

**Boston Greenhouse Gas Plan Update Process  
Third Leadership Committee Meeting**

**September 15, 2009**

**New England Aquarium, Boston  
Meeting Summary**

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

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

# Meeting Summary

## Meeting Topics

During this meeting, we developed a shared understanding of:

- Highlights of the first Community Advisory Committee meeting and their thinking about behavior change strategies and considerations for designing climate action strategies.
- Proposed mitigation strategies for the building energy use and transportation sectors, based on the work of our Working Groups
- Definitions of “green jobs” and the city’s current involvement with green job development and training
- Update on the Commonwealth’s process for adaptation

## Parking Lot

- Because we’ve started off organized around buildings and transportation, there are things that don’t fall neatly into either category, such as social marketing; strategies for getting people to move into Boston which will reduce the regional and city footprint (through higher density and less commuting); and waste/recycling issues. What’s the structure of our committee’s work to capture that?
- Consider integrating/describing strategies across working groups, but by sector (e.g. integrated residential strategies)
- Review research on impact of social marketing strategies with and without economic incentives

## Next Steps

- Consider inviting someone from the British consulate to meet with us about the UK system for benchmarking/labeling buildings
- Rick/David – share paper about tenant improvements, building codes and processes (from Portland, OR)
- Share report/data the city has gathered regarding car sharing with the Transportation Working Group
- Share Jim’s report about inter-agency public works
- Working groups will continue to refine mitigation strategies
- LC Liaisons to CAC should consider how to best engage the CAC moving forward, and consider whether and how LC recommendations will resonate with CAC members (and the Boston community in general)

**Next meeting: November 5, 2009.** Topics to include: Adaptation; Fine-tuned mitigation proposals; more discussion of cross-cutting issues; adaptation

## Key Comment Summary by Recommendation Subject

### Buildings

#### Lead by Example

- Ensure LBE rule language is explicit about requiring LEED certification, rather than allowing building to only meet LEED criteria for certification
- Ensure LBE rules or LEED requirements are explicitly tied to GHG reduction, e.g. by being more prescriptive around criteria that have greater GHG reduction potential

#### Performance-based Incentives

- The suggestion to think more about the relationship between the tax code and the existing building stock is good; the Leadership Committee should research and develop a concept that is self funding, e.g. a feebate.
- Any incentive program, or disincentive program, needs to carefully consider the “cost of doing business in Boston” and ensure this cost is not unduly or prohibitively increased (i.e. there is a political/legal overlay to these measures, in addition to the economic and GHG reduction considerations).

#### Green Roofs

- The grid issues related to interconnecting with the Boston downtown network need to be resolved sooner rather than later, for renewable energy in general

#### Other Measures

- Consider piloting Green Lease language with Community Development Corporations
- Think about how to revise the MA Stretch Code to be flexible enough to work for Boston (i.e. revise some requirements and then Boston will adopt the stretch code)
- Develop separate Residential and Commercial strategies and then bring the two together. Consider who is left out during this exercise, and determine how to include them

### Transportation

In general, build off the existing Access 2000 plan previously developed by the City

#### Parking

- On-street parking should turn over regularly, it should not be used for long term parking
- It is realistic to strive for all Boston households to live comfortably with at most one car and use walking, biking, transit, and car sharing for most transportation needs
- Also need some additional parking strategies
  - Develop a graduated fee scale for residential permits (i.e. successive permits are more expensive)

- Tie vehicle size (which correlates generally with mpg) to cost of permit (i.e. larger vehicles require more expensive permits)

#### Transit First and Transportation Demand Management (TDM)

- Create a City position for a TDM coordinator/czar with similar visibility and responsibility to the Bike Czar
- Ensure wider distribution of vehicles for car sharing (e.g.. City take responsibility, via RFP or other method, to place cars in more locations, including those that may not be economically desirable for private car sharing business models)
- Seriously consider removing car lanes and replacing with pedestrian streets, bikes lanes, and dedicated bus lanes.
  - This is just as much about increasing bike and foot traffic and as decreasing car traffic and driving convenience

#### **Green Jobs**

- Green jobs issues resonate with community members; when making recommendations, the City and LC need to recognize that there is mix of union and non-union interests

#### Training

- The City is expanding support for existing programs to train facilities managers (important for building energy use) and beginning new programs for energy auditors
- The auditor training is intended to pull in existing, independent local contractors, who are already engaged in most home construction projects

#### **Other Issues**

The Leadership Committee needs to begin to consider how the final recommendations can be realistically implemented in actual Boston neighborhoods, where values, understanding, expectations, and priorities may be dramatically different from those of the LC. The interaction between the LC and the CAC is crucial in this effort.

