

THE WAY WE GREEN

SUMMARY OF

Public and Stakeholder Input

OCTOBER AND NOVEMBER 2010

Appendix 3

**Stakeholder Workshops
Comments**

Prepared by
Bill McMillan
Principal
Defining Common Ground

mcmillan4@shaw.ca • 780 288 4234

Appendix 3 – Stakeholder Workshop Comments

A series of four workshops with invited stakeholders was hosted by the City of Edmonton from November 16 to 18, 2010. Participants sat at discussion tables of 5 to 8 people where a facilitator asked them to consider the direction in *The Way We Green White Paper* and to comment on (a) any concerns about the direction identified, (b) any gaps or oversights, and (c) ideas about timelines and ways to measure success. A majority of stakeholders indicated the *White Paper* is not only acceptable, but also urgently necessary. Their comments were largely about how to ensure the policies can be effectively implemented. They also identified a number of important concerns and suggested improvements to the proposed policies.

This appendix provides a full reporting of the comments captured and recorded at the workshops.

Comments are organized by goals and are also generally sorted into comments about: overall discussion of the goal and objectives; gaps or deficiencies; measures and milestones; and time lines. Comments have also been identified as to their source: stakeholders external to City of Edmonton (external) and City of Edmonton stakeholders, i.e., staff (internal).

Where specific objectives or proposed policies under each goal were discussed, a reference number from the *White Paper* is used to identify it. It should be noted that at the first workshop (City of Edmonton staff), participants were asked to review only the goals and objectives in the *White Paper*. In response to a suggestion made at that workshop, participants at the following workshops (external stakeholders) were asked to comment on the proposed policies, as well as the goals and objectives in the *White Paper*.

At all workshops during the first round of participation, the small group discussions focused on either the energy or climate change goals, objectives and proposed policies. During the second round of participation, small groups focused on one or two of the remaining goals in the *White Paper*.

Energy (Goal 1)

Overall

External

- General consensus within Council on definitions of (1) sustainability and (2) resilience
- Energy lacks cradle-to-cradle, full cost accounting regarding resources
- We appear to be looking at objectives in isolation but would rather they were looked at as a package – would encourage looking at the entire package of objectives
- Use incentives and disincentives
- Objectives being considered too much in isolation – need to consider them as a whole package
- General consensus within Council on definitions of (a) sustainability and (b) resilience
- Also need to look at environmental costs – difficult to measure
- No mechanism for indirect – to tie into grid through incentives
- Discrepancy between what Edmonton wants to do and can do
- If we produce too much energy here, can we sell outside?
- Define energy disturbances (geo, climate, supply)
- What is context for “new” – new here? But not necessarily to other parts of the world
- Costs: looking at present but also 20-30 years down the road – environmental costs
- Population projections?
- Objectives being considered too much in isolation
- Balanced approach – indirect homes and commercial
- When you become efficient, what happens to the excess? Do we just use more or save it/bank it? “Jevin’s Paradox”
- Hidden subsidies – fully accounted for transit subsidies are openly discussed, but road subsidies are not
- Goals don’t address local businesses
- Must align and link with other plans
- Consider affordability
- Must enforce and also improve standards – start at least with energy efficiency standards so builders can get used to them
- Mix alternate energy needs with land use planning
- Emphasize carbon reduction in White Paper
- Living document – review data – review science – changing rapidly – so targets may need to be adapted based on new information
- There is a legal authority issue – currently no interface between government levels
- City can work with other government bodies to acquire the (collective) power to achieve these goals.
- Some of these agreements exceed the city’s power but all are important
- Requires a policy environment that favours local businesses (shortening supply chain, buying locally, procurement of services locally)
- Encourage procurement from businesses with their own corporate (CSR) policies
- Tax breaks and incentives for businesses to help move forward
- Seems that unless there is a massive grass roots buy in, it won’t happen; how do we go about achieving this buy in?

- Policy audit; if City proposes goals, it should propose audit as well
- Failure of Co2RE program due to policies not in place to achieve goal
- Require implementation plan that displays clearly goals, measures and targets and evaluation (as practical)
- If we are serious, look at reversal of the 25-75 split on location of development – it makes the “way we grow,” “the way we sprawl”
- Looks good but need to design cities and neighbourhoods intelligently (“Eco cities” book)
- LEED standards are reference but not LEED ND (neighbourhoods) – In addition, look at Smart Growth principles
- Encourage transit oriented development
- Bus lane on ring road
- Pursue special “status” for buildings – for more stringent than Alberta Building Code
- LEED standard codes (or specific energy standards) as starting point within XX years
- Feed-in-tariff needs to be tried a minimum of 10 years
- Solar-ready
- Changing to a mix of alternatives needs to go along with a change in land use planning
- Consider what the “driver” may be to kick us to change
- If we “refuse” new money for roads, etc., we need to be able to move that money to green projects
- Need to continually engage Edmontonians to continually push the agenda so they have a say and understand
- Need predictable actions so industry can plan for it – example – it costs more to buy green power – a ‘luxury’ – it should be cheaper
- Need to shift our industry – public money built our original power plants

Internal

- Definition of built form must include green infrastructure
- Policy on moving from petro to non-petro industry – question this
- Lead by example.
- Some discussion around whether or not we should separate energy goals.
- Use airport lands as a prototype.
- Resiliency: are you talking about 3 days or 3 weeks?
- Some redundancy between sustainability and resilience – remove second half of goal.
- Something added to energy bills to know energy use better (relative measure)
- City needs to have a position on nuclear
- Depends on cost (up to a point where it becomes cost prohibitive)
- Suggested goal: Edmonton’s use of energy supply is (a) sustainable and (b) resilient to disturbances.
- Too much emphasis on resilience and supply
- Is part (b) needed? – it’s part of sustainability
- But at what cost?
- Efficient use of money
- Don’t conserve energy one way and waste energy in another or create another environmental impact
- Lead by example
- What is the “value” for the general public?
- How do we “sell” this to the general public?
- How do we brand our programs?
- Objectives require clarity; unclear if they apply to City administration or to the public
- Two separate ideas presented as one goal (sustainability and resilience)

