

Development of the City of Edmonton's Sustainability
Plan

The Way We Green

Stakeholder Advice Part A: Summary

May and June 2010

Prepared by

Bill McMillan

Principal

Defining Common Ground

This report of stakeholder participation and advice received in the early stages of development of the City of Edmonton's strategic plan for sustainability, "The Way We Green," is presented in two parts: Part A: Summary of stakeholder participation and highlights of stakeholder advice received; and Part B: Complete results of stakeholder advice received.

Part A: Contents

Purpose and context.....	1
Overview of consultation	2
Pre-workshop questionnaire results	4
Sustainability challenges.....	4
Workshop 1 Results.....	7
Workshop process	7
Workshop participation.....	7
Sustainability principles.....	8
Challenges	10
Workshop 2 Results.....	14
Workshop process	14
Workshop participation.....	15
Discussion of energy policy options	15
Policy options supporting other draft goals	19
Next steps.....	25

Tables

Table 1: Number of persons invited to participate.....	2
Table 2: Pre-workshop questionnaire - Response to questions about potential future sustainability challenges	4
Table 3: Number of times principle statements were selected as being useful for the strategic plan.....	8
Table 4: Number of times challenge statements were chosen as "most important" for the strategic plan.....	12
Table 5: Energy policy options – top three selection	16
Table 6: Energy policy options - Is the current pace of change appropriate?	17
Table 7: Which barrier would be your first priority to address if you were responsible for achieving the energy goal?.....	17
Table 8: Other policy options - Is the current pace of change appropriate?	22
Table 9: Which barrier would be your first priority to address if you were responsible for achieving the sustainability goal?.....	23

See Part B: Complete Results for:

Section 2	Workshop 1 Results
Section 3	Workshop 2 Results

Purpose and context

In January 2010, the City of Edmonton initiated the development of a sustainability plan entitled “The Way We Green.” This plan would become one of the City’s six inter-related strategic plans. The objective of “The Way We Green” is:

“To support the City Vision and City’s ten-year strategic goals by developing a bold and visionary strategy for making Edmonton the nation’s leader in setting and achieving the highest standards of environmental preservation and sustainability both in its own practices and by encouraging and enabling the practices of citizens, businesses and institutions.”

The City of Edmonton committed to making a significant effort to gain input from its citizens to keep the plan rooted in the broader perceptions and expectations of the people who live in Edmonton. The ongoing involvement of invited participants in the process of formulating the plan became an important part of the planning process. This involvement was expected to achieve two important outcomes:

- Increasing the relevance of the plan through dialogue that revealed expectations, preferences and perceptions of a broad range of Edmonton citizens.
- Increasing the level of support for the plan by developing an expanded range of leaders who felt committed to the implementation of the plan.

The persons invited to participate in these early discussions about the elements of a strategic sustainability plan for the City of Edmonton fell into two categories: those external to the City of Edmonton (external stakeholders) and those employed by the City of Edmonton (internal stakeholders).

This report describes the involvement process for the early stages of development of “The Way We Green” which occurred in May and June 2010 and highlights of the advice received from both external and internal stakeholders.

Overview of consultation

The City of Edmonton has made significant effort in the months of May and June to gain valued advice that will improve the sustainability plan and hopefully build commitment to the adjustments needed to achieve sustainability going forward.

Actions undertaken to encourage discussion and gain advice included the following:

- Early in the process, involvement was initiated by the City's project lead, Jim Andrais, who personally completed **_jim?** personal interviews with a diverse group of Edmonton leaders (both external and internal) between February 15 and May 15, 2010.
- In April and May 2010, project updates were distributed to a broad list of Edmonton organizations and to City of Edmonton staff describing the initiative to develop "The Way We Green" and the opportunities for participation.
- In May 2010, "The Way We Green" public web site was launched by the City of Edmonton to encourage investigation and discussion of sustainability topics.
- A series of 21 Discussion Papers, covering a range of topics related to sustainability, was commissioned by the City of Edmonton and made available on the public web site. A summary of the Discussion Papers was also provided directly to all invited participants.
- An expert panel was invited to review the Discussion Papers and to also provide their ongoing advice about sustainability requirements and the effectiveness of sustainability initiatives. Panel members participated in a public panel discussion on June 16, 2010.
- In preparation for discussions at the two-part series of workshops held in June, an on-line, pre-workshop questionnaire was conducted to gather advice from invited participants about sustainability principles and challenges.
- In June 2010, the City of Edmonton hosted a two-part series of workshops for invited participants (both external and internal). The first set of workshops (Workshop 1) focussed on principles and challenges (broad ideas that could provide a framework for the strategic plan). The second set of workshops (Workshop 2) addressed policy options (more specific policy directions that exemplify the sorts of choices the plan would contemplate).