The LC also needs to begin to consider how to bring the multiple, distinct recommendations together into a cohesive and encompassing GHG reduction plan. The LC should consider creating a new subcommittee on strategy development.

Proper sequencing of the roll-out of the finalized recommendations will be key to the success of the overall GHG reduction strategy and plan (i.e. need to adequately develop alternatives for the things that are removed, e.g. improve/expand transit in conjunction with graduated fees for parking permits)

## Detailed Meeting Notes

The following information is based largely on the discussions that took place at the Leadership Committee meeting. To view the information that was presented at the meeting, please visit the initiative's web pages, which include additional meeting notes, powerpoint slides, and links to other climate action resources.

Leadership Committee

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

Community Advisory Committee

<http://www.cityofboston.gov/climate/CAC.asp>

### ***1. Introduction***

#### ***Opening Co-Chair comments***

James Hunt, City of Boston, welcomed the group and gave a brief update of activities since the last meeting. Key points included:

- Jim plugged the Aquarium and encouraged all to visit the Marine Mammal Center and Harbor Walk created by City and Aquarium. It speaks to the great environmental work going on at the Aquarium and around the city.
- Working groups have been meeting since our last meeting.
- The Community Advisory Committee had its first meeting..
- The City has been coordinating with the state's process on mitigation and adaptation, to ensure the Leadership Committee can make use of information developed by the state.
- Another key issue is moving forward on a parallel track: catalyzing energy efficiency. The Renew Boston pilot launched in June with 160 homes. The city recently received stimulus funds from the U.S. Department of Energy. .

### ***2. Community Advisory Committee***

Rebecca Park led off with a description of the enthusiasm, diversity and careful thinking of CAC members. Cynthia then offered some highlights from the meeting:

- 4 of 6 Leadership Committee Liaison Working Group helped to prepare for the first CAC meeting on September 1
- 40+ participants (36 of 38 CAC members, several guests and City Hall staff)
- The group offered feedback on initial set of engagement/behavior change strategies and on the GHG reduction goals and mitigation focus areas for buildings and transportation.
- The group suggested a joint meeting with Leadership Committee.

Summary of messages that support behavior change, drawn from multiple disciplines, including environmental action, public health, community organizing, organizational development, and behavioral economics:

- There is a problem and it must be addressed.

- Change is possible.
- We need you for the community to succeed.
- We're making progress.
- There's something in this for you.
- Change is not as hard as you might think. (And, not changing is costlier than you'd like.)

The CAC also articulated a number of considerations to take into account when designing mitigation strategies:

- Awareness, norms and behavior are different in different neighborhoods.
- Barriers to taking climate action are different for people in different situations.
- Disparities exist among neighborhoods. Whatever we develop should work to end current disparities and not create new ones.
- We should expect that different messages will resonate with different groups. Messages and ways to get involved should be tailored.
- Since we are discussing long term goals (for 2020 and 2050), we have to educate and involve children and youth, who will be the adults by the time our goals are realized.

Jim added a few observations, having delivered the kickoff at the CAC meeting.

- Viki said at the initial Leadership Committee meeting that we need to inspire people. With the energy and amount of participation in the CAC meeting, I walked out completely inspired about how much people from different neighborhoods, different knowledge bases, different ethnic and socio-economic backgrounds came together for an incredible conversation. I encourage you to go to the meetings and listen in.

### **3. Priority Mitigation Strategies – Buildings**

In our last meeting, we identified topics and priorities. The Working Group has met twice since last LC meeting to develop mitigation strategies, recognizing that Boston and MA have been leaders for a while. The following recommendations reflect the WG efforts to maintain those positions of leadership by expanding and adding to the current good work.

#### **Recommendation: City leading by example in city buildings (includes BRA, BHA, etc.)**

##### **Comments, questions and answers**

- LEED certification—Does it “meet Gold standards” or “achieve Gold certification?” Studies show that if you don't go for certification you slip and don't achieve what the designer has in mind.
  - Work group has not discussed this.
  - Jim's comment—in crafting zoning standard for private construction we do not require certification, but municipal projects will be certified LEED Silver—holding ourselves to a higher standard, as specified in the Mayor's