Energy

- Energy efficiency is implied but not stated
- Clarify references to City of Edmonton (corporation) or broad community of Edmonton
- Paradox: As we become more efficient, do we use more energy?
- Efficiency must be achieved first before alternatives
- Education and partnerships need to be expanded throughout the plan

Gaps

External

- Conservation
- Energy mapping needs to be done – a useful tool
- Financial costs should be weighed against environmental costs of not acting
- Need to focus on education
- Should be a consensus on Council about resilience and sustainability
- Regional coordination is essential
- Conservation piece missing – a need to conserve overall
- Energy mapping
- Costs – present costs for 20-30-50 years down the road, including the costs of not acting
- Missing throughout is a focus on public education
- Conservation critical
- Energy mapping
- Lacking cradle to cradle calculation – PV panels have a huge impact (metals, minerals in panels); total life cost/cycle analysis (full cost accounting) – hidden subsidies
- Public education – enabling people to make choices themselves
- Building economic resiliency in the plan for local businesses seems to be missing – corporate reliance – technology reliance – management during global changes/losses
- The principle of engagement seems to be missing throughout the plan (people being involved, approaches used, strategies used in all these goals/policies/objectives, standing public involvement)
- Require methods of increasing community support
- Full cost account for roadways
- Pedestrian overpasses should have been considered for ring road
- Consideration for affordable housing and for mixed income
- Need to have enforceable targets for building codes – ways for us to improve standards

Internal

- Amount of energy saved from trees, vegetation
- Need to figure out how to sell the ideas to the public
- Objectives require clarity – are you referring to the administration or to everyone?
- Clarity – Infrastructure – what is being referred to?
- Gather a risk and need inventory – determine disturbances that may be coming
- “Built Stock” – terms needs to be more precise and improved
- Set targets: need to understand the consequences of not meeting targets; creates a sense of urgency
- Define “built form” – too broad

Measures and Milestones

External

- MDP indicates 75% growth in suburbs – should be at least 50/50
- Indicators and milestones have significant overlap
- Feed-in tariffs in year 1 as it will take a long time to measure success
- Implementations should be the benchmarks, then measure success

Internal

- Absolute energy use vs. per capita energy use – both should be tracked (consumption)
- How will you measure – total footprint or per capita? There could be problems in measuring
- Appears many objectives would have a 20-30-40 year time frame, but can identify milestones
- There are a lot of possible targets but whatever they are, Council needs to understand the consequences of not achieving them or they will be meaningless
- Building stock – 20-30 years for existing stock to achieve improvements
- Trend how much of each energy source is used (i.e., solar, electricity – from which sources, etc.)
- Percentage of residential homes that are at least 70% energy efficient
- Percentage of commercial buildings that are at least 70% energy efficient
- Percentage of energy that comes from renewable sources
- Reduction in cars and roads
- 50% of all our energy comes from renewable sources
- 100% of city fleet running on alternative fuel in 10 years

Time Lines

External

- Focus on what we have control of first
- Start all immediately regardless of length of time to attain goal- some early wins
- Initiate policies over which the City has control – some will require lobbying to other bodies
- Have short, medium and long-term goals for each objective

Internal

- 2050
- Regular reporting
- Regular review/evaluation of targets/benchmarks
- Should be able to demonstrate annual improvements in renewal energy sources (especially city-controlled assets)
- We should have achieved this yesterday
- We can achieve it in 40-50 years
- We need to plan for it now, invest money in it now
- Some objectives can be achieved in a shorter time frame
- Need to see what other cities are doing and establish benchmarks

Energy

Objective 1.1: Edmonton's built form promotes energy efficiency and minimizes Edmonton's energy footprint

Overall

External

- Like focus on infill
- Like focus on energy efficiency
- Question industrial energy
- Can't underestimate implications of density
- Clean autos will allow lower densities to exist – to some degree
- Not enough emphasis on cycling and e-efficient transport
- Green belts and zones are essential to preserve habitat, food
- Integrate energy with ecology and biodiversity
- Not enough emphasis on cycling and e-efficient transport
- Policies need to be stronger in stressing the role of developers and builders to achieve a smaller energy footprint
- Policies should place stronger emphasis on regulations
- The City Centre Airport project should be seen as Edmonton's major launch to sustainability. Use this project as a catalyst to demonstrate a more energy efficient urban form. Exciting, leading-edge technologies should be incorporated into this project. Make it a global / international showpiece. Combine this project with Expo.
- As part of a more efficient urban form, promote more multi-use facilities. For example, consider redevelopment of old school, developing them into larger complexes that include worksites, schools, places where people live, senior care centres, etc.
- Broaden the focus of policy 1.1.4. The policy should call for more than "developing a strategy to retain and repopulate schools in mature neighbourhoods." Have it focus on revitalizing all aspects of mature neighbourhoods
- There is a sense that if revitalization of the downtown is successful, homeless people and the poor will be displaced. A policy should be added stating that revitalization of mature neighbourhoods will not result in the displacement of poor and homeless people
- Consider the use of green bonds
- 1.1.2 Amend to include both carrots and sticks (i.e. Rail Town – policy in place and more should be done)
- 1.1.4 Extremely important when addressing ecological footprint – built form is critical to address transportation (commute distances, walkability index of area where you live)

Internal

- A very important objective
- "built form" is unclear
- Redundant with 1.2, 1.4
- Too vague – get rid of it
- Disagree – we already have our city built with urban sprawl – how do we go back?
- What is "built form"? – it is not clear

Gaps

External

- Business cases for new technology, i.e. district energy
- Policy should include regional coordination on policies such as density – essential not to expand sprawl
- Incorporate social data demographics in planning future built form – lifestyle plus culture
- Integrate energy with ecology and biodiversity
- Green belts are essential to preserve habitat, food
- 1.1.5 - consideration for safety needs to be specified

