

**City of Bend Environment and Climate Committee**  
**March 11, 2021**

The meeting of the Environment and Climate Committee was called to order at 11:00 a.m. on Thursday, March 11, 2021, online and by phone.

**Roll Call:** Bill Welch, Kavi Chokshi, Kellie Jensen, Kersey Marion, Mark Buckley, Neil Baunsgard, Peter Grube, Rory Isbell, Serena Dietrich, Tess Gardner (alternate), Anne Birky (ex officio), Sasha Sulia (ex officio)

**1. Approval of minutes from February 11, 2021 ECC meeting**

**Changes to Minutes**

Member Welch said that his name is was spelled incorrectly in the motion on item 5.

Member Dietrich moved to approve the February 11, 2021, Meeting Minutes as corrected. Member Chokshi seconded the motion, the motion passed unanimously (9-0).

**2. Public Comment**

No public comments.

**3. Updates**

Cassie Lacy, Senior Management Analyst, presented the following updates:

- Council request to Environment and Climate Committee (ECC) to review options for addressing fossil fuel transport by rail
- Council Goals update/change
  - Draft Goal: Environment and Climate Goal Area – Action Review “Review and consider implementing for the ECC”

Member Buckley asked, in terms of the equity actions and the goal to prioritize those actions, what would be the implications for the ECC. Lacy said if you look at the equity actions, they are not necessarily separate actions but they are modifiers to the action. Lacy suggested when the ECC is thinking about the different kinds of co-benefits they want to prioritize, equity is one that has a relatively high priority since it is a Council priority.

**4. Rubberized Chip Seal Project**

David Abbas, Transportation & Mobility Director, presented the following slides on the Rubberized Chip Seal Project:

- Pavement Condition Trends
- Street Preservation Tools in the Toolbox – Standard Chip Seal Treatments with Deschutes County (\$18K/LM)
- Street Preservation Tools in the Toolbox – Slurry Seal (13K/LM)

- Street Preservation Tools in the Toolbox – Asphalt Paving (\$114K/LM)
- Street Preservation Tools in the Toolbox – Rubberized Chip Seal Contract 2021
- Rubberized Chip Seal
- Various Studies Over Many Years
- Questions

Member Welch asked if the Rubberized Chip Seal would be applied to the same roads that the City would receive the normal chip seal. Abbas said this is a mid-range treatment. It could take the place of a chip seal but the City still wants to have a normal standard chip seal as a tool. The rubberized chips provide some additional resiliency and elasticity to it.

Member Jensen asked what happens to the material at the end of life and how each of the different categories and tools are managed. Abbas said if the road is in good condition, the City could chip seal it two or three times if there is a good road structure with a good base. Abbas said when getting into more of the failed or the expensive grind and inlay, that is where the City would actually come in and grind out two inches of asphalt material which gets recycled and put back into mixes. Abbas explained that this treatment would be going on top of the existing surface.

Member Dietrich asked what are some of the biggest cons that have been seen with this method. Dietrich asked what was the reasoning behind not implementing something like this sooner. Abbas mentioned not seeing much for cons. The University of Washington studied this within the past six months. Abbas said the City would monitor the Madras pilot program to see how it performed in the region.

Member Grube asked what the concern would be if the rubberized chip seal were on the west side of Third Street and which drains into the Deschutes River. Abbas said there is that element on any mode of transportation, using a rubber tire on any type of road surface where the wear and tear of the particles coming from rubber tires.

Member Grube asked if the decision to go east of Third Street is just out of an abundance of caution, or is it something where the City could get resolution and go on both sides of Third Street or maybe never. Abbas said this would be a great tool for any street. Abbas explained that the City picked the current road before the study and it was not the intention of staying outside of the drainage basin initially. Abbas said because the City has the Deschutes River coming through town, this year's project is outside of that, and out of 863 lane miles, the City has a number of streets that this could be a tool on, even if we stayed out of that drainage basin completely if there was a concern.