The number of people invited to participate in the process to develop "The Way We Green" to date, is noted in Table 1 below.

Table 1: Number of persons invited to participate

Activity	External Stakeholders	Internal Stakeholders	Total
Invited to attend Workshop 1 and 2	170	77	247
Invited to complete pre-workshop questionnaire	209	76	285

Pre-workshop questionnaire results

On May 18, 285 people representing both internal and external stakeholders were invited to complete an on-line questionnaire that asked them to consider several ideas drawn from the Discussion Papers and other sources. The intention was to discover any pattern in perceptions that could be used as a starting point for discussion at Workshop 1 (i.e. to learn the large patterns of response rather than spending much of the workshop discovering these patterns). The deadline for completion of the on-line questionnaire was May 28 and 106 people responded (37% of those invited to participate). Results indicated that:

- The definition of sustainability used in two current Edmonton strategic plans was broadly accepted, but many participants felt the definition was too long and became unnecessarily complicated. Two other sample definitions also provided useful information that could be incorporated into a definition. Many respondents preferred a connection between the adopted definition and the UN definition adopted in 1987.
- Respondents supported 10 sample principles, drawn from three sources. It was felt these principles provide important moral guidance that should be incorporated into the plan. However, many participants indicated the need for the principles to be re-worded for clarity within the context of this plan.
- Respondents felt that major changes will be needed in the next 30 years to respond to sustainability challenges (results provided below).

Sustainability challenges

The response to the questions about environmental challenges was an important reference point during the June workshops and is therefore described below. A high percentage of respondents felt Edmonton will face serious concerns if no changes are made and also felt that an effective response will require major changes.

Table 2: Pre-workshop questionnaire - Response to questions about potential future sustainability challenges

Sustainability Challenge	How probable is it that this will be a serious concern within 30 years if we make no changes?		Will an effective response to this challenge require changes to infrastructure and/or lifestyles?	
	Somewhat probable	Highly probable	Little or no change	Major change to both infrastructure and lifestyle
Oil supply and price	17%	77%	2%	89%

	How probable is it that this will be a serious concern within 30 years if we make no changes?		Will an effective response to this challenge require changes to infrastructure and/or lifestyles?	
Sustainability Challenge	Somewhat probable	Highly probable	Little or no change	Major change to both infrastructure and lifestyle
Maintaining high quality agricultural land in, or near, the city	21%	68%	5%	69%
Global changes in supply and demand	26%	65%	5%	71%

	How probable is it that this will be a serious concern within 30 years if we make no changes?		Will an effective response to this challenge require changes to infrastructure and/or lifestyles?	
Sustainability Challenge	Somewhat probable	Highly probable	Little or no change	Major change to both infrastructure and lifestyle
Demand for water might exceed available supply some or all of the time	26%	61%	3%	72%
Maintaining biodiversity in the city of Edmonton and region	31%	55%	9%	64%
Maintaining local natural ecosystems and the ecosystem services they provide	30%	56%	8%	65%
Maintaining food supply	35%	50%	4%	70%
Demand for renewable resources might exceed supply some or all of the time	31%	49%	5%	70%
Natural gas supply and price	30%	52%	3%	68%
Extreme weather	22%	54%	9%	59%
Maintaining good water quality in the North Saskatchewan River	35%	45%	6%	59%
Maintaining good air quality	35%	44%	7%	65%
Coal supply and price	25%	34%	11%	57%

The number of respondents for each question varies from 102 to 105.

The complete results of this pre-workshop questionnaire (both numerical and comments) are provided in Section 1 of Stakeholder Advice Part B: Complete Results.