Internal

- Built form wording is not clear

Measures and Milestones

External

- Plan, policy, regulations in place
- By energy mapping
- By new developments in mature neighbourhoods that are diverse
- Incorporate demographics, lifestyle, culture into consideration of built form – how will it influence built form of future
- Implement within three years
- Leadership from development industry
- Inventory of infill opportunities
- 10 years: Increased density in mature neighbourhoods
- 10 years: Reduced energy use/person
- 10 years: increased use of alternative energy
- 10 years: Mode shifts - less demand for roads
- By 2011 Policy should include regional coordination on policies such as density – essential not to encourage sprawl
- By 2011 Incorporate social data demographics in planning future built form – lifestyle and culture
- 1 year – detailed plan to City Council
- 1.1.1, 2, 4 and 6 could be done quickly – 0-5 years; and in as little as 1 year
- 1.1.3 and 5 look like they would take longer – 10-20 years
- Start all immediately but can't transform the building stock quickly
- Done when 90% of buildings are done
- A certain percentage of city land use/neighbourhoods have a strategy plan (renewal plans)
- Policy audit
- Establish performance targets and measures
- Annual reports on progress policies. Short term – policies in place and adopted by Council (1.1.1, 2, 4 and 6)
- Policy in place for new construction (short term)
- Immediate: Council has directed staff to commence work on these policies – within the next month
- Allocating resources
- Public transportation throughout the entire city will be much more reliable and timely
- Density of 40 units/ha will be achieved

Energy

- Major amenities (shopping, schools, doctor, work) will be within x km of the average home. (Multi-use, contained neighbourhoods)
- Efficient, rapid transit from downtown to the International Airport
- Density in the downtown will increase
- ≤ 1 car per family
- Less sprawl
- Significant re-development of old/mature neighbourhoods
- Fewer cars downtown
- Reduced distance travelled per person per year

Internal

- By solar access (passive solar)
- Design of built form - per lot or per unit?
- What scale can this be measured at and how?
- How much energy used versus baseline – various categories of infrastructure
- Some measure of renewal of building stock (uptake of program funding)
- Carbon footprint – total carbon footprint vs. footprint per capita – per capita may go down but total could still go up

Time Lines

External

- Policy and plan within 5 years; 25 years to meet objective
- By 2013 infrastructure changes should be built into new work. Bike lanes for more effective routes.
- 1 year: business cases for new technologies, i.e., district energy
- 2013 – infrastructure changes should be built into new work (biking, more effective routes)
- 1 year - business cases for new technology
- 2011 – regional coordination to prevent sprawl
- 2011 – preserve habitat, food
- 30 years to achieve the overall objective: Edmonton's built form promotes energy efficiency and minimizes Edmonton's energy footprint

Internal

- Change will be slow on this one

Objective 1.2: Edmonton's building stock is energy efficient.

Overall

External

- 1.2.3 and 1.2.4 require building code improvements
- Changing building codes – stage it – Edmonton can't act in isolation of the region
- Be careful not to restrict/discourage new business to Edmonton
- Better regulation of "installers" and better regulation of "educators" – also better information from City to citizens

- Need to reconcile
- More townhouses

Internal

- Too vague
- Priorities: 1 – energy efficiency; 2 – alternate energy forms
- Is resiliency covered? Bit of a motherhood statement
- Best on list
- What direction? Include word like “improvement”
- City has “new building” policies – look at new standards for building rehab

Gaps

External

- Need to reconcile market drivers process with what is now: offered, affordable
- Need to look carefully on the impact of changes to bylaws and zoning
- Focus on policies that work with natural features such as home orientation, trees, etc.
- Incentivize city building and development permits
- New property tax structure based on energy (incentives, disincentives)
- Suggested additional policy: When selling or renting property in Edmonton, owners will be required to disclose the buildings energuide rating.
- Suggested additional policy: City will provide incentives for re-skinning commercial buildings.

Internal

- Clarify “energy efficient”
- Deal with greenwashing – establish green criteria

Measures and Milestones

Internal

- Energy efficiency - measure against what standard?
- Develop standards for equipment in buildings
- Develop green building standards quickly (standard by “X” date)
- Back up plan – greener energy
- By number of Edmonton developers or builders that are Natural Step
- % of homes that score at least 80% on the energuide rating
- Number of buildings built to a certain standard, i.e., LEED
- How do we measure success of objective from current baseline?
- Number false thermostats
- Improvement over present
- Kw/square foot or gj/square foot – to determine efficiency of building itself and its operation
- Lights off when not in room
- Green building
- New standards drafted for redeveloped building strategy approved

Energy

Time Lines

External

- 1 year: 1.2.4 in place; 1.2.1 in place; building operation efficiency programs
- 10 years: X% of new homes being built as NZR
- 2012 – new property tax structure based on energy
- New -5-15 years: mean 7-8 years
- Existing – 10-40 years: mean 22-23 years
- City-owned (new) 5 years; (existing) 10-20 years – mean 15 years
- Comprehensive energy mapping and targets for energy efficiency – “state the savings”
- Comprehensive energy mapping and targets for energy-efficiency within 3 years

Internal

- New buildings: tomorrow
- Existing buildings: 20 years
- Land on a timeframe, i.e., ROI in 5 years/7 years
- Approved ROI – 5 years – 10 years to help guide our investments

Objective 1.3: Edmonton is not overly reliant on fossil fuels for energy. Much of Edmonton’s energy comes from renewable sources that are produced locally.

