



CLIMATE INVESTMENT PLAN Full Draft

Public Comment Key Takeaways

Public comment period: May 16 – June 2, 2023

— PORTLAND —
**CLEAN ENERGY
COMMUNITY BENEFITS
FUND**



THE BUREAU OF
**PLANNING &
SUSTAINABILITY**

VISIT US ONLINE
portland.gov/bps/cleanenergy

The following is the template that was used to organize and categorize comments received during the public comment period for the preliminary draft of the Climate Investment Plan (CIP)

Public comment dates: May 16 – June 2, 2023

Sections included:

Global comments, clean energy, transportation decarbonization, green infrastructure, regenerative agriculture, organizational capacity building, 82nd Ave., access to fair and flexible capital, schools, workforce & contractor development.

Template:

KEY TAKEAWAYS

[Strategic Program # - Name or Community Responsive Grants or Other]

What was good / where there was support	Key takeaways that are under consideration for next draft	Not under consideration for next draft
Noting general themes of support	Noting comments that are being considered for clarification, addition, revision of next CIP draft. Comments were included even if they are addressed elsewhere as it may suggest the need for greater clarification.	Rationale for why something is not being considered. May include, but is not limited to comment being: <i>Out of scope, out of alignment with PCEF’s climate/equity focus, Committee guiding principles, addressed in another SP, or detail too specific for CIP/best addressed in implementation.</i>

Global comments on the full draft of the Climate Investment Plan

KEY TAKEAWAYS

Global comments: communication/design

What was good / where there was support	Key takeaways that are under consideration for next draft	Not under consideration for next draft
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • "Great job incorporating readability improvements since the preliminary draft!" • "I applaud ...[PCEF] for developing this full draft and seeking public input to improve the initial 5-year Climate Investment Plan." • "Led by those who live it" – sentiment resonates 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In Table 1, could you assign a letter ("A" through "L") to each of the 12 items in the first column (titled "Primary Code Category"). Example: "A. Climate jobs, workforce and contractor development." And again on the corresponding description in the document, use the same letter in the header on that page. Example: on p. 18, the header would start with the letter "A" as follows: "A. Climate jobs, workforce and contractor development." The last header would start with an "L" - i.e., "L. Multiple funding categories/other carbon emissions reducing projects." • "It is unclear how values vary in different parts of the document for what seem like the same program category. For example, on page 5, the Energy efficiency and renewable component is listed as \$473.9 million. In Table 1, this value is \$397 million. I see on page 16 that some categories include several types of funding allocations, but that is a big difference and I can't see how it is calculated." 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • "Expand the PCEF website to include a section on available services to members of the public." <i>Staff response: though related to PCEF programs and the CIP, this is out of scope for the actual CIP development process. This could be a potential change for our website, providing we had appropriate resources allocated to upkeep.</i>

KEY TAKEAWAYS

Global comments: general

What was good / where there was support	Key takeaways that are under consideration for next draft	Not under consideration for next draft
	<p>Concern that ‘community benefit’ doesn’t explicitly say ‘community leadership’. It’s “For us but not with us”. Section on “Building Community in Partnerships” is too nuanced in terms of community leadership.</p> <p>New strategic programs or allocations to consider:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Portland Water Bureau: new strategic program that invests in the existing “Water Leak Repair” program to expand capacity to serve an additional 200 households. Add a funding source to be used by Bureaus as match to unlock federal and state funds that will both compliment PCEF and make PCEF funds go farther <p>Participatory budgeting (PB):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Implement as a fourth funding pathway for all PCEF funds as it aligns with guiding principles of accountability and community powered PB can amplify youth voices, foster civic engagement, address unmet needs in communities, promote transparency, accountability, and equitable allocation of funds; taps into lived-experience, provides data to guide broader investments <p>Increase clarity:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Add rationale on eligibility and involvement of public agencies in certain categories On how PCEF staff and Committee will be resourced On how specific programs were chosen 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Suggestion that funds held for 2027-2028 should be utilized with 5-10% allocated to enhancing infrastructure for the CIP including funding to external consultants managing similar programs. <i>Staff response: Programming beyond current CIP funding will occur later.</i> Use urban spaces more wisely – look at opportunities to use existing buildings that we could upgrade like urban refill or redevelopment. <i>Staff response: While out of scope for the CIP, an RFP respondent may contribute to these efforts.</i> Funding should be made available to all parts of the City. <i>Staff response: All projects within the City of Portland are eligible to be funded for specific strategic programs if they meet PCEF goals.</i>