- 2007 executive order. Roosevelt School in Hyde Park will be the first project to meet LEED Silver, may even achieve LEED Gold.
- Suggestion: “be certified for Silver and achieve Gold standard.”
  - Response: if we are leading by example, we should certify for Gold
  - There are intersections between buildings and transportation, including how buildings are designed and located.
    - Do we want to encourage buildings toward transit-oriented development? Could that be encouraged more, have it in the building section relative to municipal buildings?
    - Might also say that we will link transportation-related amenities for private facilities, same for municipal. E.g., facilities for bicycles.
    - Response: LEED covers a lot of those things related to transit, bikes, etc.
  - Suggestion: CDCs are doing a lot of buildings still. Does it make sense to set goals related to energy efficiency/performance standards for their buildings?
    - Jim: City does not have direct authority, but can often impact the project in some way: access to land, financing from feds, direct funding. Green Affordable Housing program requires they meet LEED standards, not certified, and requires Energy Star ratings or meeting certain ASHRAE standards, depending on the kind of project.
  - Hope we would find ways to use carbon metrics to tie to larger goals of cutting carbon footprint. We could do some of these things and still see carbon go up. Use that “carbon price tag” to prioritize actions. Broader comment for this and all recommendations
    - Response: Once we had a stable portfolio of measures, the intent is to try to make some estimates of what each could save (tie the recommendation explicitly to measurable GHG reductions)
  - Jim: Agree carbon metric is important. Important to look at roof tops. “Green roofs” means different things. If we are looking through carbon lens, different choices are going to be made. E.g., Planted green roof may not be as likely to have as much of a return as white roof tops. Would be good to prioritize, with data, for municipal buildings.
    - LEED is a great system, but carbon is not its driving force. When Commonwealth started, they used LEED plus. LEED has a menu. I wonder if for city buildings we should be a little more prescriptive around things that are not in LEED. In setting an example, go beyond required points.
    - Carl: Executive Order did that two years ago. Need to look at that.
    - Jim: Other thing in the past two years, LEED has closed a lot of the loop holes on energy side. ... Utilize Green Roundtable’s expertise on this.
  - Jim: This committee will need to grapple with what “cost effective” means. Cost effective for a utility is anything that doesn’t cost more than new generation. The

city would have more of an appetite for long term pay back. This will be a challenge given fiduciary relationship with tax payers.

- Maybe work on this in next LC meeting.
- Getting ready for that, look at models in transit. They relate to public benefits, not just profit-based formula that a utility or developer might consider. What are the externalities and longer term benefits?
- We're considering recommending minimum life-cycle cost as the test for considering cost-effectiveness of major infrastructure. Opens up process to measures with 20 year pay-back period, as long as they are cost effective over their expected lives..

### **Recommendation: Performance based incentives to go significantly above building code**

#### **Comments from presenter—**

- A few comments from someone from BRA who wasn't at work group.
  - Wanted to flag that LEED goes to more things than energy. Energy Star is primarily focused on energy. If you move to Energy Star, you might miss some of the other carbon reducing options.
  - The way that the city has dealt with LEED previously is through zoning. Energy Star looks more like a building code. Need to think that through *vis-à-vis* relationship between city and state jurisdiction.

#### Comments, questions and answers

- EPA is working on a water saver rating like Energy Star. Should be happening in next year or two. The next major category we want to capture
- Re: density bonuses—example of Tufts Medical Center building that added above existing building. May be reason to include that in a retrofit
- Re: incentives:
  - Less keen on property tax abatement, but may be way to incentivize developer (e.g. if you go for LEED platinum or gold, you get through the process sooner. That wouldn't cost anything, but would be an incentive).
  - Popular in other jurisdictions. State Climate Protection Advisory committee is looking at this too. But, changing processes, dates may not help that much. Given public involvement on Section 80, moving faster might make the process more difficult. Not sure the commercial sector would reap much benefit
- Like thinking about the relationship between tax code and existing building stock. Don't have as many good tools on existing buildings, more on new construction. It's complicated—what's Boston's authority to do multi-tier tax structure?
  - Good for this group to do some research, including legal research on 2 sets of issues.
    - If it looks like building code only have 2 choices—building code or stretch code.

- If it doesn't look like building code, really looks like tax code, we could recommend home rule approach to let Boston and other communities do that. We already do a lot of tax abatements for other reasons.
- Could say anyone getting abatements for other reasons also has to meet these standards? (e.g. "If you want a tax abatement, we want carbon reduction.") Haven't heard a lot about that, would have to figure out how to implement.
- Either fee or tax reduction approach could work. How will legal people see it? As tax or as back-door building code?
- You can only have residential and commercial tax rates, not different rates within each category (by law). We could go for home rule petition.
  - Jim: From city's perspective, important that it be a self-funding mechanism. A feebate approach would need to be self-sustaining.
    - Other issue, penalizing those who perform at the lowest of the scale needs to be examined with a whole other set of policy issues. Who owns those properties if they are distressed? Equity issues. Historic preservation issues to consider. Should examine that through many lens/be mindful of other interests.
- Different facilities have different demands. E.g. labs demand more than typical commercial space. Could we look at the utility bill itself, figure out the average use of electricity per square foot and penalize or award based on the bill and how far they deviate from the average.
  - Energy Star does that. Will cover more with benchmarking later.
  - Rating is for your class of building; don't want to dis-incentivize high demand buildings
- Challenging issue re: tax abatements is relationship between how Boston grows relative to environmental goals and "cost of doing business" in Boston. How does it relate to things that are so special we think they merit tax relief? The relationship to property tax is critical; sensitive issue. Struck with the offsets that relate to Chapter 90 and thresholds that push for recognition that go outside the norm. Need to analyze about cost of doing business competitively, e.g. compared to Cambridge, nationally? Currently pushing for Silver certification without tax abatements.
  - More re: housing ordinances if abatement approaches aren't feasible or ultimately desirable
  - Jim: NYC approach is benchmarking requirement; some feebate structure to help support that; assume working group will grapple with regulations vs. incentives