Overall

External

- Issue of trade-offs, costs – what is reasonable? Price points – PV example – reduced CF – how it’s done is implied
- Ambiguity – what is “overly reliant” – reword to “less reliant” – provides direction and we can do incrementally
- Peak oil most affects transportation – have other options for heating, etc.
- Global supplies will dictate
- Policies to favour home building that reduces energy use
- Where are we with carbon capture and storage? – We don’t want that.
- Tax structure should reward/penalize appropriately
- Ensure tax structures are rewarding/penalizing ‘right’ actions – creative taxes
- 1.3.2 Where are we with carbon capture and storage? (don’t want)
- 1.3.6 People may not know what that means: reword – “tariff” generally is interpreted as something that’s going to cost “me” money but that is not the intent of the objective
- Amend policy 1.3.6: “The City will use local improvement charges to help finance alternative energy development.” Local improvement charges should be used to facilitate retrofits
- 1.3.7 Switching to electricity is not feasible and not responsible to switch 100% - need a mix of sources
- 1.3.7 Transmission costs
- 1.3.7 Problem with switch to electricity (wording)

Internal

- Delete first statement
- Restated: Much of Edmonton's energy comes from increasing renewable sources that are produced locally
- Disagree: not feasible. Also how do you measure this objective? Issue with wording "overly reliant"
- Local – how local?
- How much? Most?
- Turn around wording to be more positive, i.e., Edmonton has a diversity of energy sources; a significant amount from renewable sources

Gaps

External

- City needs a good policy/support for net metering
- Need current benchmark
- 1.3.5 Need to include taxation/green tax rebates
- 1.3.6 Local imp. Charges good – doesn't include property tax incentives – likely should
- 1.3.7 Energy end uses? – means what? Could end up wasting in the conversion
- Clarify policy 1.3.7: *"The City will take action to electrify and eventually switch to electricity for all energy end uses in the City."* Make it clearer that electrification is supportive of renewable/alternative energy and movement away from carbon (over the long term). Although much of our electricity comes from coal today, coal would be replaced by renewables in the long term

Internal

- Not possible (multi factors) – "overly reliant" wording is an issue
- "Overly reliant" – how do you measure this term?

Measures and Milestones

External

- Expo 2017 – use it
- 1.3.4 How would we determine this?
- Compare energy mapping over time – nice visual indicator
- Energy use within city
- Amount of renewable use
- Number of homes or buildings net metering
- Differences in measurement for different forms of energy
- Milestone: Target a specific area to start and duplicate as we go

Internal

- By amount solar is used
- By % green power – possibly 100% target (EPCOR-City strategy)
- % of energy from renewable sources (by class of building/infrastructure)
- % alternate fuels
- Renewable energy strategy (1.3)
- % from renewables
- City use
- Technology – what's available

Energy

- Direction from Council to implement
- Airport project – prototype
- New city buildings
- Alternative providers if EPCOR doesn't become proactive

Time Lines

External

- Performance-based permitting for vehicles by 2013
- Begin now, implement within 3 years
- Establish model community within a couple of years
- Energy map – create early on – use to develop/try a feed-in tariff

Internal

- 10 years – 20% of fuel from renewable sources
- 30% from renewable in 50 years
- 50% from renewable in 30 years
- Long term

Objective 1.4: Travel in Edmonton is energy efficient, with the majority of trips made by public transit, walking and cycling.

Overall

External

- Has to be affordable
- LRT
- Make car use less attractive and sustainable transportation more attractive (not sure how or what control City has e.g. with user fees)
- User fees: expand this – road use directly, vehicle registration, fuel sales, parking
- Expand use of bike and walking paths – car-free roadways
- Have a second look at collectors and arterial flow through residential areas – stop these
- Rehab old and new neighbourhoods with more bike lanes, fewer vehicle lanes; walking and public transit corridors
- Sustainable transportation systems are particularly important to Edmonton's overall sustainability

Internal

- Public transit may not be energy efficient
- Add: and shared rides, carpooling and school buses
- Does this include efficient delivery of goods and services?
- Air quality/water quality measures
- Not clear what "energy-efficient" is. How is this measured?
- Ambitious – as related to word "majority" – goes further than current Transportation Plan – also given urban sprawl
- May need to break into new developments, or peak travel times

- Consideration for people coming into city to work? Tied to 1.1
- Toll zones to discourage vehicle use?
- Require understanding of people's values and behaviours

Gaps

External

- Stronger incentives/rewards are needed to lower emissions of vehicles and encourage shifts away from large higher polluting vehicles

Internal

- Livability limited mobility choice (don't do) impossible

Measures and Milestones

External

- By energy usage
- By number of tickets
- By retail developments that have accommodation for walking and riding
- By polling and surveying of public (e.g., how they make trips and how often, transportation study)
- By % of main thoroughfares with safe bike paths
- By when seasonal safety factors have been addressed
- Enforcement of policies and bylaws
- Physical barriers between roadways and paths
- Network analysis between neighbourhoods and how they link up
- Signage within city – feel safe, corridor is identified
- Policy of hierarchy of transportation – which guides planning

Internal

- By travel mode shift
- Measuring public transit use may not measure success in this objective
- By length of trips taken
- By number of trips (other than walking or cycling)
- By amount of parking (New York – removal of street parking)
- % increase in use of alternative modes of transportation
- Percentage of people taking public transit
- How do you measure seasonality effects – i.e., "winter"
- Mode split: proportion of trips made by each transportation mode
- Average trip length to work
- Full LRT trains/ridership
- City fleet – average fuel economy/vehicle
- Public fleet – average fuel economy/vehicle
- LRT reaches all corners of the city
- Average kms travelled
- Energy efficient fleet

Energy

Time Lines

External

- User fees – one year (don't think we can have – need to lobby provincial government)
- Initiate the ones City of Edmonton can achieve without lobbying, then work on others for future achievement

Internal

- Long term

Objective 1.5: Edmonton's infrastructure is resilient in its ability to withstand energy disturbances

Overall

Internal

- Define energy disturbances (does it refer to emergencies?) – unclear
- Pretty broad – clarification needed for “disturbance” – 3 days or 3 weeks?
- What is meant by “infrastructure”? Everything? Private? Public? All of it?
- Not stated clearly enough to understand its intent
- Could be achieved if we achieve 1.1 and 1.4 – back up systems of energy, storage systems

Gaps

External

- A resilience plan should be officially put in place
- Active community partnerships for policy-making and implementation (centered on resiliency)
- Full cycle communications

Internal

- Clarity gaps – define infrastructure

Measures and Milestones

Internal

- Difficult to measure resiliency
- Failure rates/reliability rates
- Diversity of fuel source supply and availability of capacity
- Tested and achievable contingency plans
- Any examples we can look to?
- Does the technology exist to reach objective?
- Prototype – airport, perhaps?
- Risk inventory? Risk and need inventory
- Other examples? i.e. switching trolley buses to hybrid/diesel buses

Time Lines

Internal

- 20 years +

Objective 1.6: Edmonton is a leader in the advancement, testing and adoption of new energy technologies, i.e., an Energy City.