KEY TAKEAWAYS

Global comments: vision, marketing, and engagement

What was good / where there was support	Key takeaways that are under consideration for next draft	Not under consideration for next draft
	<p>Accountability</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Improve accountability measures by committing to use reviewers with scientific and technical expertise in climate strategies, selection, and evaluation phases • Concern regarding specificity in some strategic program areas – higher-level programmatic allocations would encourage creative solutions, wider range of project proposals, and enable greater transparency based on pre-established criteria (Comm Mapps) <p>Evaluation and criteria</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Criteria for investments should include leveraging federal, state, Metro, and private funds • Re-visit CIP annually to assess effectiveness and revise (Comm Mapps) <p>Equitable engagement</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Insufficient nonprofit engagement and limited targeting to specific communities, misses the opportunity for sustainable BIPOC communities • Address barriers faced by BIPOC communities by funding communities directly, fostering relationships w/culturally competent partners, improve oversight of nonprofit agreements • Use funding to compensate those with difficulty in engaging in efforts for lost hours of work <p>Approach</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Should have a more cohesive and focused approach • Coordinate across City climate programs by convening joint meeting for PCEF Committee and City’s Climate Preparedness Inter-Bureau team before CIP is finalized (Comm Mapps) 	

Workforce and Contractor Development/ Workforce and contractor equity goals

KEY TAKEAWAYS

Workforce and contractor development: general comments

What was good / where there was support	Key takeaways that are under consideration for next draft	Not under consideration for next draft
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• General excitement for exciting to see funding for workforce development programs.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Clarity is needed on the role of public higher education both in regards to the CIP's workforce development goals and within PCEF more broadly.• There is a perception that the focus of our workforce development beyond investments are for entry-level jobs. Can we can clarify that career development or job retraining for people interested in changing careers is also a focus.• Increasing support for pre-apprenticeship focus was mentioned several times	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Support of all of the workforce and contractor development especially if some of that funding can go outside of the State of Oregon where a lot of work is happening in the green energy field that isn't necessarily centered here, but would provide trainings for BIPOC and emerging professionals to get into the field. <p><i>Staff response: PCEF cannot fund workforce development initiatives / programs outside the Portland workshed.</i></p>

KEY TAKEAWAYS

Workforce and contractor equity goals: general

What was good / where there was support	Key takeaways that are under consideration for next draft	Not under consideration for next draft
	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Large projects, are much better equipped to incorporate apprentices in all trades and to track apprentice hours and demographics. In contrast, a 4-plex may include a handful of hours by various trades. Disaggregating hours worked according to the gender and race/ethnicity of the apprentice, quickly becomes a highly complicated puzzle. For example, if the HVAC crew spent 30 hours on the project, 10 would need to be worked by any apprentice, including 3 hours by an apprentice of color and 90 minutes by a woman apprentice, and so on across the trades. We often contract with small companies that don't operate at the scale required to handle the logistics and cost of an apprenticeship program. We strongly recommend that apprenticeship requirements apply only to larger developments, such as 50 or more units.• Concerns that outcomes/goals don't kick in unless they are greater than \$350,000 but excludes work less than \$100,000, this is where many minority contractors work. This may leave them out of contracts since goals don't address that gap.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Could some of the funds offered be used to compensate them for lost hours of work? <i>Staff response: this level of detail is not applicable to the scope of CIP.</i>

Renewable Energy and Energy Efficiency

- Community responsive grants
- SP1: Clean energy in regulated multifamily affordable housing
- SP2: Clean energy in unregulated multifamily housing
- SP3: Clean energy improvements in single family homes
- SP4: Clean energy in small commercial buildings
- SP5: Building upgrades for community severe weather response
- Other

KEY TAKEAWAYS

Renewable energy and energy efficiency: general

What was good / where there was support	Key takeaways that are under consideration for next draft	Not under consideration for next draft
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Support for integration of workforce training and contractor support in implementation of all clean energy projects General support for clean energy funding 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Prioritize sites with good transportation options, on bus routes etc. Find place for clean energy improvements in regulated affordable housing NOT owned by non-profit organization. Unclear how funding allocation sizes were determined, add explanation Clarify language about fossil fuel fed appliances and equipment Invest in City owned assets to reduce carbon 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Consider how we can support empty office space into housing. <i>Staff response: support for this type of project may be defined through the RFP process, but not at the level of the CIP.</i> Establish inverter standards in collaboration with PGE. <i>Staff response: out of scope for the level of the CIP, collaboration with partners will occur as part of planning and implementation of CIP.</i>