## **Recommendation: Benchmarking/labeling energy performance in commercial and residential buildings**

### **Comments, questions and answers**

- Does EU model for labeling consider cost savings when determining current and potential energy “grades.”?
  - Not sure.
- Like that the EU label addresses current state and requires you to document actionable initiatives to get from current to potential.
  - It’s one thing to establish a benchmark; we also have to identify what we can do to improve efficiency and hence the rating
- This could be a performance label to build a revenue neutral system.
- How has EU scaled up the use of this rating?
  - Often in US we are talking about making it mandatory before re-sale. Can do it earlier if they want to get ahead.
  - Same in EU. Public buildings are just required to do it. This has only been in place in UK for 1 year.
  - We could get someone from the UK consulate to meet with us to discuss the program.
- Do we have enough professionals to do the ratings?
  - We’re talking about training cadre. Could be done by city or embedded in utilities or private sector, or some combination.
- Utility audits focus on action items. NSTAR expressed concerns about hitting their goals re: kilowatt hours. Don’t want to audit houses where people are not willing to make changes.

## **Recommendation: Green roof strategy development**

### **Comments from presenter—**

- We’re taking three perspectives: reflective, vegetative, and solar. They are not mutually exclusive.
- On-site renewables—zones in downtown where you cannot tie into the grid and use on-site renewable energy. Have to fix this to get more uptake

### **Comments, questions and answers**

- Some studies show PV is not cost effective here. Not the biggest bang for the buck. We have to say that as well as saying it’s out there. Study coming out in May with more data.
  - One of our recommendations is to make “solar ready roofs” – with wiring and pipes so that people can do things later. Another thing we could add to this list.

## **Recommendation: Other—Building energy codes and enforcement**

### **Comments from presenter—**

- Reduce threshold for LEED requirements from 50,000 to 25,000 square feet for new construction and major renovation
- Already ratcheting up the codes at state level. We could advocate for improving the state energy code. Working group was not totally enthusiastic about requiring stretch code (e.g., there are concerns about the requirements for onsite renewable energy generation)
- Improve self-policing... require architects, others to certify...
- Train building code officials

## **Recommendation: Other—Green Leases to overcome tenant/owner split incentive issues**

### **Comments from presenter—**

- Ways for owners and tenants to share costs and benefits; commercial and residential

## **Recommendation: Other—Residential energy conservation ordinances (RECO)**

### **Comments from presenter—**

- Berkeley and San Francisco have had RECOs in place for a long time.
- This is something we may want to consider if we want to step out ahead of NY and Chicago

## **Other ideas post working group meetings**

### **Comments, questions and answers about the last few sets of ideas**

- City leading by example: assuming Boston Public Schools would be part of that? Would be cool to have schools as a primary focus for pilots.
  - Kids are going to be the ones who have the green jobs, have to live and work in the new environment.
  - Retrofitting schools can show kids how to do it; double impact of environmental and educational impact.

**Jonathan asked the group whether we like where the Working Group is heading?** *Lots of heads nodded yes.* Anything troubling?

- Where are things relative to tenant improvements? Does that still need fleshing out?