Overall

External

- Need to build partnerships, e.g. WADE, Alberta Innovates
- Lead collaboration with the Province on MGA, planning, building codes, etc. and overhaul of the fiscal structure
- “Leader” is ambiguous – maybe a cold city leader?
- City of Vancouver – all new homes must be LEED certified
- Doesn’t necessarily have to be solar PV
- Need to look at a variety of alternatives
- Energy Efficient Light Coalition (EECL) – a new policy? – dim/brighten according to needs/seasons
- Quality: “Clean” Energy City?
- Include iterative processes; acknowledge imperfections
- 1.6.2 Net energy efficiency – homes may improve, businesses may increase consumption

Internal

- Disconnect between focus on petro industry and direction here to promote other non-petro energy
- Edmonton is a leader... “among major municipalities” ...technologies “and energy efficiency design”
- “advancement, testing and adoption” – enough? too much? “use”
- Add: “designs/methods”
- Aspirational

Gaps

External

- Actively involve ‘partners’ in technology in guiding the process
- Curriculum in education
- 2011 - curriculum in education

Measures and Milestones

External

- Carbon footprint – inventory of technologies – reporting what is/isn’t feasible (2009 Price Waterhouse Coopers study on renewables/costs)
- % and costs of structures that employ new technologies
- Educate public
- Work with ARC

Energy

- All levels of government cooperating on same goals
- Easier to achieve GHG emission reduction than overall conservation
- 2017 Expo
- Airport redevelopment – short timeframe
- Working together with Calgary, Red Deer and talk to pressure province

Internal

- Measure of education/outreach/awareness
- Measure of pilot projects
- Airport – maybe a prototype
- Incent people to come to Research Park to develop/provide/test technology

Time Lines

External

- Need results quickly; need aggressive steps
- 2017 – Expo – race to carbon-neutral
- We need to take a risk and lead the province
- 5 year benchmark for all. Example: Energy security – 1 year – feed-in tariffs; 3 years – policy; 4 years – zoning bylaw; 10 years. Focus on tools not outcomes. Measure outcomes along the way

Objective 1.7: Edmonton is conserving and efficient in the energy used to light its outdoor public spaces (streets, walkways, signs, building exteriors, etc.).

Overall

External

- Need to reference light pollution
- Need to review lighting design standards – easy win!
- Share information/educate small business – pass it on

Internal

- Much more specific than other objectives
- Part of 1.1

Gaps

External

- Need some policies to support this objective
- Need a detailed strategy surrounding outdoor lighting standards, streetlight technology, etc.

Internal

- There should be discussion of reduced lighting

Time Lines

Internal

- Focus on what can be done in next 10 years
- Targets should be set less than 10 (tie to 3 year cycles)
- Progress may be slow (acknowledge and report the bad so you know progress to goals)
- Phased realistic approach to timelines is required

Climate Change (Goal 2)

Overall

External

- There are two concepts: (1) climate change and (2) carbon neutrality. Climate change is global, not just Edmonton. Rephrase goal to achieve carbon neutrality. 2.1 and 2.2 then fall under that goal.
- Who is responsible to achieve objectives, what is their role?
- Keep policies more general, some are too specific
- Suggested change in order of policies: 2.1.3, 2.1.4, 2.1.5 followed by 2.1.1, 2.1.2
- Provide better linkage to energy and its impact on climate change – make reference to energy sections
- What measures do we use to manage climate change?
- Provide a definition of what is meant by “Edmonton community” and “city operations” – i.e. does that include EPCOR?
- There are two concepts: (1) climate change and (2) carbon neutrality; climate change is a result or affected by increases of carbon in the atmosphere; climate change is global – not just Edmonton
- Goal 2 should be reworded to emphasize achieving carbon neutrality; then objectives 2.1 and 2.2 fall under carbon neutrality
- Climate change is a separate goal (from carbon neutrality) with 2.3 as its only objective
- Global benchmarks are difficult for a northern city
- Need to be carbon negative (rather than neutral)
- Decisions made here will affect the rest of the world
- Need to be clear that it’s about everyone but not too specific about who everyone is
- Is neutrality achievable? Is it realistic? Would it be too expensive to achieve?
- Deciding the baseline
- Not positive feeling about carbon credits
- Climate change doesn’t have the tangible immediate results that some of the other goals/objectives do.
- Not all at once - target one neighbourhood and duplicate effort as we go
- Work with other cities in province to start to pressure province – take a leadership role
- Whether or not achievable – still a great goal
- Goal touches all – particularly energy – should perhaps be number 1
- Difficult to achieve, but still a great goal
- New developments carbon neutral, maybe not existing
- Does this take away from 200 years of development?
- Should be Goal No. 1 – overarching
- Emphasis should be on carbon reduction – “neutral” difficult to grasp
- Implementing carbon charges in TWWG but not policies
- Requires regular review of data and targets – living document
- Provincial charters

Internal

- Stated as an end state – too passive – more action
- Generally support but need to define: Edmonton community, carbon neutral, no net contribution; in particular “resilient to changes due to climate change” is most difficult to understand