KEY TAKEAWAYS

Renewable energy and energy efficiency: SP2 - Clean energy in unregulated multifamily housing

What was good / where there was support	Key takeaways that are under consideration for next draft	Not under consideration for next draft
<ul style="list-style-type: none">Support for trying to get at this sector of housing market	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Concern about ability to get property owner participation	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Engage tenants/tenant advocacy groups. <i>Staff response: Important aspect for implementation, but this level of detail is not appropriate for the CIP</i>

KEY TAKEAWAYS

Renewable energy and energy efficiency: SP3 – Clean energy improvements in single family homes

What was good / where there was support	Key takeaways that are under consideration for next draft	Not under consideration for next draft
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Support requiring 180% min wage. General support and appreciation for emphasis on deep-energy retrofits for homeowners below 80% AMI 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Allow greater than 30% for critical repairs. Seems to not address DEI goals for smaller contractors. Include condominiums – flexible language about level of investment per unit b/c of high variability in type of building they come in. Eligibility, level of investment and match framework will mimic single family with lower amounts. Single family congregate living 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Include the following measures: water efficiency; battery storage; induction stoves for renters; EV charging. <p><i>Staff response: Eligible measures are defined in supporting program documents and are not defined in CIP.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Expand website to make it clearer how people can access PCEF programs. <p><i>Staff response: Included 5% of 20% to central administrator/website portal etc.</i></p>

KEY TAKEAWAYS

Renewable energy and energy efficiency: SP4 – Clean energy in small commercial buildings

What was good / where there was support	Key takeaways that are under consideration for next draft	Not under consideration for next draft
	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Clarify when EV charging infrastructure is an eligible measure• Program should prioritize older buildings	

KEY TAKEAWAYS

Renewable energy and energy efficiency: SP5 – Building upgrades for community severe weather response

What was good / where there was support	Key takeaways that are under consideration for next draft	Not under consideration for next draft
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Support for prioritizing solar installation and battery back-up in the projects.• Support for including libraries and churches as eligible applicants.• General support for this program.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Create a geographic prioritization of buildings that are in low-income neighborhoods.• Provide clarity about requirements related to fossil fuel equipment, such as gas stoves.• Allow for both day-use and overnight responses during climate emergencies.• Increase funding amount for seismic retrofit projects.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Include schools as eligible applicants. <i>Staff response: addressed in a different strategic program</i>• Dedicate funding for City infrastructure sites, such as PPR community centers and Fire Department buildings. <i>Staff response: they are eligible applicants in the current CIP draft for this program.</i>

Transportation Decarbonization

- Community responsive grants & Other
- SP6: Comprehensive e-bike access and support
- SP7: Equitable clean transportation access

KEY TAKEAWAYS

Transportation decarbonization: E-bike, transportation wallet, community responsive grants

What was good / where there was support	Key takeaways that are under consideration for next draft	Not under consideration for next draft
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> General support for e-bike program 	<p>E-bike program</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> E-bikes investment should be paired with safety measures as a main safety concern is getting hit by a car Invest in safe, well-maintained active infrastructure including crosswalks, bike lands, and greenways to support e-bike access (Commissioner Mapps) <p>Increase transportation investments</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Concern around not enough transportation investments Dedicate more funding or reprogram funding years 3 to 5 to mitigate transportation-based carbon given the total emissions (Commissioner Mapps) Include electric car share programs as an eligible program to be grant funded 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Support Frog Ferry electric ferry system, installation of EV charging stations at parks, fund secure charging/storage in low-income multi-family housing to facilitate the usage of e-bikes, and provide funding for e-bikes owned by organizations operation low-income housing to be available for use by residents. <i>Staff response: Specific project ideas will be considered through request for proposals after CIP is finalized; projects must have targeted benefit to PCEF priority populations.</i> Consider efforts to bring resources to neighborhood centers in this program to reduce car trips and build resiliency. <i>Staff response: Throughout of scope for the CIP, RFP respondents may speak to these efforts to advance transportation decarbonization.</i>

KEY TAKEAWAYS

Transportation decarbonization: E-bike, transportation wallet, community responsive grants

