

# Meeting Minutes

## Environment and Climate Committee



CITY OF BEND

Location: Council Chambers, 710 NW Wall Street

Date: September 11, 2025

---

The meeting of the Environment and Climate Committee (ECC) was called to order at 11:03 a.m. on Thursday, September 11, 2025, in the City Council Chambers, 710 NW Wall Street, and online.

- 1. Roll Call:** Kavi Chokshi, Kenneth Davies, Laura Tabor (online), Mark Buckley, Neil Baunsgard (online), Ray Hartwell, Robyn Breynaert, Rory Isbell, Scott Nordquist

Absent: Madalyn Paquette (ex officio), Sasha Sulia (ex officio), Amy Leedham, Nick Millar

### 2. Approval of Meeting Minutes

8/14/2025 ECC Meeting Minutes

Approved with no additions or corrections.

### 3. Public Comment (2 minutes each)

Visitors can use "Raise Hand" feature when prompted to provide public comment

None

### 4. Staff Updates | Cassie Lacy

Presented by Senior Management Analyst Cassie Lacy.

Slides included:

- **Committee Recruitment**
  - Fall committee recruitment cycle beginning
  - Term up: Nick Millar
  - If any vacancies, we can appoint an alternate
- **Climate Action Partner Grant Program**
  - 4 applicants so far

- Application closes September 21
- Keep encouraging folks in the community to apply!

Lacy asked if ECC if wanted a council liaison to come and share updates from council moving forward, and that Councilor Norris agreed to be this person for the ECC if interested. ECC members indicated interest in having council updates at future ECC meetings.

Councilor Norris shared the following updates:

- Council has adopted a hybrid meeting schedule to increase public participation and reduce fatigue from long meetings.
- Work sessions are now held Wednesdays from 4–6 p.m., followed by executive/business sessions on alternating Wednesdays.
- Recent Council Highlights:
  - The Human Rights and Equity Commission (HREC) presented its work plan, aiming for adoption in Q1 2026 to embed an equity lens in all Council decisions.
  - Welcoming Week (Sept 21–28) will include community engagement events.
  - Council agreed to pause Phase 3 of the Transportation Utility Fee due to anticipated state transportation funding. Phase 1 raised \$5M; Phase 2 raised \$10M. If state funding is approved (expected Sept 17), Phase 3 may be unnecessary.
  - Council granted a 50% fee waiver to BPRD.
- Council is exploring parking districts to address congestion and support economic development.
  - Phase 1: Box Factory
  - Phase 2: Galveston St.
  - Phase 3: OSU Cascades, Columbia Park, Old Mill
  - Target adoption: January 2026; implementation: February/March 2026
  - Council gave unanimous direction to staff to proceed with planning.

## 5. Land Use Planning and Climate | Breanne Gale and Susanna Julber, *Growth Management* Informational

Presented by Breanne Gale (senior planner) and Susanna Julber (transportation planner), Growth Management.

Slides included:

- **Agenda**
  - The Basics: Oregon's Land Use Planning System
  - Local Implementation
  - Recent Changes: Climate Friendly & Equitable Communities (CFEC) Rule
  - "Growth Plan" Update
  - Targets & Measures
  - Questions & Discussion
- **Oregon's Land Use Planning System**
- **Oregon Land Use Planning 101**
  - Comprehensive Planning Framework

- Senate Bill 100 (1973) established a system requiring cities to adopt plans aligned with 19 statewide goals
  - Public Involvement
    - Goal 1 –citizen participation, ensuring communities have a voice in land use decisions
  - Urban Growth Boundaries (UGBs)
    - Help cities grow efficiently while protecting farmland, forests, and open spaces outside urban areas
  - Balanced Development and Conservation
    - The system balances future growth with resource conservation for sustainable community development
- **State Planning Goals & Sustainability Connection**
  - Goal 12 –Transportation
    - Promotes walking, biking, and transit to reduce greenhouse gas emissions and vehicle miles traveled.
  - Goal 14 –Urbanization
    - Manages urbanization by keeping growth within boundaries (UGBs) to prevent sprawl and promote efficient land use.
  - Goal 9 –Economic Development & Goal 10 –Housing
    - Long-term land use planning. Cities plan for 20 years of land supply supporting housing, jobs, economic development, and housing goals.
  - Aligning Growth with Climate Goals
    - Coordinated land use and transportation strategies help reduce emissions and support livable, sustainable communities.
- **Local Implementation & Bend's Comprehensive Plan**
- **How Statewide Goals are Implemented Locally**
  - State goals
    - Statutes (ORSs)
    - Rules (OARs)
  - City Plans
    - Comprehensive Plan (Policies)
    - Infrastructure Plans (TSP, CSMP, etc.)
    - Tools
  - Codes
    - Development Code
    - Building Code
    - Engineering Standards & Specs
  - Projects
    - Private development initiated projects
    - City-led projects (Capital Improvement Plan – CIP, GO Bond, etc.)
- **Existing Growth Framework**
  - Bend's 2016 Comprehensive Plan established a clear policy vision to 2028
  - “Complete communities”, grow up and out
  - Increasing infill and redevelopment for housing
  - Expanding the Urban Growth Boundary (UGB)
  - Supporting economic development with land, infrastructure, flexible employment zones