- Do not support the way it is stated: what about other pollutants besides GHGs? State it as a goal, not a statement – move toward or by date?
- Generally support but not sure about operational/economic implications
- Carbon neutrality becomes goal 1; climate change adaptation becomes goal 1; within climate change adaptation add more detailed policies

Gaps

External

- Missing a restored community
- Require better explanation of 2.1.2 and also what happens when we are carbon neutral in the future – do we want to restrict ourselves from selling carbon credits?
- Missing the piece about being a “restorative community” - we want to go beyond carbon neutrality
- Policy re doing business with others who are climate change concerned
- More immediate targets

Internal

- Conflict – is goal achievable?
- Define resiliency – ensure link to definitions
- Where are we now? Hard to assess practicality of goal/objectives
- Does this mean potential changes or some changes? Unclear
- Watch out for trade-offs – air vs. water vs.
- Needs a dynamic modifier: Uncertainty – must modify as change occurs
- Had some difficulty with the reality of the targets and how we will measure them - first need to determine if it's achievable
- Significant gap: how to handle regional issues – define “community.” Need to establish a regional body – something within 5 years. We need to start now.
- Needs to be clarification on who is accountable and who is responsible to achieve the objectives – what is their role?

Measures and Milestones

External

- Need to have a baseline and then establish targets based on that, then timelines and measurement
- Establish baseline
- ISO certifications, building codes, taxing incentives, etc.

Internal

- Need to be able to measure current state of outputs
- Success may never be possible for a northern city with large seasonal heating requirements
- Establish higher and higher levels of efficiency over time, both for new buildings and processes and existing
- Where are we now? Need a starting point for measures
- Require targets for meeting carbon-neutral
- Priorities – identify the biggest – cost effective approaches
- Annual reporting
- Establish short term target (5 years) and medium (10 years)

Climate Change

Time Lines

External

- 40-year goal is appropriate (80% lower footprint by 2050) for the city as a whole. City operations should be more aggressive – start 5-10 years – be a leader

Internal

- Regional model – 2 years
- Need to establish a goal for Edmonton emissions before we can decide a timeline; make the goal more specific such as “City operations reduce emissions by 50% by X amount of time” – possibly 20 years

Objective 2.1: City operations are carbon neutral – no net contribution to increased concentrations of greenhouse gases in the atmosphere.

Overall

External

- Look at more than corporate city
- Narrow look at climate change
- Difficult in cold northern climate
- Partnerships with community
- Need to be carbon negative
- Carbon credits questionable – “easy way out”
- Generate our own green energy
- Not enough urgency (p. 18, White Paper)
- Bigger picture: decisions made here affect all Alberta – e.g., oil and coal
- Follow models like ISO
- City should not buy carbon credits and should be cautious (set policy/rules) about who they sell to
- Policies refer more toward energy whereas there should be more discussion on “carbon sequestration” management; for instance, expanding green spaces, expanding and protecting the river valley

Internal

- 2.1.2 as a policy is very specific

Gaps

External

- More emphasis on carbon sequestration – more green spaces and protecting the river

Internal

- Where we are makes a difference. Need to know City’s intent. Financial commitments and City commitment – leadership or following role?
- Inventory – cost assessment/payback – where we are?
- 2.1.2 and 2.1.2, replace these to a more general objective such as “City will look at programs to reduce carbon emissions and strive to increase benefits to the city”

Measures and Milestones

External

- PPM in atmosphere (350) total emissions
- Edmonton assessed too low – consider greater region
- Milestone: Total emissions at XXXXX
- Decide baseline – soon!
- % of green energy used
- Number of ISO certifications
- Per capita emissions

Internal

- By all current outputs
- By utilities
- By decreases in energy
- By continuous review

Time Lines

External

- 40 years, 40 years, 5-10 years – start immediately – world standards
- 50% reduction by 2020

Internal

- 5 years to first target – emissions reduction – and then continuous review

Objective 2.2: The Edmonton community is carbon change neutral – no net contribution to increased concentrations of greenhouse gases in the atmosphere.

Overall

External

- Not clear about city operations vs. all of city
- Make sure it applies to everyone – not too specific
- Carbon change neutral
- Is this achievable, realistic? (\$\$)
- 2.2.1 Provide better explanation (and 2.3.1) – what is a “community greenhouse management plan” and what is a “climate change adaptation plan”

Internal

- Community = Edmonton capital region

Gaps

Internal

- Control
- Definition of community

Climate Change

- Trade-offs – region vs. city
- Taxi example – one way

Measures and Milestones

External

- Urban sprawl
- Need to establish baseline
- Actually measure emissions now – GHG in air – to get baseline – for both 2.2.1 and 2.1.1
- Milestones: Establish baseline; establish goal and timeline; measures
- What is the baseline?
- Similar to 2.1
- Milestone: ISO certifications (5 years)
- Milestone: Building codes that reflect environment
- Milestone: Taxing incentives
- Milestone: Zoning rules

Internal

- County “outside” initiatives
- Require baseline and updates – on buildings, fuel (transportation), waste
- Regional model

Time Lines

External

- 2.2.1 Timeline is much longer than the timeline for city operations to achieve carbon neutrality; the issue is complex because new developments can easily retrofit while for older ones it is harder
- 40 years (City should lead and be quicker)

Objective 2.3: Edmonton is prepared/adapted to all significant risks arising from climate change.

