VMT and GHG emissions, traffic congestion/mobile source pollution. Need to capture and address that outside of residential transportation bucket. Emphasize working with employers; revisit taking over state ride share program as a City program—state has not had the capacity to pay enough attention to that.
- We have ride matching/sharing. Does that capture numbers from state re: their van/ride sharing programs?
  - No state numbers, but if we get the overall goal right (which we think we do), and measure towards it; then have umbrella of programs to make as strong as we can. Obviously the economy is the biggest drive of VMT right now.

## **Are there any programs related to other/solid waste that we should not be recommending? Anything missing?**

- Jim: Those kinds of programs of very politically difficult things to do; and also relatively small from GHG reduction standpoint but very important from behavior change and community engagement viewpoint (e.g., pay as you throw, numbers of parking permits, etc.)
- Another BHAG: one of our recommendations should be that the City put in place programs to increase City's share of jobs and residents relative to state and regional share (i.e. get people to live in dense urban areas that allow small carbon footprints); 600,000 in region of 3 million, increasing to 650,000/ people moving into the city could reduce GHG reductions for region. Not saying we should grow more, but as there's growth in region, City should welcome more of the jobs, commercial buildings, etc. that would help. See SF methodology, became 10% of the GHG reductions. "Good Neighbor" Policy
- Be more specific about the role of colleges, universities, hospitals, other nonprofits (e.g. museums). Probably 15-20% of residents and employees in Boston are associated with one of these kinds of institutions.
- As part of outreach, have to pull them together in specific ways; many have shown willingness and could become leaders. E.g., when MFA reoriented entrance to Huntington Ave, it changed the way parkers thought about visiting the museum, is affecting parking and drop off
- In short term, facilities and some faculty people at colleges/universities to meet with Mayor re: specific ways they might connect to this. Those groups don't usually meet/talk and have a lot
- **May be leading to recommendation of Boston Climate Leaders recognition program**
- Cost of calorie production: The Food Project has created carbon calculator for colleges, universities, hospitals on local vs. traditional food sources. Can affect food procurement policies. UC system is now using it. Given number of students in Boston, look at potential of institutional systems.

## **Should we increase the GHG reduction goal from 20 to 25%? Any reservations**

- Formal Baseline is 1990, but assume a basically flat line from 1990 to 2010; it's also what the Mayor's 80% by 2050 goal is based on
- Assuming behavior change will get us from 23% to 25%?
- If we give substantive discussion to this and follow up on institutional recommendations, we can go to 25%.
- Where does this goal stand relative to other cities?
  - Most other US cities at 25% by 2020, but Copenhagen will be carbon neutral by 2025. Chicago is at 25% by 2020
- Is there a +/- for our numbers?
  - Yes. Everyone should take a look at the spreadsheets. Let consultants know about anything you're not comfortable.
  - Did not do a ranged analysis for each item.

No other objections or comments ... will come back to this one more time after the workshops and discussion of items raised today but **general consensus seems to favor a 25% reduction goal for 2020.**

## ***Initial Adaptation Recommendations***

### **Outcomes for today**

- Understanding of recommendations developed by working group

### **Comments by Jim McCarthy**

- Just returned from Antarctica—the grandeur of the place!!!
- Peninsula, the part that extends toward South America, reaches lowest latitude, where changes are most dramatic. Over past 5 years, collapse of ice shelves that have persisted over 10,000+years; dramatic shifts in penguins—the species most dependent on krill; on margins is where you see blooms more dramatically—the early retreat of sea ice, blooms of krill, affecting penguins and whales... penguin populations in decline; impact is quite evident
- Weather patterns—rain, which was previously beyond belief; warmer air, bringing more precipitation and coming as rain.
- Can see marks and chart when the next ice shelf is going to go.
- Not as dramatic as Artic, coldest, windiest, highest average elevation makes it cooler
- It's complex, but well accepted that the depletion of ozone has delayed the warming in some measure. As ozone problem is correcting itself, the Antarctic is expected to warm at greater rate than over past 40-50 years

### **Carl's presentation**

See slides for details.