What was good / where there was support	Key takeaways that are under consideration for next draft	Not under consideration for next draft
	<p>PBOT Allocate \$35 million for PBOT services given transportation service reductions including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• \$1.5 million/year for leveraging federal grants to enhance street safety, equity, and sustainability• \$2.5 million/year for small-scale capital projects, safety maintenance, transit, and active transportation infrastructure• \$1 million/year for active transportation education and programming• \$2 to \$4 million/year for streetcar operations and replacements• \$500,000 for transit signal operations and equipment upgrades to enhance bus speed and reliability	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Collaborate with PGE Drive Change Fund, PGE Electric Bus Fund and Fleet Partner Program. <i>Staff response: Partnerships and collaborations will occur, but details will not be included in CIP.</i>

Green infrastructure

KEY TAKEAWAYS

Green infrastructure: Community responsive grants

What was good / where there was support	Key takeaways that are under consideration for next draft	Not under consideration for next draft
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• General support for working to invest in green infrastructure including tree canopy and bioswales.• General support for investments in tree canopy expansion	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Increase funding allocation for Green Infrastructure to make a more robust investment• Green infrastructure investments overemphasize tree canopy expansion, and needs to consider a broad range of strategies, such as green roofs, green streets, habitat acquisition, composting, etc.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Include habitat mitigation banks as eligible for community responsive grants funding. <i>Staff response: no clear link to additional and meaningful carbon sequestration.</i>

KEY TAKEAWAYS

Green infrastructure: Tree canopy maintenance reserve (TCMR)

What was good / where there was support	Key takeaways that are under consideration for next draft	Not under consideration for next draft
<ul style="list-style-type: none">General support for investments in tree canopy expansion		<ul style="list-style-type: none">Increase allocation for Green Infrastructure Maintenance Reserve to build a comprehensive urban tree maintenance program, rather than subsidizing maintenance on a property-by-property basis. A comprehensive urban tree maintenance program focus on a block-by-block basis. <p><i>Staff response: Not under consideration given scale of funding necessary for comprehensive urban tree maintenance program. Model/approach may work well in a future evolution of this program, if additional funds materialize.</i></p>

Regenerative agriculture

KEY TAKEAWAYS

Regenerative agriculture: Community responsive grants

What was good / where there was support	Key takeaways that are under consideration for next draft	Not under consideration for next draft
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> General support for investing in sustainable agriculture methods. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Develop a Regenerative agriculture baseline assessment to identify a vision, opportunities, gaps, and partners for the Portland area Less emphasis on Western programmatic metrics and more emphasis on qualitative storytelling Explore re-granting model to reach more farmers as subgrantees and to address conflicts that arise from competition 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Comment included details of an aquaponics regenerative agriculture program. <i>Staff response: Comment is more appropriate for RFP.</i> Public agencies should be eligible to apply for community responsive grants. - Submitted by Portland Parks & Recreation. <i>Staff response: Community responsive grants are awarded for projects designed and implemented by community-based nonprofit organizations.</i> As PCEF works to expand urban farming opportunities, PGE can help connect PCEF to electric landscaping tool manufacturers. <i>Staff response: Comment is more appropriate for RFP #3 projects and grantees.</i> How will the plan account for growth in population and long-range planning/UGB restrictions when thinking about available land and food production demands? <i>Staff response: Bureau coordination will be a part of CIP programs, but details on the structure of those partnerships to make policy-level change will not be covered in this plan.</i> Provide longer-term support in grant periods, rather than applying every year <i>Staff response: this is more appropriate for RFP.</i> Support the general operations of existing organizations who have been doing the work. There are tensions between funding new and existing programs <i>Staff response: Comment is more appropriate for RFP.</i>

KEY TAKEAWAYS

Regenerative agriculture: SP9: Increasing Urban Farming Opportunities – Planning and Land Acquisition

What was good / where there was support	Key takeaways that are under consideration for next draft	Not under consideration for next draft
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> General support for the inclusion of regenerative agriculture investments in the plan 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Question submitted inquiring if there funds for assisting in utility payments and taxes for community land trust models, or if that would be part of the responsive grants. Provide details on how the program will measure households receiving healthy foods and baseline metrics. Request that program’s approach and language be more inclusive of diverse cultural practices related to food cultivation. Leverage a broader coordination of climate programs across the city. For SP9, existing City land acquisition programs within Parks and BES as well as a federally funded Brownfields remediation program in BES could be brought on to support and enhance the efforts (Commissioner Mapps) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Public agencies should be eligible to apply for community responsive grants. Submitted by Portland Parks & Recreation. <i>Staff response: This program is directed to community-based organizations to address accessibility barriers to land for regenerative agriculture programs and projects.</i> How will the plan account for growth in population and long-range planning/UGB restrictions when thinking about available land and food production demands? <i>Staff response: Bureau coordination will be a part of CIP programs, but details on the structure of those partnerships to make policy-level change will not be covered in this plan.</i>