- Aligned and coordinated infrastructure planning
- Updated Transportation System Plan (2020) investing in all modes, focus on bike and pedestrian
- Updating Plans every 5-8 years
- **Bend's 2020 Transportation System Plan (TSP)**
  - Part of the Comprehensive Plan, the TSP outlines policies, projects and programs that aim to enhance our community. Using an analysis of current and future transportation conditions, the plan creates a vision for what the transportation system might look like in 2040.
  - Bend's 2020 TSP envisions an integrated multi-modal network balancing the needs of drivers, transit users, freight movement, and people who walk, ride bikes or roll.
  - The TSP provides a list of prioritized projects, with construction carried out by the City, private developers, and regional, state, or federal agencies, depending on the project. It also describes a feasible financial plan to guide the City's transportation investments for the next 20 years.
- **Recent Changes: Climate Friendly & Equitable Communities (CFEC) Rules**
- **Climate Friendly & Equitable Communities (CFEC)**
  - **Legislative Mandate:** In 2007, the Oregon Legislature set a goal to reduce greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions to 75% below 1990 levels by 2050.
  - **Strategic Planning:** Statewide Transportation Strategy (STS) in 2013 outlined actions to achieve these goals.
  - **Strengthened Goals:** Executive Order 20-04, in 2020, directed state agencies to reduce climate pollution-changes to land use rules big component of strategy. New target GHG emissions reduction-80% below 1990 levels by 2050.
  - **Rulemaking:** LCDC adopted the CFEC program after two years of rulemaking.
  - **Adoption:** On July 21, 2022, the CFEC program was adopted, resulting in significant updates to Oregon's transportation rules.
  - [Progress — Oregon Transportation Emissions](#)
- **CFEC (OAR 660-012)**
  - Increased links between land use and transportation
  - Climate Friendly Areas (CFA): place where community members can live, work, and meet most daily needs without having to drive a vehicle
  - Bend will need a land use designation of 275-350 acres or more to accommodate 30% of existing and needed housing
  - Located to avoid gentrification and displacement
  - Community engagement centers the voices of underserved populations
  - Tool to decrease per capita VMT, provide more connected neighborhoods via infrastructure investment in bike/ ped/ transit
  - Reformed parking regulations
  - Bend's CFA Study completed late 2023
  - Designation of CFAs – part of Growth Plan Update
- **Oregon Housing Needs Analysis (OHNA)**
  - **New requirements** regulating planning for housing: locations, types, and characteristics
  - State delegated **20-year housing need** by income level
  - **33,763 total housing units** needed by 2045

Member Hartwell asked how many housing units currently exist in Bend.

Gale estimated around 60,000 and noted she would confirm the exact number.

Member Baunsgard highlighted that declining household size is a significant driver of increased housing demand.

Gale confirmed this trend, explaining that the City previously determined average household size using census data, but that responsibility now lies with the state. Historically, Bend's housing capacity analysis used an average of 2.4 people per household, but that number has been steadily decreasing. New planning rules now incorporate more granular considerations, including multi-generational housing, ADA accessibility, and housing for the houseless population—factors that were not previously reflected.

Chair Buckley clarified that the 60,000-unit estimate refers specifically to housing within Bend city limits. He asked whether there are defined time steps for meeting housing requirements and what penalties exist for non-compliance.

Gale responded that housing targets are typically broken into 8-year increments, and jurisdictions are required to report progress via a statewide dashboard. While Bend has not yet adopted its updated housing capacity analysis, the state's draft rules will apply once it is adopted. Enforcement is currently handled by the Department of Land Conservation and Development (DLCD), which is exploring stronger mechanisms. If a jurisdiction fails to meet housing production targets, the state may require changes to land use or housing strategies to remove barriers to development. Gale noted that cities that fall out of compliance may face consequences. Fortunately, Bend has a strong working relationship with the state. She also noted that a new state office has been established to monitor and enforce compliance.