Overall

External

- Keep climate change as a goal with objective 2.3 as its only objective

Internal

- Risks vs. consequences – “all” foreseeable assumes prediction

Gaps

External

- Adaptation needs more clarity, more information

Internal

- Knowledge
- Overlapping interest – understanding consequences
- Reality of target, knowing where we are, plus financial commitment and City commitment, and too much faith – unless identified – need to know consequences

Measures and Milestones

Internal

- Identify risks
- Link action to ultimate goal

Time Lines

Internal

- Start now – with reasonable understanding of problems

Water (Goals 3 and 4)

Overall

External

- Goal 3 is really about water quality and quantity – should be reframed to say something like “the water quality and quantity sustain a healthy aquatic ecosystem and support the needs of Edmontonians”
- City should actively participate in watershed management plan – provide a leadership role and take responsibility for its actions regarding watershed
- Involve specific communities in enhancing and protecting local water bodies and wetlands – encourage naturalization
- Is there any technology information or recommendations GBWWTP can make for facilities upstream?
- Prioritize the issue of combined sewer overflow into the NSR
- Even though wetlands play a role in surface water quality, we may want to keep this concept under biodiversity, i.e., wetlands discussed in the policies under 3.1 – river valley plays a role in water quality going into the river
- Prioritize: repair existing wetlands
- Ensure inter-departmental communication, i.e., LID in drainage communicated in other departments
- Enforce “erosion control” for everyone
- Bonus incentives for lot development, e.g. with more native plants
- Don’t use potable water for irrigation
- More partnerships – rather than saying “EPCOR” will lead
- Goal: needs to be re-worded – why just human?
- 3.1 - Change to: The City will support the water quality and quantity and aquatic ecosystem goals set out in the NRS Watershed Management Plan (to be developed by the NSWA)
- 3.1 - Policies are not clear; do they apply to the entire NSR basin or just to the reach of the NSR within the city? Most are beyond the jurisdiction and capacity of the City to deliver. Policies should be reframed to say the City will be a partner in the development of the NSR watershed plan and commit to work with others to achieve the plan’s objectives.
- 3.1 - Maintain natural systems
- 3.1 - Other stewardship groups?
- 3.2 – LID – great vs. conventional storm water plans
- 4 - Should be reframed as a water source and conservation goal, i.e., protect water sources, reduce need to treat water for drinking, reduce the use of water
- 4.1 – Corporatization of water is a major concern
- 4.1 – With our relationship to EPCOR and their role in water, how much control does Edmonton have?

Internal

- Goal wording should be changed: “Water quality in the NSR is of sufficient quality to thrive” or “The NSR supports healthy ecosystems”
- Realistically, we can’t “protect” the river from pollution from surface runoff, combined sewer and GBWWTP into the river; however, we can “minimize”
- Work with the “regulators” i.e., Alberta Environment, to set goals; lobby to influence goals for the region
- There is the “water quality index” used by Alberta Environment
- 3.1 - Hard to achieve, even impossible, without regional cooperation

Gaps

External

- With respect to education, it is important to involve communities and schools
- Definition of a healthy river
- Education for public for all of the objectives; also ensure education for business and industries
- Very little discussion regarding the demands on the river by everyone, including industry
- Needs to be discussion around “contouring” the land so that surface water is directed to wetlands and green spaces rather than flowing into sewers
- City needs to enforce the LID guidelines
- Objective “protection of riparian areas”
- Water audits for industry and business – connection between water use and energy
- Need a description of the process of how Edmonton will work with other stakeholders to protect the ecosystems of the watershed (working toward goal of water quality)
- 3.1 - Chemical (pesticide) runoff is missing
- 3.1 - No mention of Regional Advisory Committees (they were established after TWWG framework)
- 3.1 - Other partners, e.g. community leagues?
- 3.1 - How do we define “healthy”
- 3.1 - Need study of all city codes – we need best hydro (e.g., top of bank) practices
- 3.2 - Add another policy that addresses sediment and erosion
- 3.2 - Agricultural run-off (Big Lake)
- 3.2 - Other watersheds in the city?
- 3.2.1 - LID refers to individual solutions but we need to define what we want to achieve – is putting in 20 bio swales achieving our goal?

Internal

- 3.4 - “The discharge from the GBWWTP does not exceed the assimilative capacity of the NSR”
- 4 - “managed” rather than “conserved and used” efficiently

Measures and Milestones

External

- Establish baselines

Internal

- 3.1 - Currently have the contaminant load reduction index which can be used to measure objectives 3.2, 3.3 and 3.4; for 3.1, use a biodiversity index – i.e. number of types of species, and how it changes over time
- 3.1 - Parts per million of pesticides (indicator pesticides)
- 3.1 - Sales of pesticides
- 4 - Consumption per capital
- 4 - Overall consumption
- 4 - Cubic meters of grey water used
- 4 - Success achieved by 2017: 3-5-10 year goals

Food (Goal 5)

Overall

External

- Edmonton should participate in the local food co-op that is being formed in the area
- Social = equitable? System should allow all access to food

Gaps

External

- Need consensus and understanding at the Council level as to the definition of agriculture – is it industrial? Natural? Organic?
- Remove regulatory restrictions via regional coordination
- Licensing
- Zoning for community farms (central activity)
- Connect with local currency
- City partnership with development industry for forward planning, use and designation

Internal

- There is currently a high but minority interest in biodiversity and agriculture and the links between them. However, I believe that will change in the future to a high interest.
- Program: Food order/delivery to public library
- Regional focus important (provincial as well)
- Financial/resource commitment is important
- Potential issue for livestock in Edmonton (e.g., beekeeping)
- Policy caveats for grocery store lands to be examined
- How does agricultural land relate to environmental agenda?
- Should Edmonton even be focusing on this?
- Tying it into green/food towers
- Farming practices may not be sustainable
- Tie into green roofs/edible landscaping
- Derelict buildings/brownfields
- City plantings can be food producing
- What is the environmental gain from food and agriculture strategy?

Measures and Milestones

Internal

- Percentage of local food at food bank
- Food Policy Council within 2 years
- June 16, 2010 – City-wide Food Ag Strategy
- Link to live local/shop local efforts
- Community gardens
- Free Gardens Groups

- Amount of agricultural lands in Edmonton (and provincial)
- Winter markets
- Number of food banks (access to food for low income)
- Education around agriculture/gardening
- Food waste measurement
- Local economic development for agricultural business
- Creation of Food Policy Council
- Creation of Regional Group
- More urban agriculture (%)

Time Lines

Internal

- Big gains could be made quickly under food security. Tangible results.
- If focus (people-commitment-\$\$) is made many quick gains are possible (no obvious champion right now)

Objective 5.1: Increase access to local food through regional, city-wide and neighbourhood-level approaches to sustainable urban food systems and build resilience into the food and urban agriculture system to withstand both gradual and sudden changes in the food supply.