- Green leases: how do tenants and owners better share both costs and benefits of installing/retrofitting
- Residential ordinance, which bypasses split incentives insisting buildings must improve
- Labeling—would help tenants factor in energy costs as well as lease payments
- Prescriptive codes like lighting code
- Utilities also redesigning multi-family building programs
- We included this as topic for energy conservation strategy being approved by US Dept of Energy, will provide base work for Renew Boston. This will include ways to incentivize rental improvements as part of roll out. One of the topics under study is how to structure the landlord ownership/tenant payment of bills.
- For multi-family, work with CDCs. They own a variety of unit types and they are willing landlords.
  - Many already participating in City green housing program.
  - In addition to broader efforts, consider piloting green lease language with CDCs.
- Jim: stretch code-new construction, new buildings, ratcheting up requirements. Rather than advocate for ratcheting up the base code in the future years, try to fix some of the stretch code concerns and set Boston up to adopt the stretch code.
  - New construction will give us a significant jump in carbon reduction.
  - It would be great if we could get flexibility on the renewable energy requirement in particular
  - Many of the prohibitive things are unique to Boston. Strong work by the Leadership Committee and Building Energy work group could be useful to try to figure out a path forward
- We went through many proposals, they are connected. E.g., financial incentives; benchmarking and tiered standards, etc.
  - They are daunting, with political and financing challenges, but we're getting close to the connections.
  - Come back with 'residential strategy' and "commercial strategy" with how they phase in
- How will the recommendations be rolled out, implemented? Who will be left out? E.g., low income home owners. What could we add to address sub populations or geographic areas?
  - Also, nothing here about behavior. E.g., inter-neighborhood competitions. Great to have a piece that brings people in differently.
  - CAC will be very helpful on this. Probably want to roll out energy, buildings, transit, recycling neighborhood by neighborhood
- Re: solar, many buildings, e.g. Hospitals, colleges, hotels, are hot water users. It may be better to focus on solar thermal water heating rather than solar PV. Solar hot water is more cost effective in the near term.

## **4. Priority Mitigation Strategies – Transportation**

### **Recommendation: Commuter Mode Reporting**

#### **Comments from presenter—**

- Looking for recommendations that would shape the context for behavior change; still working on the behavior changes themselves.
- Goal to get large % of employees to be in companies that are part of TMAs.
- City would need a person to coordinate this. E.g., Cambridge has such a person, who is resource for companies and TMAs.

### **Recommendation: Parking**

- Idea that every household could get by with at most 1 car, and some combination of Zip Car, transit, walking, bikes.

#### **Comments, questions and answers**

- Dis-incentivize gas guzzlers through increasing fees based on weight; rationale is about the extra wear and tear on roads.
  - State sets excise tax rates. That would be the mechanism to get the tax tied to weight and fuel efficiency. This has been discussed and failed in legislature in the past year for political reasons. Viewed as “anti-suburban.”
- Jim: observation re: residential parking. Like the graduated parking permit fee approach vs. taking permits away.
  - Other alternative is permits for more driveways, more impervious surfaces.
  - Links to behavior changes. When people pick up their permit at City Hall, provide info re: alternatives, social marketing materials re: thinking about giving up a car. Have to start to change the psychology.
- Two phenomenon in my office neighborhood—Leather District. New loft housing without more parking, created more people circling looking for spots. Have to be mindful as we change zoning and allow housing, many will have a car.
  - May be unique to Leather District: vans from restaurants parking 2 or 3 deep, idling, backups, creating other problems. Is there a way to provide for those folks am/pm when they come in? We tried to get standing parking in am/pm because it happens.
  - Need to pay attention to things that happen in specific neighborhoods.
- Are Boston Police authorized to enforce no-idling law?
  - Yes, but they don't.
  - May be worth pursuing stricter enforcement
  - The police don't see it as their thing. Could we get the traffic enforcement officers to do it instead?
- Is the residential permit fee a new way to get at weight and size?
- Transportation demand management—

- Pretax benefit for purchasing transit pass or parking was recently leveled by new legislation. Now \$230 for transit or parking or some combo, related to federal income tax.
- We didn't talk in working group about what employers subsidize. There is a concept "give a buck, take a buck." If employer is paying \$25 for parking, you give employees the \$25 and then charge them for parking. But anyone who wants to stop parking and buy a transit pass can keep the money. Appealing idea, popular in CA, especially in suburban areas where they attach a fee for what was free parking and then reward with cash.
- There is no employer requirement to balance now as they consider employment compensation.
- Employer cannot give more than \$230/month without considering the rest as taxable income.
- Will talk about how to get voluntary programs more part of the culture and decision making for corporations.
- Is the London downtown congestion fee plan too radical?
  - It's illegal under new MA law that takes effect November 1. No new tolls are allowed to be set up. If there are any, the new tolls have to be put into the roads from which the tolls were collected.

## **Recommendation: Mass Transit**

### **Comments from presenter—**

- Boston has limited direct control. We discussed things Boston can do to influence change.
- Also need to be a city where 'transit first' decisions are being supported by an efficient and growing transit system. City's access plan had robust recommendations in 2000 plan. We can add to them to make the city's transit plan a living part of our climate plan.
- Multi-modal promotion campaign—social marketing has taken hold. Portland and Minneapolis are model cities for us to learn from. Families undergo transportation audits; look at how they make choices about commuting, vehicle purchasing, car sharing, etc.