Gale added that Bend's 2016 Growth Plan positioned the City well for these new requirements. Many of the strategies implemented then—such as mixed-use zoning and upzoning—align closely with the goals of the Climate Friendly and Equitable Communities (CFEC) rules.

Julber added that Bend's Office of Performance Management (OPM) is a valuable asset in this work. The OPM already tracks detailed transportation metrics, which will help the City meet new data and reporting requirements under CFEC.

- **Updating the “Growth Plan”**
- **Oregon and Bend’s Land Use & Transportation Policies**
  - Future work focus: Urban Growth Boundary expansions, infill and redevelopment for housing and employment, increased biking, walking, transit options to meet state requirements
    - State Transportation Planning Rule, State Land Use Rules
    - Planning for over 33,000 dwelling units in Bend by 2045
    - 2020 Transportation System Plan
    - Council Goals
- **Draft schedule for next few years of updating growth plan**

- For greater efficiency, updating everything all at once which will be pretty groundbreaking.

Member Isbell asked for clarification on the two phases of the housing capacity analysis.

Gale explained that the first phase involves identifying the City's housing need. If a deficit is found, the second phase requires the City to determine how to accommodate that need—typically through land use efficiency measures. These steps must be completed before the housing capacity analysis can be formally adopted.

Member Isbell further clarified that this process involves exploring efficiency measures and applying Goal 14 UGB factors while developing the housing plan.

Gale confirmed and emphasized that although the state's rules are written in a siloed manner, the City is intentionally integrating them to ensure that each component informs the others. This interconnected approach also improves public engagement by making the process more accessible and meaningful. Gale added that the City will conduct targeted outreach to ensure that lived experiences are reflected in the planning process.

- **New TSP Component: Targets & Measures**
- **CFEC Required Local Performance Measures (OAR 660-012-0905)**
  - **Compact Mixed-Use Development**
    - # of publicly supported affordable housing units in CFAs
    - # of existing and permitted dwelling units in CFAs and % of existing and permitted dwelling units in CFAs relative to total number of existing and permitted dwelling units in the jurisdiction
    - Share of retail and service jobs in CFAs relative to retail and service jobs in the jurisdiction
  - **Active Transportation**
    - % of collector and arterials streets in CFAs and underserved population neighborhoods with bicycle and pedestrian facilities with level of traffic stress 1 or 2
    - % of collector and arterial roadways in CFAs and underserved population neighborhoods with safe and convenient marked pedestrian crossings
    - % of transit stops with safe pedestrian crossings within 100'
  - **Transportation Options**
    - # of employees covered by an Employee Commute Options program
    - # of households engaged with Transportation Options activities
    - % of all Transportation Options activities that were focused on underserved population communities
  - **Transit**
    - Share of households within one-half mile of a priority transit corridor
    - Share of low-income households within one-half mile of a priority transit corridor
    - Share of key destinations within one-half mile of a priority transit corridor

- **Parking Costs and Management**
  - Average daily public parking fees in CFAs
- **Transportation System**
  - VMT per capita
  - % of jurisdiction transportation budget spent in CFAs and underserved population neighborhoods
  - Share of investments that support modes of transportation with low pollution
- **Target Setting and Reporting (OAR 660-012-0905, -0910)**
  - Performance targets “must be set at levels that are reasonably likely to achieve...”
  - Major Report and assessment towards targets every TSP/ MTP update; minor report annually in other years
  - Current status:
    - Working with ODOT/ DLCD to finalize baselines/ targets, complete first major report
    - Assessment towards progress at TSP and/ or MTP update/ adoption (likely 2029)
- **Questions?**

Lacy noted that many of the strategies and metrics outlined in the plans that the Growth Management Department works on (i.e., Transportation Systems Plan (TSP), Growth Management Plan, and Climate Friendly & Equitable Communities (CFEC) rules) are already reflected in the Climate Change Action Plan (CCAP). She emphasized the natural alignment between the two and encouraged ECC members to consider how their work can support and inform the Growth Plan. A consultant is expected to be on board early next year to support this integration.

Chair Buckley asked how binding these various plans are, and how they move from aspirational to actionable.

Gale explained that documents like the Economic Development Strategy directly inform the Economic Opportunities Analysis (EOA), which in turn shapes zoning and land use decisions.

Julber added that the Bend Development Code is where these policies become enforceable—e.g., through development review processes for projects like, say, a new Costco.

Gale also noted that CFEC rules include specific, enforceable requirements such as walkable connections.