Workshop 1 Results

Workshop process

One month in advance, 247 persons were invited to participate in early discussions about Edmonton's sustainability plan in a workshop format. The intention was to "try out" a number of ideas and choices, and to incorporate the perceptions and expectations of a range of leaders (both external and internal to the City of Edmonton) whose support in implementing the plan will ultimately be very important.

Three opportunities to participate were provided for external stakeholders:

1A	June 1	1:00 – 4:30 pm	Shaw Conference Centre
1B	June 3	8:30 am – 12 noon	Holiday Inn Express Downtown
1C	June 3	5:30 – 9:00 pm	Holiday Inn Express Downtown

One opportunity was provided for City of Edmonton employees on June 7, 2010 at the Shaw Conference Centre.

At each workshop, participants were assigned seating at one of several tables in the room (the assignment of seats favoured a diversity of ideas and perspectives at each table). Information was provided to the participants in plenary presentations by a moderator, while the actual topic discussions were facilitated at each table by a City of Edmonton employee. Each table was urged to act as a "board of directors" making sustainable choices for Edmonton. At the end of each exercise, each table facilitator reported highlights of their discussion to the plenary. Facilitators noted comments on flipcharts (which were gathered) and participants were also invited to write additional notes (also gathered). The complete account of Workshop 1 comments is included in Section 2 of Stakeholder Advice Part B: Complete Results.

Workshop participation

A list of persons who represent a wide range of sectors and interests was developed in April 2010. In early May, these persons (both external and internal to the City of Edmonton) were invited to participate in the workshops planned for June. The following describes how many came, and what sectors were represented. In all, 161 people attended Workshop 1: 112 external stakeholders and 49 City employees.

External stakeholders represented the following sectors:

- Business (companies, organizations, service groups) (30)
- Academic institutions (professors, principals, administrators, students) (16)
- Non-profit organizations (15)
- Government (federal, provincial, provincial agencies, city council) (13)

- Environmental organizations (12)
- Professional companies or service groups (10)
- Community organizations (6)
- Youth (6)
- Unknown (4)

Note: Many participants could have been assigned to several categories.

Sustainability principles

Participants were informed of the results of the on-line questionnaire and then asked to review the sustainability principles included in the pre-workshop questionnaire and consider them as follows:

What do the principles mean for Edmonton?
If we adopted them, what would we do differently?

In three of the workshops, participants were also given dots and asked to select the 4 principles they would most like to see incorporated into Edmonton's sustainability plan (the decision to include this exercise was made after the project team evaluated the first workshop and determined they would benefit from observing the choices stakeholders would make). The following table illustrates the results when participants were asked to "select four principles that you would prefer as guidelines for our sustainability plan." As noted above, this exercise was not part of the first workshop, so results from only two workshops for external stakeholders and the workshop for City of Edmonton are reported.

Table 3: Number of times principle statements were selected as being useful for the strategic plan

Note: The numbers shown represent the number of dots placed beside each principle when participants were allowed to make four selections. The occasional participant assigned "half dots."

Principle Statement	Workshops		Combined
	External 1B and 1C	Internal COE	
Model cities on ecosystems. Build on the characteristics of ecosystems in the development and nurturing of healthy and sustainable cities.	39	30	69
Substances introduced into the environment from human activities must be minimized and rendered harmless to biosphere functions.	34	27	61
Recognize the intrinsic value of biodiversity and natural ecosystems and protect and restore them.	33	26	59
Renewable resources must be consumed at a rate that is less than, ore equal to, the rate of natural replenishment.	25	28	53
Use of non-renewable resources must decline at a rate that	22	26.5	48.5

Principle Statement	Workshops		Combined
	External 1B and 1C	Internal COE	
is less than or equal to the rate of natural replenishment.			
Ensure that population growth and/or growth in the rate of consumption of resources are sustainable.	23.5	22	45.5

Principle Statement	Workshops		Combined
	External 1B and 1C	Internal COE	
Ensure that Nature is not subject to systematically increasing degradation by physical means	19	9.5	28.5
Ensure that people are not subject to conditions that systematically undermine their capacity to meet their needs.	14	14	28
Ensure that Nature is not subject to systematically increasing concentrations of substances produced by society.	8	5	13
Ensure that Nature is not subject to systematically increasing concentrations of substances extracted from the Earth's crust.	8	-	8

COE = City of Edmonton

The discussion of principles aroused comments about the human perspective: some felt that we have failed to see that environmental requirements are more important than everything else in our world, while others felt that the principles should be expanded to ensure that the “three pillars” (environmental, economic and social) are in balance.