### **Comments, questions and answers**

- Jim: funding. We have a strong relationship with Zip Car. This summer, we did a promo campaign "Low car diet." Think they and other competitors would be interested in supporting such a campaign
  - Looking on car sharing side... Zip Car is private company; have seen lack of vehicles in less dense, more neighborhood focused areas. Idea of city to take stronger control of car sharing fleet. Solicit bids from car sharing companies to create a City of Boston program that serves entire city.
  - E.g., spots in school parking lots. Better geographic spread, builds message that even with license don't necessarily need a car. Message from

city, with RFP process: “we want a car within ½ mile of everyone in city.”  
Make it pervasive.

- Data that social marketing doesn’t work on wide spread basis if it’s only behavior change without economic incentives. We should check this.
  - Direct one-on-one customer contact and follow up is additional success factor, always understanding that economics are key. Ads on TV are not enough. Also, making it part of social context, friends also participating.
- We should do an inventory of how people use Zip Cars. Would guess that it’s cross-boundary use. If we don’t combine with near neighbors, will it work?
  - Where do car sharing users go? My instinct is that if we can get people to share vs. own a car overall, we’ll reduce vehicle miles traveled. Almost doesn’t matter where they go.
  - Jim: we have some data. Car sharing tends to be third choice after transit/walking, car second to supplement those trips you couldn’t do on foot/transit. Pricing signal is so clear that it leads to efficient car trips/planned trips.
- Need to look by neighborhood. There are no zip-cars in Dorchester. A lot of people have small children to bring out to school/day care and then go to work. Bus stops are not that reliable. Many people opt to get a car to do what they need to do.
  - That’s the idea of RFP: companies can’t cherry pick neighborhoods.
  - In Portland and Minneapolis, they send out volunteers to people’s home to go over transit map, how to make connections, walking map, bike parking facilities, do trial rides with people. Very intensive behavior change program. Portland had an 8% mode shift in that pilot neighborhood. In Minneapolis, 800 of 2500 families requested assistance.

### **Recommendation: Bikes and transit-oriented development**

#### **Comments from presenter—**

- Re: transit orientated development—BRA does a lot of this already. We could recommend more to support car-free existence.

#### **Comments, questions and answers**

- City has done a great job on joint roads. Is it too much of a political nightmare to eliminate car lanes to make them pedestrian or bike only?
  - Working Group talked about eliminating parking lanes, convert to bike lanes.
  - Some cities have put in place bus priority lanes. Can work, but need to be given serious thought.
  - Jim: There is a discussion around bus route 28 in Dorchester, where community is rising up against a policy that would seem to enhance mobility. To reduce lanes and vehicle access to enhance other modes is something we should explore.

- Jim: Need to understand that biking is not necessarily taking cars off the road. Enhancing bike access is not an efficient carbon reducing strategy. It tends to take people out of subways or walking. Tends to be people who live close in as opposed to commuter strategies.
  - Where bikes make a lot of sense is closing the gap, that “last mile,” to connect people within downtown (North Station to South Station).
- It’s not just about less lanes; you have to have better choices. We have to find ways to improve the perception and reality of public transit in the city
- Could this dis-incentivize use of cars even if the bikes themselves are not replacing cars? More likely to outrage commuters who don’t elect the mayor?
  - Important to consider the large connections among policies. London process was coupled with robust alternatives. Some of those are things we don’t have control over
- Re: political third rails, notice nothing here about
  - Taxicabs
  - Reducing reliance on public school transportation system
  - re: transit oriented development – might this be the time to push back on city/state jurisdictions.
    - E.g. of project in Dudley, developer challenged by connections between the existing transportation hub and building use. Push back re: use of stimulus funds to link transit and municipal buildings. Since we’re doing things for shorter and longer term action. We ought to have some leverage now to push back on state and federal around what the city needs
  - When there was a state office coordinating transportation, development. under Gov. Romney, they had a coordinated approach. That office doesn’t exist and the dollars have fallen into an abyss. Can still push for links between transit, economic development... But culture and resources to get it done have changed. Still, doesn’t mean that we should not make recommendations.
- Listening to this and building conversation, a few wrap up ideas to follow up on:
  - May need to recommend re: city governance and how to organize agencies in city hall to create a sustainable city. What to do about disconnects between BRA, zoning enforcement, etc. Are there policies and strategies to make that better? Look re: how do cities that do this well govern themselves?
  - Infrastructure—long term time line, perfect for longer term goals. We need a green infrastructure vision for the city: storm water, waste disposal, etc. if our goal is to reduce carbon. Also, adaptation issues related to infrastructure
  - We need to sequence these things: between now and 2012/2015. We can reduce lanes, etc. once we have a robust set of options. If you lead with coercive stuff and no good options, it will backfire. Ratchet things up in ways that are sensible.