Member Tabor kindly asked why staff are optimistic about meeting the VMT reduction target.

Julber explained that while initial expectations were for a 20–30% reduction, the state’s modeling assigned Bend an 11.2% per capita reduction—making the target more achievable.

Member Isbell asked how the ECC can ensure that CCAP goals—particularly those related to VMT and transportation—are reflected in the Growth Plan.

Julber shared that there had been discussions about incorporating the CCAP into the Comprehensive Plan. While modeling approaches differ, the CCAP was referenced in different growth plans and in

target development. The CCAP's VMT targets are more aggressive than the state's, but they provide a useful framework.

Lacy added that staff are working internally to align metrics across plans, though differences in measurement (e.g., number of crosswalks vs. emissions impact) make this challenging.

Gale emphasized that the City is building on existing documents to avoid duplicating efforts and to ensure consistency.

Lacy noted that the CCAP's "targets" have been reframed as "modeling assumptions" to avoid confusion with TSP targets. She stressed that setting separate targets outside the land use system would be ineffective, and that the CCAP can serve as an aspirational guide while remaining aligned with state-mandated frameworks.

Gale reiterated that many metrics are dictated by the state, leaving limited flexibility.

Member Chokshi expressed appreciation for the presentation and asked whether managing multiple overlapping plans and goals creates an administrative burden.

Gale acknowledged that the CFEC rules are highly prescriptive and represent new territory. However, Bend is well-positioned due to its strong data infrastructure through the Office of Performance Management (OPM). Despite this, there are still unknowns and data gaps, and the workload is significant.

Member Chokshi also asked whether the various plans are aligned or if there are tensions between goals.

Gale responded that while there is alignment at a high level, some conflicts may emerge—particularly between housing and transportation rules. The state may eventually need to prioritize between competing objectives.

Julber added that CFEC rules apply to jurisdictions over 50,000 in population, but Bend must comply with the stricter standards for cities over 100,000.

Chair Buckley asked whether the state's planning rules—particularly those related to vehicle miles traveled (VMT), electrification, and climate adaptation—are sufficiently flexible to accommodate Central Oregon's unique context, including snow and ice conditions and broader temperature ranges.

Julber responded that, in her view, the rules are likely not flexible enough. She noted that they are largely designed with a more urban, metropolitan footprint in mind, which can be frustrating for communities like Bend. However, she acknowledged the challenge of creating a one-size-fits-all framework at the state level.

Gale added that some of the Climate Friendly Area (CFA) targets are so ambitious that, in theory, they would require relocating existing homes to meet the criteria—something that is clearly not feasible. She emphasized that while the state recognizes these targets are aspirational, how they play out in

practice remains to be seen. She also noted that the current draft rules apply uniformly across the state and are modeled on the Portland metro area, which may not reflect the realities of other regions.

Member Nordquist asked about the timeline for formally adopting CFAs.

Julber responded that adoption is expected in late 2027 or 2028, though the identification of CFAs will occur much earlier. She noted that the City has already completed its CFA study and knows where the areas are likely to be designated. The formal adoption will occur as part of a broader package of land use changes.

The committee recessed at 12:19 p.m. and reconvened at 12:31 p.m.

## **6. Climate Fee plan Update | Cassie Lacy, Senior Management Analyst** Informational

Presented by Senior Management Analyst Cassie Lacy.

Slides included:

- **Work to Date**
  - June 2024: Launched electrification policy options research process
  - Dec 2024: ECC recommendation to Council about policy options to pursue: prioritize ROW restrictions, NOx regulation, or fee to electrify new development. Pursue incentives for existing buildings.
  - Feb 2025: At Council's direction, engage with BEDAB and AHAC. Staff proposal to focus on incentive creation, including investigating a fee.
  - April 2025: Present staff recommendation to Council. Council directs staff to pursue the fee option as foundational element of incentive/disincentive creation.
  - May-July 2025: Research fee policies in Ashland and other cities, determine and plan approach for fee development in Bend
- **Next Steps**
  - August 2025 (we are here): Council Work Session to share information about other cities, takeaways and proposed next steps
  - Aug – Oct 2025: Procure consultant support for fee and incentive development. Further analysis to frame and scope options for fee. Present to Council for direction Oct. 22
  - Nov 2025: Begin public meetings with joint committee and other stakeholder engagement to define fee
  - March 2026: Fee proposed
  - May 2026: Incentive program proposed
- **Scope of Policy Decisions**
  - What is the ultimate goal of the disincentive fee?
    - Raise revenue vs. drive behavior change
  - What factors should be included in our fee and how are they defined in Bend?
    - Social cost of carbon, appliance-specific emissions, size of home/climate impact of home, market costs to electrify, other?
  - Defining the incentive

- What should the funds incentivize?
- How should it be implemented?