- Jim's intro helps understand why we need to think about adaptation. The point of adaptation is to prepare for changes in climate that are expected, that we have no control over even if we start to reduce GHG enormously very quickly.
- Working group has come up with recommendations
- Recommendations in 3 sets:
  - Principles, Frameworks and Priorities: 4 recommendations in this section, including focusing on sea level rise, increased intensity and frequency of heat waves and storms as highest priority effects
  - Information, Management and Analysis: 3 recommendations in this section, including developing more Boston-specific data and considering catastrophic events
  - Measures and Planning: 5 recommendations in this section, including incorporating climate change projections in all City planning for public and private activities

**Comments/discussion: Anything important missing? Anything you're uncomfortable with, don't agree with or needs to change in some way? Is this a sufficient level of detail for this cycle of planning or do we need to reconvene work group to do something more?**

- Agree that “magnitude uncertainty” is less than the uncertainty about the time frame, so should consider the worst case scenario when planning (i.e. plan for 3 foot sea level rise, regardless of how soon it might happen)
- Jim: nice job with the recommendations
  - We said at the beginning that these would be higher level recommendations because we haven't done any planning on this before. Think this is the right tone.
  - Missing—Comment re: Recommendation 9: To a large extent we do that in development reviews, 100 year storm analysis; may be a role for City to play re: FEMA reexamination of 100 year storm/flood maps

**Missing**

- **How does climate change affect public health?**
  - Call out the public health impacts, particularly as it relates to urban heat islands
- **Large, long term effects on food supply, agriculture?**
  - Might be worthwhile to reference
  - Fellow from Columbia that wanted to come in and do that; Boston Food Policy Council felt we had local resources to do that; add recommendation from that group here?
  - There was some discussion of food security and emergency management
- **Economic impact related to shipping and trade?**
  - Call out in particular, impact on Boston, neighboring communities, impact on Boston's ability to be a trade hub
  - There is a recommendation to work with Coastal Zone Mgt, other municipalities for safety and access to Boston Harbor
- **Embedded in #6, but also put in principles, thinking about adaptation and equity**
  - Not all residents have the same access to resources for adaptation; to leave the city, to adapt their homes or business. Important to pay attention.
  - Should be a principle about how the City approaches adaptation work
- **What about also looking at social system changes**
  - We anticipate as a result of global climate change? E.g., immigration patterns, patterns related to commerce (as carbon price is established, idea of metro area may change radically so that there isn't as much commuting.
  - Include social responses to the natural system changes
  - Have had some discussions at the state level but difficult making it more concrete beyond general concern. Working Group was concerned about starting off by keeping the work relatively focused at this point. This one starts to make the inquiry bigger and bigger, when it's already big enough
  - Jim: City is good at responding to crises, but doesn't do as well with embedding those experiences into long range planning. E.g., immigration,

what's happening in Haiti and preparing city agencies to deal with situation, bringing refugees into schools, etc. It's worth trying to see if there is something we can at least learn from experiences we have already had

- **Financial impact on city**
  - Impact on property values, taxes, residents to pay for changes that can be made. What's the cost to City and residents?
  - Included in a bullet.
- **Transportation network:**
  - Massport, Logan, transit systems underground, train lines that slow down when rails expand, roadways and bridges
  - It's in there, rec #10
- Carl: someone suggested **developing a "citizen's guide to adaptation"** as part of general community engagement strategy.
- **Urban heat island effect**
  - Did anyone look at increasing amount of open space as strategy?
  - Talked about it, know about Grow Boston Greener program, but this is not exactly the same thing include this in measures of effects