Similarly, there was considerable discussion about how intrusive the City should be in people's lives (i.e., how much regulation and enforcement?) and about whether or not incentives have a role in creating the kind of changes that the principles imply (i.e., carrot or stick or both?). A related topic concerned the role of municipal government—how much can it do? What kinds of actions are appropriate? How does it influence higher levels of government?

Some people felt the principles overlook the nature of a city because they don't mention the built environment or infrastructure. Similarly, others wondered if biodiversity and ecosystem functions can be supported within the city, or whether the city requires an outlying rural area to take the primary role of protecting biodiversity. This discussion of city boundary also emerged about food supply and agricultural land, leading to comments that perhaps the city must have regional alliances to live up to these principles.

There were many comments about individual principles which will help planners make choices about the principles to incorporate into the plan and about how those principles should be interpreted. Most participants supported the value of including principles in the plan. The complete account of comments about principles is included, by principle, in Section 2 of Stakeholder Advice Part B: Complete Results.

Challenges

Participants were informed of the results of the pre-workshop questionnaire. They were then asked to review environmental challenges that had been included in the

questionnaire. Following the first workshop, challenges were grouped into slightly larger categories (i.e., all energy challenges were grouped together, ecosystem and biodiversity were grouped, and agricultural land and food supply were grouped). This change was made by the project team because they felt this approach would make participant choices more clear.

Participants were first asked to place three dots on the challenges they considered to be most important for Edmonton to address in the strategic plan. The results are shown in the table below. The four challenge statements most selected as important are highlighted.

Table 4: Number of times challenge statements were chosen as “most important” for the strategic plan

Note: The numbers shown represent the number of dots placed beside each challenge when participants were allowed to make three selections.

Challenge Statement	Workshops		
	External 1A	External 1B and 1C	Internal COE
Energy: Edmonton’s dependence on fossil fuels will become a serious challenge (due to resource depletion and/or the need to reduce greenhouse gas emissions/ climate change).	Oil 6 Gas 2 Coal 1	58	38
Water Supply: The demand for water will exceed supply (due to a growing population, receding glaciers at the headwaters of the North Saskatchewan River, and/or the general effects of climate change .)	18	38	33
Biodiversity: The loss of biodiversity and the related ecosystem services will seriously affect Edmonton’s wellbeing (e.g., loss through habitat destruction, degradation, fragmentation and/or climate change .)	Maintaining biodiversity 15 Maintaining local natural ecosystems 38	20	16
Food: Edmonton will experience food security challenges (due to a growing world population, vulnerable supply lines, loss of local agricultural land, and/or the effects of climate change both here and around the world).	Maintaining agricultural land 20 Maintaining food supply 4	29	15
Water Quality: The quality of Edmonton’s water will be seriously affected by the growing population within the watershed and /or reduced flows in the North Saskatchewan River (i.e., climate change) that are unable to handle pollution loads.	13	14	14
Ambient Air Quality: Edmonton’s outdoor air quality will be seriously impacted due to a growing population, growing industry and/or effects of climate change .	14	9	16
Extreme Weather: Edmonton will face increasingly severe weather that will lead to property loss, productivity loss and possible loss of life (as a result of climate change).	7	1	9
Demand for renewable resources might exceed supply some or all of the time	5		
Responding to global changes in demand and supply	4		
Mass transit		1	
Natural gas shortages		1	
Land availability		1	

Urban sprawl/densification		1	
Poverty		1	

COE = City of Edmonton

After each table had selected its top challenges, the participants at the table addressed one challenge and discussed the kinds of action they imagined would be necessary to address the challenge (in some cases, the challenges were assigned to ensure all challenges received suggestions during the consultation).