- **ECC Discussion**
  - Do we have 3 members who would like to volunteer to serve on the Joint Electrification Committee?

Member Hartwell asked whether the joint committee would be limited to three ECC members and whether those members would be the only ones voting on recommendations to Council.

Lacy confirmed that the structure currently envisions three voting members from each advisory body. She added that Council also requested roundtables with environmental advocates and builders.

Member Hartwell asked whether more than three ECC members could participate.

Lacy responded that while three is the intended number, there is still time to discuss changes with Council. She noted that BDAB recently voted to add an ex-officio member from the trades.

Member Hartwell emphasized the depth of expertise within ECC and suggested that even non-voting members could provide valuable input.

Lacy agreed that additional participation is welcome, but emphasized the importance of a clear and structured process to avoid confusion. She noted that the consultant, staff, and ex-officio members will bring additional expertise to the table.

Member Chokshi asked whether this committee would be similar to the Tree Code Committee.

Lacy clarified that the key difference is that this committee will be composed of existing advisory body members, rather than a standalone group.

Member Chokshi also asked whether there had been any discussion with AHAC about the fee.

Lacy said she had not yet spoken with AHAC since Council directed staff to pursue the fee and acknowledged that their position may evolve as the structure becomes clearer. She anticipated that AHAC may raise concerns about added costs to development.

Selkirk emphasized that the joint committee is a Council initiative—not a code-mandated body. Council is seeking input from three advisory bodies (ECC, AHAC, BDAB) to inform its policy decisions. He cautioned against assuming or characterizing the positions of other committees before the process begins. He encouraged ECC to think about how to ensure diverse perspectives are represented and noted that now is the time to suggest changes to the committee structure before the resolution is finalized.

Member Chokshi asked whether ECC should have more representation, given its leadership on the electrification topic.

Selkirk responded that while ECC has been deeply involved, this is ultimately Council's process. ECC's role is to provide input. If ECC believes additional expertise is needed, it can formally request changes to the committee composition.

Chair Buckley noted that ECC's voting power is limited.

Selkirk confirmed that the joint committee will make recommendations, but final decisions rest with Council. He encouraged ECC to submit a letter to Council if they wish to influence the committee's structure or process.

Chair Buckley asked about the timeline for public comment.

Lacy clarified that the Council work session is scheduled for October 22, but public comment is not accepted during work sessions. Comments must be submitted by October 15 to be included in the Council packet. Letters can be submitted at any time before the work session, with earlier submissions preferred.

Members Breynaert, Davies, Hartwell, Nordquist, and Baunsgard showed interest in serving on the committee, pending scheduling.

Lacy emphasized that all ECC members will have opportunities to provide input throughout the process, even if not on the joint committee.

Selkirk recommended appointing an alternate to ensure full participation if a member is absent.

Member Isbell suggested also appointing an ex-officio member.

Selkirk reiterated that public comments, letters, and other forms of engagement remain available to both individuals and the ECC as a whole.

Member Hartwell moved to recommend Ray, Robyn and Neil to be our representatives to the joint electrification committee and for Scott to be the first alternate and Ken to be the second alternate.

Member Chokshi seconded the motion.

The voice vote passes 8 to 0.

Yes: Chokshi

Yes: Tabor

Yes: Buckley

Yes: Baunsgard

Yes: Hartwell

Yes: Breynaert

Yes: Isbell

Yes: Nordquist

Member Davies left before voting occurred.

**7. Adjourned at 1:02 pm**

Respectfully Submitted,

Megan Lee  
Management Analyst - Environment, Climate & Sustainability



**Language Assistance Services & Accommodation Information for People with Disabilities**

You can obtain this information in alternate formats such as Braille, electronic format, etc. Free

language assistance services are also available. Please contact Megan Lee at

**[mlee@bendoregon.gov](mailto:mlee@bendoregon.gov)** or 541-693-2161. Relay Users Dial 7-1-1.



**Servicios de asistencia lingüística e información sobre alojamiento para personas con discapacidad**

Puede obtener esta información en formatos alternativos como Braille, formato electrónico, etc.

También disponemos de servicios gratuitos de asistencia lingüística. Póngase en contacto con Megan Lee en **[mlee@bendoregon.gov](mailto:mlee@bendoregon.gov)** o 541-693-2161. Los usuarios del servicio de retransmisión deben marcar el 7-1-1.