Organizational capacity building

KEY TAKEAWAYS

Capacity building: SP10 – Organizational Capacity Building

What was good / where there was support	Key takeaways that are under consideration for next draft	Not under consideration for next draft
<ul style="list-style-type: none">General support for organizational capacity building investments in community nonprofits.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">N/A	<ul style="list-style-type: none">N/A

Other carbon reducing projects

KEY TAKEAWAYS

SP 11 and SP 12 – 82nd Ave investments

What was good / where there was support	Key takeaways that are under consideration for next draft	Not under consideration for next draft
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• General excitement about improvements to the 82nd corridor and increase in the urban tree canopy.• Support towards allocating funds to address the urban heat island effect by widening sidewalks to increase street trees (Commissioner Mapps)		<ul style="list-style-type: none">• PCEF funding should also support the large tree median effort of the Portland Bureau of Transportation (PBOT) and Portland Parks & Recreation (PP&R) to contribute to a low-carbon and equitable 122nd avenue, while also address the low tree canopy coverage in East Portland. <i>Staff response: Large tree median efforts are already planned within PBOT's conceptual designs for Building a Better 82nd Ave. This particular funding allocation is part of a broader directive focused on investments in the 82nd ave corridor that demonstrate additionality.</i>• PGE can serve as a resource on selection and placement of trees. <i>Staff response: Thank you. Specific resources will not be listed in the CIP, however, PCEF will reach out to partners/stakeholders etc. during program implementation.</i>

KEY TAKEAWAYS

SP13 – Targeted EV Financing

What was good / where there was support	Key takeaways that are under consideration for next draft	Not under consideration for next draft
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Support investment in assisting the adoption of EVs for priority populations• Support for some of the existing programs focused on this approach, like Metropolitan Family Services’ program focused on EV financing	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Clarify eligibility to apply for PCEF funds for this, unsure whether organizations could use funding to leverage other funding opportunities.• Clarify what types of vehicles are eligible	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Provide information on available incentives to purchase/lease new or used EVs. <i>Staff response: This will be considered for program implementation as this level of detail is not included in the CIP.</i>

KEY TAKEAWAYS

SP14 – Access to fair and flexible capital

What was good / where there was support	Key takeaways that are under consideration for next draft	Not under consideration for next draft
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Support for the reduction in budget to \$65M as part of splitting out and allocating funding for EV financing (through SP13) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> More clear language regarding selecting financial institutions or organizations with history and track record of serving PCEF priority populations Allow public agencies like Prosper Portland to administer funds through existing Property FIT, commercial property assessed clean energy financing mechanism. Consider additional ways for this funding area to leverage Federal / State opportunities with public partners 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Mitigation banking for offsetting land development along waterways. <i>Staff response: no clear link to additional and meaningful carbon sequestration.</i>

KEY TAKEAWAYS

SP 15: Climate-friendly public schools

What was good / where there was support	Key takeaways that are under consideration for next draft	Not under consideration for next draft
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Overall excitement about investment with a desire to see electrification of school vehicles, career resources for green jobs, climate disaster preparedness, free / reduced TriMet passes, behavior change education, climate curriculum standards for all schools, teacher training for curriculum development Support for investments (PPS superintendent) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Concern for maintaining youth / student-led leadership and bureaucracy Are there opportunities to connect physical improvement investment with student-led allocation? Can projects be outside of school boundaries? What is an accountability framework for this investment look like? Promote the transition to electric buses from diesel. Incorporate participatory budgeting as a mechanism for allocating the \$50M for this strategic program. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Publicize the funding to make sure students understand resources are available to be ambitious (flyers, Instagram). <i>Staff response: Will address as part of program implementation.</i> Include long-term maintenance of plantings as an eligible expense or have schools direct utility savings for tree maintenance. <i>Staff response: Will address eligible expenses during program implementation.</i> Collaboration opportunities with PGE through Project Zero initiative. <i>Staff response: Will connect on partnerships during program implementation.</i> Work with federal dollars, PGE program to layer incentives for electrification of school buses. <i>Staff response: Will consider for program implementation.</i>