The complete account of ideas that emerged from this discussion is included, by challenge, in Section 2 of Stakeholder Advice Part B: Complete Results. These ideas were then summarized by the City of Edmonton project team and used as a basis for discussions at Workshop 2. The summary of ideas was distributed under the title, "Inventory of Ideas" (June 15, 2010), issued by the City of Edmonton.

Workshop 2 Results

Workshop process

At Workshop 2, internal and external stakeholders were invited to analyze policy options developed by the City of Edmonton project team, based on the outcomes of Workshop 1 and the expert advice received to date (summarized as an “Inventory of Ideas” and provided to registered workshop participants several days prior to their workshop).

At each workshop, participants were asked to consider a number of policy options in the context of the policy option influencing Council decisions to either favour or discourage certain directions and activities. Participants were seated in small groups at discussion tables, and each table had a City of Edmonton staff member to facilitate, keep time and record the points raised by the group on a flipchart. As well, participants were encouraged to complete a worksheet. Flip charts and completed worksheets were gathered after each discussion.

Discussion of policy options to achieve the draft energy sustainability goal

Due to the number of energy policy options developed to support achievement of the draft energy sustainability goal, each small group was asked to review the options and first identify three that they felt merited further consideration as the draft strategic plan is developed. Participants then selected one energy policy option to discuss in their group and identified the benefits and potential problems that might result if Council adopted the policy.

Further examining the same chosen policy option, participants reviewed the City of Edmonton’s existing initiatives and discussed if the current pace of change is sufficient or if the City’s commitment needs to be moderately or urgently increased.

Finally, given a list of potential barriers to achieving the draft energy goal, participants were asked to consider which potential barrier would be their priority to address if they were the leader responsible for achieving the goal.

Discussion of policy options to achieve other draft sustainability goals

Each group was assigned another sustainability goal and completed similar exercises as noted above: (a) discussion of benefits and potential problems; (b) discussion of pace of change; and (c) discussion of the priority barrier to address. The other draft sustainability goals had limited policy options for discussion so the exercise to select the “top three” as described above for energy policy options was not required.

Workshop participation

Most participants registered to attend Workshop 2 at the same time that they registered to attend Workshop 1. Approximately 22 new participants joined the process for Workshop 2 and approximately 62 or 39% of those who attended the first workshop did not return. However, many of the organizations were still represented by others from the same organization or by the new representatives attending.

Three opportunities to participate were provided for external stakeholders:

2A	June 22	1:00 – 4:30 pm	Shaw Conference Centre
2B	June 24	8:30 am – 12 noon	Holiday Inn Express Downtown
2C	June 24	5:30 – 9:00 pm	Holiday Inn Express Downtown

One opportunity was provided for City of Edmonton employees on the morning of June 22, 2010 at the Shaw Conference Centre. In all, 112 people participated in Workshop 2— 37 City of Edmonton employees and 75 external stakeholders. The participants at the three external stakeholder workshops represented the following sectors:

- Business (companies, organizations, service groups) (21)
- Environmental organizations (12)
- Professional companies or service groups (10)
- Non-profit organizations (9)
- Academic institutions (professors, principals, administrators, students) (8)
- Government (federal, provincial, provincial agencies, city council) (5)
- Community organizations (4)
- Youth (4)
- Unknown (1)

Note: Many participants could have been assigned to several categories.

Discussion of energy policy options

Top three selection

Participants were given a draft energy sustainability goal, “Edmonton’s sources of energy and the way Edmontonians use energy are sustainable” and then given a list of 8 policy options (all described as a bias introduced into Council decisions).

Participants were then asked to select three policy options that they felt should be further explored (deserved further analysis and consideration) in the draft strategic plan (see table 5, next page, for a list of the energy policy options and the results of the top three selection).