Member Welch asked what the environmental benefits of doing this would be if this product is going to last longer and what happens at the end of life of this product. Abbas explained that the rubberized chip is more resilient and it lasts longer than other treatments, but that all comes down to the right treatment, right timing, and right road. Abbas added that there are some benefits from just a raw material capacity or supply and then what goes into the processing and keeping the tire material out of stockpiles or landfills.

Member Chokshi asked how much longer this would last compared to the regular chip seal. Abbas said there are variables with Bend's climate but the normal chip seal lasts five to seven years and the City is hoping the rubberized chip seal could get up to ten years.

Member Chokshi asked if there have been any other implementations in a similar climate with similar wear and tear and specific to Bend's kind of use. Abbas said Caltrans did some studies on their highways near the Shasta area and there have been some tests of this in other climates or conditions similar to Bend's with good results.

Member Jensen mentioned that in a couple of weeks she will be meeting with the Global Platform for Sustainable Natural Rubbers and they may have some feedback, data collected or studies related to this type of effort.

Member Grube asked if there were any real performance differences, even for bikes. Abbas explained that it looks and feels just like a normal chip seal.

Member Grube asked if there are any studies that speak to pollutants, volume particulate matter, and any pollutants leached and is there evidence strongly one way or the other, that it is better. Abbas said the Federal Transportation Research Board did a specific leaching assessment of this treatment with the conclusion that it does not have a negative environmental impact in terms of leaching above and beyond the normal efforts and the toxic metal metals were below the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) drinking water standards. Abbas explained this material is encapsulated in the binder at 400 degrees and covered with a layer of rock and there is not a lot of wear off from that, it is more from the tires themselves.

Member Grube asked if the City proceeded with this, does the City know what vendor they would use and where the material would originate from. Abbas shared that the contractor is Inter Mountain Slurry Seal and the City had used them on their Slurry Seal Project in recent years which has been successful. Abbas shared that the City has awarded contacts this spring and the next steps are to have a pre-construction meeting where the contractor will submit certificates and designs.

## **5. Process for Citywide Climate Action Plan (CCAP) Prioritization**

Member Baungard asked what outcome is the ECC expecting from their CCAP prioritization. Lacy said she sees the prioritization as the initiatives that will move forward within this biennium that we might not otherwise. Lacy said there is a big list of things in the CCAP that will not happen unless the ECC says they want this program to be initiated and it would make sense for the ECC to focus on those because they are the items that would most likely get done.

Member Welch said that there are two levels of decisions the ECC is going to make about prioritization, what is already happening and then what has not happened yet. Lacy said it might be worth it to break those into two and chose what the ECC wants

their initiatives to be, and then, what are the things that are ongoing that are important and want to stay closely involved with and helping to shape.

The committee discussed and brainstormed the following CCAP priorities:

- Equity actions
- Prerequisites for other actions to take place
- Low effort and high effort impact actions
- GHG reduction potential
- Require code changes or regulations
- Be sure to include short and long-term projects to keep momentum and long-term progress
- Require capital outlay or be financed
- Actions creating affordable living (I.E. lowering electricity bills)
- Keep an eye to key and community partners
- Lost opportunities versus retrofits
- Address all sectors (energy supply, buildings, transportation, waste)
- What is already in action that the ECC can help support or enhance through priorities and partnerships
- Support policies that increase the energy efficiency of buildings
- Have significant co-benefits that can be leveraged
- Long term savings rather than one-time savings
- Actions that benefit everyone in the community
- ECC led, low-effort actions that can be accomplished quickly to increase CCAP and ECC visibility and role (early win)
- Have available funding sooner than later

Member Baunsgard asked what the process can be to consolidate the priorities into a memo if that could be done with other people and how to coordinate without deliberation or meetings. Ian Leitheiser, Assistant City Attorney, said one option is the staff liaison might take this information and then bring some kind of memo or written summary back for the ECC at its next meeting to review, approve, modify, suggest edits, or whatever is appropriate.