### **Does this feel like the right level?**

- Jim: yes, but need to re-word so it doesn't all start with "CoB should..." Some of the greatest vulnerabilities are not in City's direct control; language re: working with state and other partners
- Education on "citizen's guide;" in NYC, already have a campaign about resident preparedness, probably related to 911. Encourages people to prepare.
  - City's office of Emergency Preparedness has also been working on this.
- Recommend looking at the 3 priority areas and do economic impact analysis.
- What are the regulatory and financial implications of FEMA lines changing? Addressing questions that are starting to pop up about residential and commercial insurance.
- Generally great idea. 2 quick thoughts... (1) There are a handful of things that need a time line attached (e.g., development on waterfront filed with BRA after a certain date..., storm water planning); (2) Have heard concerns at the intersection of adaptation and mitigation—Boston has a huge amount of non-air conditioned spaces; federally subsidized buildings were not allowed to put in central air. Individual AC units are less efficient than centralized units. Need to understand this, especially for low income residential housing stock; how much is air conditioned, able to respond to heat in energy efficient way, cost effective way. This is a big equity issue for the City, particularly in residential stock
  - 3 Tufts students are about to do some work on this very thing
  - UCS report looked at this a couple of years ago. AC in residential quarters is below national average. In high emissions scenarios, we could have 3 weeks over 100 degrees, more over 90... people who cannot control their living spaces, maybe not even owning a fan, take a huge slice of vulnerability window for people who can/can't flip the switch. Huge environmental justice issue.

### **Summing up**

- Got it at pretty much the right level of detail; should look at adding a few things (dates/time lines, a few more sub-bullets, additional recommendation re: citizen response)

## ***Community Engagement Workshop Update and Draft Public Engagement Strategy***

### **Outcomes for today**

Short term engagement:

- Shared understanding of process
- Agreement to participate as Partners and/or to identify Partners

Longer term engagement:

- Shared understanding of process and draft elements of strategy
- Feedback/ideas to share with CAC

### **Discussion of Short Term Engagement Strategy/Community Workshops**

See slide for details of presentation.

- How to get participants to add to recommendations/why not on agenda?
  - Optional open mic
  - Gather input in small groups
- Prudential Center –Pru Pay = 31 constituencies...
  - Resources from workshop
  - Boston CAN can attend as resources for pre-meetings
- Business community engagement; institutional community engagement—Rick Brian, Ted to shape at this point...
  - Organize feedback from constituencies...park that for today, need to develop a template/ppt to tell the story so we can be ambassadors
  - As partners for their employees
  - And, in long term strategy, there needs to be a business piece not just residential piece...
- Market research... why the feedback?
  - Reactions to what should be in the plan
  - More ideas from Margaret
- Comment re: engaging younger people through universities is extremely important. Think of short term goals for students—goal 4 years from where I get involved, when I graduate, what's my class's contribution to this?
- Don't lose work already happening in Boston Public Schools; similar model for high school students; Youth CAN model

## Discussion of Longer Term Engagement Strategy

See slide for details of presentation.

- Jim: has there been discussion at CAC level re: marketing?
- Get ad agency involved on pro bono basis?
- Make tag lines neighborhood friendly
- Ties to impact on health
- Impact on safety
- Design of ongoing involvement in policy
- How much focus on adaptation during workshop? Do we have enough time for that in the workshop? Communicate a few things people can do to make a difference; focus more on mitigation...may adjust agenda now that we know what's in the adaptation recommendations.... add more time for engagement strategies... what matters to you? What resonates with you and your neighbors?
- Use only video for brief presentation???
- Add demographic question about employed/unemployed...
- Lay out actions and recommendations as options, not commitments; be careful about raising expectations too high about what the City *will do*, vs. what City *will be considering* as planning continues

## Review Outline of Final Report

See outline for details.

- Plan is to produce an approx 70 page report with the details, goals, inventories, process description, community workshop results, etc.
- Also planning an approx 16 page summary, glossy with photos, stories, etc.
- All due mid-April
- Will seek LC volunteers to review draft report (chapter or whole) in detail

## Feedback

- Guest: section that highlights vibrant and resilient neighborhoods (e.g., after expanding green economy, in section on green economy)
- Guest: Prioritize recommendations by near/later term
- Audience for report: longer version for citizens?
  - No, it's for the Mayor, policy people. Smaller piece is for general public.
  - Keep in mind that this is the first step in a lot of other things that will be happening; community engagement through Renew Boston; City's official plan will come out in the fall, based largely on these recommendations; more of that will follow
- Regarding tone: How do you expect it to come across to the individual who knows there's problem but doesn't know what to do about it? Will the report help them understand "This is what the city will do. This is what's up to me. This is what I can do that will make the most difference. This is how much needs to shift for City or individuals to attain the goals?" "How much will just unfold without me, the citizen, getting too involved? Where do I really have to get involved?"
- Engaging younger people through universities is extremely important. Think of short term goals for students—goal 4 years from where I get involved, when I graduate, what's my class' contribution to this?