Table 5: Energy policy options – top three selection

		Workshops				Totals
Energy Option	Council decisions would...	Internal COE	External			
			2A	2B	2C	
A	Favour an urban size and form that achieve optimal energy efficiency. (Examples: increase density, reduce sprawl)	23	26	18	14	81
B	Discourage use of private motor vehicles. (Examples: fees, parking changes, pedestrian areas)	5	2	1	3	11
C	Favour energy efficient travel options. (Examples: increase public transit use, design for transit)	19	17	7	4	47
D	Favour energy efficient building stock. (Examples: building code, adopt advanced standards for municipal buildings, zoning regulations)	19	21	13	10	63
E	Favour a distributed/decentralized energy system that uses renewable energy. (Examples: zoning changes, incentives for solar, municipal feed-in tariff, incentives for renewable energy use, substitute renewable sources for coal-fired generation)	21	22	15	3	61
F	Favour a diversified economy; not largely dependent on fossil fuel extraction and fossil fuel-related industries. (Examples: develop green jobs and companies through developments such as municipal airport site, support training in green jobs, focus on attracting industries that are not energy intensive or polluting)	8	16	5	8	37
G	Favour a resilient city that can withstand energy disturbances. (Examples: establish an energy and carbon accounting system, introduce redundancy in utility and emergency services, purchase gas supplies on futures market)	3	1	-	-	4
H	Promote lifestyles that contribute to energy sustainability. (Examples: community awareness, community events, community energy initiatives)	15	15	1	3	34
Other	Switch to electricity for all uses	-	-	2		2
	Totals per Workshop	113	120	62	45	340

Benefits and risks of implementing energy policy options

At each table, participants were asked to select one energy policy option to discuss in more detail. Participants were asked to identify the benefits and potential problems of proceeding with the policy option that they chose to discuss. The complete account of workshop 2 comments, including the identified benefits and potential problems associated with implementing energy policy options, is included in Section 3 of the report Stakeholder Advice Part B: Complete Results. The results of this discussion will help planners consider how to fashion an appropriate policy direction in the draft strategic plan.

Is the current pace of change appropriate?

With respect to the particular energy policy option under discussion in their group, participants were asked to provide their opinion about whether (a) the current pace of change is sufficient, (b) a moderate increase in the City's commitment is needed, or (c) an urgent increase in the City's commitment is needed. The following table describes the responses that were recorded for each of four energy policy options discussed at workshops.

Table 6: Energy policy options - Is the current pace of change appropriate?

Policy Option	Current Pace of Change is Sufficient	Moderately Increase City's Commitment	Urgently Increase City's Commitment
Favour an urban size and form that achieve optimal energy efficiency	2 (4%)	8 (17%)	37 (79%)
Favour energy efficient travel options	1 (13%)	6 (75%)	1 (13%)
Favour energy efficient building stock	3 (13%)	10 (42%)	11 (46%)
Favour a distributed/decentralized energy system that uses renewable energy	-	13 (46%)	15 (54%)
Overall (107 responses)	6 (6%)	37 (35%)	64 (60%)

Note: Percentages may not equal 100% due to rounding.

Barriers to achieving the draft energy sustainability goal

Participants were asked to consider a list of potential barriers to achieving the energy sustainability goal (see table headings below for potential barriers). They were then asked to consider which potential barrier would be their priority to address if they were the leader responsible for achieving the goal. The following table illustrates the barriers identified as priorities. Note: For the discussion of energy policy options, each small group discussion focused on a particular option (and participants were likely influenced by that). For that reason, the energy policy option under discussion is also noted.

Table 7: Which barrier would be your first priority to address if you were responsible for achieving the energy goal?

Energy Policy Option Under Discussion in Small Groups	Number of participants who chose the barrier as their highest priority to address					
	Cultural norms	Regulations	Technology	Leadership	Public awareness	City form and scale
A Urban size and form	17 (39%)	9 (21%)	1 (2%)	8 (18%)	3 (7%)	6 (14%)
C Favour energy efficient travel options	4 (67%)	-	-	1 (17%)	-	1 (17%)
D Favour energy efficient building stock	6 (32%)	5 (26%)	-	6 (32%)	1 (5%)	1 (5%)
E Favour distributed/ decentralized system that uses renewable energy	4 (15%)	9 (33%)	-	10 (37%)	1 (4%)	3 (11%)
Overall (96 responses)	31(32%)	23 (24%)	1 (1%)	25 (26%)	5 (5%)	11 (12%)

Note: Percentages may not equal 100% due to rounding.