- Re: dealing with TOD, Transportation Equity Act legislation to tie transit dollars to zoning/transit orientated development. Used to be 0.15 on the dollar for mass transit. That's shifting more in the direction of transit.
- Are there opportunities for city to lead with its own fleet? Philly has outsourced that to ride sharing.
  - We did talk about that in the committee.
- Alternative fuel vehicle infrastructure. If we don't have electric refueling or CNG stations, we will not have those vehicles.
  - Jim: City is already engaged and supportive. Updates re: other initiatives—this afternoon Mayor is filing legislation re: green taxis on federal level to give cities authority to regulate taxis with Mayor Bloomberg. Also kicking off initiative to look at public works projects, low impact of road projects, electric vehicle infrastructure...gets to comment re: how we organize govt. used to hand from agency to agency. Now having interagency conversation about what we expect on a host of issues.
- Connect to what's happening at CAC level. Can't see how some of this will be implemented in communities with high numbers of immigrants, places where people don't think like this. Doesn't mean it can't be done, but have to take that seriously.

## **5. Green Jobs – Definitions and Current City of Boston Activity**

### **Comments from presenter—**

Presentation by Matthew Bruce from Green Jobs office at BRA....

Overview for people who come into workforce development system

- Last year, Mayor took linkage fees to initiate our first green jobs training program—a buildings maintenance program that added a green component. That strategy works—a job and training process that already exists and is “going green.”
- Hope is to coordinate with green job creation efforts happening with city. E.g., Renew Boston—works with employers to inform our curriculum and place our grads. Boston bike programs will hire youth to manage installations. BHA stimulus funds for retrofits. CDCs are applying for similar grants; leverage this to insist that contractors hire their residents and grads of our training programs.

### **Comments, questions and answers**

- Tie into job access/reverse commute funding. How do we get folks we're training to jobs in Devens, 128 corridor?
  - Yes, that's a challenge. Long term, many things would have to happen for success in those jobs. In short term we're thinking about jobs we can get people into. Talking to CSG re: auditors. But requirement that auditors have a car. A lot of people in this corridor don't have access to cars for use like that.

- Where do the labor unions come into play? And, given the not-so-positive article in Globe last week re: mayor's record of engaging minority contractors or increasing numbers of people in job training programs, how are you planning to move this focus forward factoring all of these issues?
  - Current economy is forcing unions to focus more on getting their members off the bench vs. the longer term goal of getting more people into unions. Long term, the goals are still aligned. Still need those solutions about how to get Boston residents to succeed in apprenticeship jobs.
  - Auditors are still non union, has not been claimed as union work. When you get into more skilled labor, those jobs may/may not be claimed. With solar, it might be more difficult. Recent regulations say you have to be licensed electrician to install PV roofs, so we would have to get people into unions.
  - Now, we're not talking about fall apprenticeship programs, they have been cancelled. 2011 is more realistic goal for apprenticeship programs.
- After November elections, unions' leverage will not be what it is at this moment. A lot of what we're talking about will seem abstract to people in the community. This is one area where people in the community are going to feel proprietary, ownership about what we're trying to do.
  - If we're not willing to push back on the unions on this, we'll be here 2-3 years from now, not having engaged these issues in ways that are meaningful for people in the neighborhoods.
  - The LC recommendations will come after the mayoral election. We ought to have the chutzpah to say we're going to push the unions to engage people in meaningful ways. This stuff only works from the bottom up.
  - Hoping auditor program will open the door; if we add insulation to this—they are talking about creating a new union/organization... agree this will have to come to a head
  - Jim: We'll be testing a lot of these opportunities out in Renew Boston—connecting green jobs... green jobs expectations are huge and they are not quite there today.
    - We are still bullish on green tech. Renew Boston, which focuses on the residential side;
    - There will be small, neighborhood retrofits. Unions probably won't be touching these. We're talking about retraining neighborhood contractors whose businesses are trying up around the city. Often have trucks, skills to do basic weatherization work. Looking to make those connections with city's funds.
    - Also working with ABCD, state groups, Empowerment Zone contract holder.

## **6. State Adaptation Process**

Several working groups have been meeting over summer. Draft report should be available in October. Final report due to legislature in December. Our intention is to distribute draft to LC. Based on that, we can start to consider adaptation issues and figure

out what to do. We will probably look to form our own adaptation working group and delve more deeply at next meeting.