- Building on audience question—may want to think about tailored short pieces. 1 tailored to residents, 1 tailored to small/large business community
  - Resource crunch re: two separate documents, but can, within the shorter piece, have sections for different audiences
- Organize the 16 page summary around “what the city can do” and “what you can do”... create little things/recommendations for each group.
- Images – images of Boston and 100 year floods are eye openers; house image with mitigation measures... have it done up more professionally... Think about what is on cover, what goes where
- Maybe rather than 16 pages glossy, deliver it electronically rather than hard copy.
- **We were asked to make recommendations to the Mayor. That’s the audience. There’s a way to make them in a way that isn’t just about mitigation and adaptation. It’s about Mr. Mayor, this is what you need to do to move the city. This is really big and important and you have an opportunity to move it through in a different way, and these are the pieces!**
  - Not only set big goal, set sub goals... here are some examples
  - Engage the business and institutional community in things they can do before the regulatory process is completed
  - Engage Boston residents
  - Use the City’s regulatory power to put in place a framework for buildings and transportation
  - Also, don’t want to lose what we’ve said about affinity/engagement groups, citizen involvement, etc.
- Jim: There is a way to do what is suggested above... Green Building Task Force report follow similar structure; we’re now on an aggressive time line; staff and consultants are going to be working fast; let us know if you want to be a reviewer on specific sections

## **Next Steps**

- Take another look at VMT assumptions and MAPC’s alternative methodology for calculating baseline (Rick)
- Look again at hot spots/traffic congestion; state, employers, Boston have a responsibility for dealing with those trips
- Everyone is welcome to come to the Renew Boston Advisory Committee meetings
- Working Groups to take in today’s discussion and adjust recommendations accordingly
- Redline the Adaptation recommendations (may/not go back to Working Group) then to LC for final approval
- Check in with Margaret re purpose of feedback in workshops
- Marketing professional on *pro bono* basis for help with tag line?
- Seek LC volunteers to review draft report (chapter or whole) in detail; let us know if you want to be a reviewer on specific sections

- March 23, which was already scheduled; would like to have first half as joint presentation re: what we learned in the community workshops together with CAC; then LC meeting re: changes based on feedback
- April 8—last meeting, review full draft, celebrate

### ***Meeting evaluation***

#### Pluses

- Great materials sent out before hand; well put together
- Location
- Ability to incorporate our feedback without appearing defensive

#### Deltas

- Pipe cleaners, quotes
- Hot water
- Print outs in room for guests

**Boston Greenhouse Gas Plan Update Process**  
**Fourth Leadership Committee Meeting**  
**Tuesday January 26, 2010 - 9:00 am -12:30 pm**  
**Raytheon Amphitheater, 240 Egan Research Center**  
**Northeastern University, 120 Forsyth St. Boston (#60 on map below)**  
<http://www.northeastern.edu/campusmap/printable/campusmap.pdf>

**Co-Chairs, Mindy Lubber, CERES and Jim Hunt, City of Boston**

Co-Facilitators: Dr. Jonathan Raab, Raab Associates and  
Cynthia Parker, IISC

**Meeting Agenda**

- 9:00 Welcome and Introductions—Committee Co-Chair Jim Hunt, City of Boston
- 9:10 Overview of Agenda—Jonathan Raab
- 9:15 Mitigation Measure Recommendations and 2020 GHG Reduction Goal –Jonathan Raab
- 10:25 Break
- 10:40 Initial Adaptation Recommendations —Carl Spector, City of Boston
- 11:25 Community Engagement Workshop Update and Draft Public Engagement Strategy—Cynthia Parker and CAC Members
- 12:05 Review Outline of Final Report
- 12:20 Next Steps
- 12:30 Adjourn

## Documents Distributed

- 1) Agenda
- 2) Read Carefully
  - a. Mitigation recommendations/descriptions
  - b. Initial WG Adaptation recommendations
  - c. Draft Long-Term Public Engagement Strategy
  - d. Final LC Report—Draft Outline
- 3) Background Documents
  - a. Mitigation measure spreadsheet
  - b. MIT Adaptation background document