Some participants made choices other than those presented in the table above:

- Budget (aligning revenues and expenses, funding, costs): 8
- Legislation: 1
- Incentives: 1
- Carbon tax: 1
- Economic factors: 2

Policy options supporting other draft goals

After energy policy options were discussed, each discussion group was assigned a draft sustainability goal from the following list:

Category	Draft Goal	Policy Options: <i>Council Decisions would...</i>
Water supply	Edmonton's sources of water and the way Edmontonians use water are sustainable	A. Favour an urban size, form and infrastructure that achieve water conservation and water efficiency. (Examples: stringent water efficiency standards, promote low impact development designs that capture rainwater, promote xeri-scaping, etc.)
		B. Favour a resilient city that can withstand water supply disturbances. (Examples: promote resilient approaches, develop an inter-municipal water management plan, develop an water storage reservoir)
		C. Promote lifestyles that contribute to water supply sustainability. (Examples: build community awareness, support community events and initiatives)
Food	Edmonton's food system is sustainable.	A. Favour local food production, processing and distribution capacity. (Examples: protect farmland, develop food charter, encourage urban agriculture)
		B. Promote lifestyles of Edmontonians that contribute to food security/sustainability. (Examples: inform citizens about consequences of actions, encourage participation in efforts to support food security/sustainability, local citizen engagement)
Air quality	Edmonton's air quality supports high standards of human and ecosystem health.	A. Favour initiatives which reduce impacts from point source emissions and transportation source emissions. (Examples: vehicle inspection, congestion zone charges, no idling, work with Province on building standards and emission regulation)
		B. Promote lifestyles of Edmontonians that contribute to clean ambient air. (Examples: inform citizens about consequences of actions, encourage participation in efforts to improve air quality, local citizen engagement)

Category	Draft Goal	Policy Options: <i>Council Decisions would...</i>
Biodiversity	Edmonton's biodiversity is rich and its natural ecosystems are healthy, plentiful and connected.	A. Favour initiatives that support biodiversity and healthy ecosystems. (Examples: natural corridors, protected areas, inventory biodiversity, developer guidelines, residential guidelines, brownfield development)
		B. Promote lifestyles of Edmontonians that contribute to biodiversity and healthy, robust ecosystems. (Examples: inform citizens about consequences of actions, encourage participation in efforts to support biodiversity, local citizen engagement)
Water quality	Edmonton's water quality supports high standards of human and ecosystem health.	A. Favour highest standards of water quality – ground, surface and drinking. (Examples: low impact design such as green roofs and water absorbent landscape; downtown storm water management)
		B. Promote lifestyles of Edmontonians that contribute to clean water. (Examples: inform citizens about consequences of actions, encourage participation in efforts to improve storm water quality, local citizen engagement)
Extreme weather	Edmonton is resilient – able to withstand extreme weather events that may occur in the future.	Favour initiatives that will help the city and its residents withstand extreme weather events including droughts, severe storms and floods. (Examples: emergency preparedness, identify risks and risk zones, increase utility and infrastructure durability)
Waste Management	Quantities of waste produced and methods used to manage waste are sustainable.	A. Favour minimal production of residential and non-residential solid waste, and responsible management of whatever waste is generated. (Examples: expanded role in non-residential waste management, waste fuel research, closed loop recycling)
		B. Promote lifestyles of Edmontonians that contribute to resource conservation, low levels of consumption and overall low levels of waste production. (Examples: inform citizens about consequences of actions, encourage participation in efforts to reduce-reuse-recycle, waste fees such as plastic bag fees, local citizen engagement)

Using a worksheet describing each goal and current efforts to achieve it, each small group then chose a policy option on the worksheet to discuss.

Benefits and risks of implementing policy options

Participants were asked to identify the benefits and potential problems of proceeding with their chosen policy option. The complete account of workshop 2 comments gathered from flip charts and worksheets is included in Section 3 of Stakeholder Advice Part B: Complete Results. The results of this discussion will help planners consider how to fashion an appropriate policy direction in the draft strategic plan.

Other policy options: Is the current pace of change appropriate?