### **Meeting Evaluation**

- Good meeting; good to have a lot happening at work group level and bring that here for feedback
- Would be good if there were more members here today
- Hope we can find a way to get out of the stovepipes. More cross cutting in next meeting (i.e. think more strategically about how to bring all the sector-specific recommendations together to form a more cohesive plan for GHG reduction)
- Suggest a strategy group, with benchmarks and combine them; use a strategy consultant to drive this committee from that point of view
- CAC Liaisons need to think more about how to best engage the CAC, how to utilize their talents, we need to get to concrete pieces to share with them

<b>Boston Greenhouse Gas Plan Update Process – Leadership Committee Meeting</b>					
<b>Third Leadership Meeting, Sept 15, 2009, Harborside Learning Center, NE Aquarium, Boston</b>					
<b>Last Name</b>	<b>First Name</b>	<b>Organization</b>	<b>5.26.09</b>	<b>7.21.09</b>	<b>9.15.09</b>
Barnett	Kalila	Alternatives for Community & Environment	X		
Bok	Viki	Jamaica Plain resident	X	X	X
Buckley	Mark	Staples		X	
Connolly	Hon. John	At-Large Boston City Councilor	X		X
Coyle	James	Boston Building Trades		X	
Cummings	Fran	Peregrine Energy Group			X
Dimino	Richard	A Better City	X	X	X
Escarfullery	Galicia	Hyde Square Task Force	X		X
Hammond	Rev. Ray	Bethel AME Church/Ten Point Coalition			
Healy	Timothy	EnerNOC	X		X
Hegland	Olav	EnerNOC		X	X
Hunt	James, III	City of Boston	X	X	X
Koop	Bryan	Boston Properties	X	X	
Landsmark	Ted	Boston Architectural College	X	X	X
Lubber	Mindy	CERES	X	X	
McCarthy	James	Harvard University and UCS		X	
McDermott	Chuck	RockPort Partners	X	X	
Nitsch	Judith	Nitsch Engineering	X		X
Park	Rebecca	Climate Action Network	X	X	X
Pollack	Stephanie	Northeastern University	X	X	X
Queeley	David	Trust for Public Land	X		X
Rickerson	Wilson	Meister Consultants Group			
Ris	Bud	New England Aquarium	X	X	?
Saunders	Tedd	Lenox Hotel/Eco-Logical Solutions	X	X	X
Swett	Brian	Boston Properties			X
Williams	Margaret	The Food Project	X		X
<b>Facilitation/City Staff</b>					
Raab	Jonathan	Raab Associates	X	X	X
Parker	Cynthia	Interaction Institute for Social Change	X	X	X
Spector	Carl	City of Boston	X	X	X
Swing	Bradford	City of Boston	X	X	X
Glascoc	Bryan	City of Boston	X		
Glickel	Jake	City of Boston	X		X
Larsen	Walker	Raab Associates	X	X	X
Rivo	Susan	Raab Associates	X	X	X

<b>Other/Observers</b>					
Menino	Mayor Thomas	City of Boston	X		
Frumhoff	Peter	UCS	X		
Grogan	Paul	The Boston Foundation	X		
Griffin	Jill	The Boston Foundation	X		X
Kleiman	Scott	CERES	X		
Puerto	Mariella	Barr Foundation	X	X	X
Reddy	Matt			X	
Robinson	Samantha	BU student		X	
Schwob	Olivia	City of Boston intern		X	
Skelton Roberts	Mary	Barr Foundation	X	X	X
Straus	David	ABC	X	X	X
Langowski	Jamie	Office of John Connolly			X
Romano	Iolanda	German Marshall Fund			X
Veilluex	Neil	CLF Ventures			X
McQueen	Jim	CAC			X
Zephiro	Sarah	Mayor's Office			X
Brandes	Pat	Barr Foundation			X
Hayes	Loie	BostonCAN			X
Bruce	Matt				X
Matlaw	Jane	CAC			X
Breirg?	Maggie	BIONC			X
Lerner	Jess	Green on the Inside			X

## **Meeting Start Ups and Closers**

### ***Meeting Agenda***

- 9:00 Welcome and Introductions—Committee Co-Chairs Jim Hunt, City of Boston and Mindy Lubber, CERES
- 9:10 Overview of Agenda—Raab
- 9:20 Report Back on First Community Advisory Committee--Parker
- 9:30 Discussion of Building Working Group Mitigation Recommendations —Raab and WG Members
- 10:30 Break
- 10:45 Discussion Transportation Working Group Mitigation Recommendations —Raab and WG Members
- 11:30 Green Jobs—Mathew Bruce, City of Boston
- 12:00 Update on Commonwealth’s Adaptation Committee—Carl Spector, City of Boston
- 12:20 Next Steps
- 12:30 Adjourn