Lacy suggested the Chair and Vice-chair can talk about that, can discuss, and make sure to get more specific direction about what the memo should look like and what that decision should look like at the agenda debrief on March 12, 2021. Lacy said if there are committee members that have specific follow-ups, they can email her and also copy the Chair and Vice-chair and they can try to capture their requests.

Lacy asked what the committee wants, what are they looking to have reflected from this exercise for the memo for next month, are they looking to get additional input, or are they looking to just have what is summarized. Member Baunsgard said the idea is re-categorizing this into potential pieces that could be used like in the matrix of evaluation and if the committee has any additional thoughts that are sent to sent out ahead of time, hopefully, will be able to review and have that additional discussion or modification at the next meeting, and then the Committee can start the prioritization suggestions after that.

Member Dietrich asked if there will be any additional homework that the Committee should be thinking about as a part of this process. Member Baungard said long term, one solution that would probably be helpful is potentially creating subcommittees.

Baungard asked if members would be interested in assigning themselves to one of the categories of the CCAP and dive into that work. Baungard said in the long term, the goal would be to have a person or two, that would be the subject matter experts in different areas and the Committee will start with the CCAP for now and then work on other topics.

Member Welch asked if a member could be in more than one subgroup. Member Baungard said that would be ok.

The following subgroups were created

- The Energy Supply Subgroup
  - Members Jensen, Gardner, Welch, Grube, and Buckley volunteered
- The Energy in Buildings Subgroup
  - Members Welch, Grube, Chokshi, and Baungard volunteered
- The Waste and Materials Subgroup
  - Members Dietrich, Jensen, and Chokshi volunteered
- The Transportation Subgroup
  - Members Isbell, Marion, Gardner, and Baungard volunteered

Member Isbell asked what the Committee's goal is between now and when the Committee has finalized its work plan. Member Baungard said the goal should be building more expertise of what is in the CCAP and have members being more hands-on.

Lacy discussed being willing to meet with each group and talk through the CCAP actions.

Member Dietrich said the intent is to further educate so members can have a better understanding of what may be missing for the prioritization process and how to further that process in the next meeting.

Member Welch asked for clarification on the tasks for each subgroup. Member Baungard explained that Lacy will follow up with each subgroup to set up a time to give an overview of their chosen topic area and who potential contacts would be for that group.

Member Isbell wanted to make sure members do not forget to figure out how to respond to David Abbas about the rubberized chip seal presentation. Lacy explained that the Committee does not need to make a formal statement or write a letter. Lacy said the Council wanted Abbas to come in and check-in with the Committee because there was conversation about whether the rubberized chip seal was bad for the waterway or if it was potentially even an environmental benefit. Lacy said the Committee does not have

to prepare anything as long as the Committee can come to an agreement by the next meeting.

Member Jensen said she will ask for some additional resources at her meeting with the Global Platform for Sustainable Natural Rubbers.

Lacy discussed possibly meeting with the Chair and Vice-chair to talk tomorrow about if there were particular questions that the Committee felt like they needed to be answered before they were comfortable taking a stance. Member Baunsgard said that if the Committee had questions that they can send them to Lacy or the Chair and Vice-Chair. Lacy confirmed that would be ok.

Member Chokshi asked if Abbas had any additional documentation that could be shared with the Committee regarding comparisons between what has been used versus what is being used so that the committee could have some general information.

Member Buckley would like the publications that Abbas referenced.

Lacy discussed having a slide deck with information that she can send to the Committee.

Member Welch discussed wanting to know what is already happening, what actions are already in the works, what is the status of the actions, and what work needs to be done in the CCAP. Member Baunsgard said the hope is that the Committee will be able to start answering those questions with the meetings with Lacy for City progress and then that will be a task of groups in the future, moving forward. Lacy said the main part of the discussion would be with the individual groups.

## **6. Establishing Committee Roles and Process**

### **7. Agenda Setting**

Was not discussed due to time.

### **8. Adjourned at 1:04 p.m.**

Respectfully Submitted,

Kayla M. Duddy  
Deputy City Recorder