With respect to the particular policy option under discussion in their group, participants were asked to provide their opinion about whether (a) the current pace of change is sufficient, (b) a moderate increase in the City's commitment is needed, or (c) an urgent increase in the City's commitment is needed. The following table describes the responses that were recorded for each policy option discussed.

Table 8: Other policy options - Is the current pace of change appropriate?

Other Policy Options	Current Pace of Change is Sufficient	Moderately Increase City's Commitment	Urgently Increase City's Commitment
Water supply Option A. Favour a size, urban form and infrastructure that achieve water conservation and water efficiency	3 (18%)	6 (35%)	8 (46%)
Food Option A. Favour local food production, processing and distribution capacity	2 (8%)	15 (63%)	7 (29%)
Biodiversity Option A. Favour initiatives that support biodiversity and healthy ecosystems	1 (4%)	9 (36%)	15 (60%)
Water quality Option A. Favour highest standards of water quality – ground, surface and drinking	4 (33%)	5(42%)	3 (25%)
Air quality Option A. Favour initiatives which reduce impacts from point source emissions and transportation source emissions	-	3 (43%)	4 (57%)
Extreme weather: Favour initiatives that will help the city and its residents withstand extreme weather events including droughts, severe storms and floods	-	2 (22%)	7 (78%)
Waste Option B. Promote lifestyles of Edmontonians that contribute to resource conservation, low levels of consumption and overall low levels of waste production	1 (14%)	6 (86%)	-
Overall (101 responses)	11 (11%)	46 (46%)	44 (44%)

Other sustainability goals: Barriers to achieving the goals

Participants were asked to consider a list of potential barriers (see headings in table below) to achieving the draft goal of the policy options under discussion in their group and then to consider which potential barrier would be their highest priority to address if they were the leader responsible for achieving the goal.

The following table illustrates the barriers identified as priorities in each small group discussion.

Table 9: Which barrier would be your first priority to address if you were responsible for achieving the sustainability goal?

Policy Option Under Discussion in Small Groups	Number of participants who chose the barrier as their highest priority to address					
	Cultural norms	Regulations	Technology	Leadership	Public awareness	City form and scale
Favour a size, urban form and infrastructure that achieve water conservation and water efficiency	7 (47%)	2 (13%)	-	4 (27%)	2 (13%)	-
Favour local food production, processing and distribution capacity	7 (32%)	2 (9%)	-	3 (14%)	7 (32%)	3 (14%)
Favour initiatives that support biodiversity and healthy ecosystems	2 (14%)	6 (43%)	-	3 (21%)	-	3 (21%)
Favour highest standards of water quality – ground, surface and drinking	-	7 (64%)	1 (9%)	1 (9%)	1 (9%)	1 (9%)
Favour initiatives which reduce impacts from point source emissions and transportation source emissions (air quality)	-	1 (17%)	2 (33%)	-	3 (50%)	-
Favour initiatives that will help the city and its residents withstand extreme weather events including droughts, severe storms and floods	2 (14%)	6 (43%)	-	4 (29%)	2 (14%)	-
Promote lifestyles of Edmontonians that contribute to resource conservation, low levels of consumption and overall low levels of waste production	2 (50%)	-	1 (25%)	1 (25%)	-	-
Overall (86 responses)	20 (23%)	24 (28%)	4 (5%)	16 (19%)	15 (17%)	7 (8%)

Other potential priorities identified:

- More information
- Economics, incentives (4)
- Budget, cost (3)
- Legislation

Next steps

The information described in this report will be a central reference for the project team as they assemble a draft strategic plan. The draft plan will likely be sent out for review in late fall of 2010—with the date yet to be determined as City elections are scheduled for October 2010.

In the meantime, there will be a continued effort to offer opportunities to all Edmonton citizens who would like to provide commentary, advice and leadership in the effort to plan and implement sustainable approaches within the city.

Anyone who is reading this report and would like to become part of the sustainability planning process should visit the City of Edmonton web site, www.edmonton.ca/thewaywegreen, to review the postings there and to learn about future opportunities to provide input.

Thanks to the many dedicated City employees who have made the effort to gather advice from experts and from a wide range of stakeholders within the city, and especially thank you to the many Edmonton citizens who have donated their valuable time for the purpose of making this sustainability plan bold and practical.