Overall

External

- Food Policy Council (should be made up of growers, owners, distributors) – needs more authority – good model is Arts Council or Vancouver Rural Growing Council – all facts of operation must be included
- Require strong Council link: grass roots, transparent
- Zoning: each building should have a food zone requirement (current zoning does not allow chickens within city)
- Social cohesion: utilize urban farming to discourage juvenile delinquency, improve health
- Look at reclamation aspect of deserted suburbia (see Minnesota – suburb desertion)
- 5.1.1 - Set new and innovative policy, scope and definition
- 5.1.1 - Regular showcasing and education – via public trade shows
- 5.1.1 - “Master” programs`
- 5.1.1 - Financial equity/balance – money should go to farmers
- 5.1.1 - Distribution shift from international to local

Gaps

External

- Need education on how to grow food: to prepare food and gather seeds, etc. Money plus resources (training, etc.) should be supplied by City to be effective
- Need regional rural cooperation
- City should be a leader with a procurement/purchasing policy (e.g., for schools, prisons)
- Protect potential growing areas
- Add 5.1.3 – Zoning – animals - allocate % for food (e.g. condos)

Food

Measures and Milestones

External

- Graduates of various skills programs related to foods
- Number of established garden in the city
- Sovereignty - volume of imports
- Benchmark sales ratio of external vs. local
- Proximity study – everyone should be within 5 minutes of food markets
- 5.1.2 - Mapping/inventory of local food system and distribution – capacity

Time Lines

External

- Urgent – land is being destroyed; need a policy now for every decision made affects our future viability
- Move now – within 1 year benchmark
- 5.1.2 - Map local food system – 2012
- 5.1.2 - Evaluate ecological services... - 2012
- 5.1.2 = Establish Agricultural Lands Trust... - 2010 – work with Edmonton Area Land Trust in partnership; easements, buffers, city allotments

Air Quality (Goal 6)

Overall

Internal

- Proviso: do we know what an acceptable “base point” is “work in progress” dynamic
- Meets current standards – what about improvement? Do we know what that would look like? Is status quo good enough?
- Review the way the goal statement is written: Define – “is understood,” “monitored,” “relevant” – “information analyzed” – by whom and for whom? Acceptably protective? Standards?
- 6.2 - Clarity: highest standards, benchmarks, consequences \$/time

Gaps

Internal

- 6.2 - Not worded properly – suggest “Edmonton’s air quality is monitored and managed to be fresh, clean and safe to the ecosystem” Also, does not infer any action is required – a “don’t worry, be happy” statement – should state a measurable objective
- 6.2 - Delete last half “to meet requirements”
- 6.3 - Level of commitment

Measures and Milestones

Internal

- Measuring and implementation – can we manage upstream issues. We sometimes don’t have control (e.g. forest fires in BC)
- We have upstream and downstream responsibilities. Need to define air shed footprint
- Standards – some universal third party verified
- Ongoing – if it’s okay now, work to maintain it
- Transparent reporting – “spill cams”
- Benchmark – then determine if we are there
- Upstream and downstream
- Assess, monitor, improvement, standards, goals, constant review
- 6.1 - What is healthy for ecosystem – what standard?
- 6.1 - Cumulative effects framework
- 6.1 - Coordination with regional/jurisdictional bodies – and regulatory
- 6.2 - Footprint (6.3?)
- 6.2 - Monitoring – manage – downstream influence on others
- 6.2 - City goal vs. others (regional air shed)
- 6.2 - Coordinate with Alberta Environment – upwind coordination of bodies

Time Lines

Internal

- Now
- 6.1 - Constant review; 5 years
- 6.2 - Now

Biodiversity (Goal 7)

Overall

External

- Will be achieved through partnerships
- Need to take a more wholistic approach – NSR watershed
- Objectives don't reflect biodiversity management
- Contaminated sites – wrong place or expand to include other types of contamination – air, water, light
- Policies that indicate the spiritual, economic, environmental value of biodiversity
- Use of chemical fertilizers/pesticides by City of Edmonton
- Understand biodiversity issues in other parts of the world that impact us in Edmonton
- Light – impact of excess light on living organisms – reptiles/birds
- Standards to minimize light pollution
- City landscaping and design should promote biodiversity
- Challenge: how much is possible in a big city? – predators X
- Paradox: Increased biodiversity – decreased densification?
- Habitat = Biodiversity
- Targets: Is there a metrics? How do we measure? Need to start with an inventory; need to have a comprehensive strategy

Gaps

External

- Needs to be specific about what we want to protect, where, and how
- Needs to emphasize that we are part of the larger biological/living system – not external

Internal

- Forestry objective; endangered species; protection of endangered ecosystems

Measures and Milestones

External

- Not losing biodiversity
- Use of chemicals
- Amount of green space; connected, natural

Internal

- Biodiversity is valued (big effort needed) and enhanced (more dense = less biodiversity) – Capture: -integration, well treed, lots of green areas, plants/animals, diverse, more biodiversity than today, part of nature (people), natural? Introduced? Protected

Time Lines

External

- Biodiversity strategy (involve partners) – 1-3 years
- Inventory (partnerships) 1-2 years
- Strategy – 3 years

Solid Waste (Goals 8 and 9)

Overall

External

- Switch order of goals 8 and 9 – focus on reduce, then divert
- Switch goal order so 9 is first; consumerism
- 8 and 9 - Tax bags
- 8 and 9 - Locally produced products can reduce packaging
- 8 and 9 - Other waste (spilled on roads, drives, etc.) – covered under water and biodiversity?
- 8 and 9 - Carbon taxes can drive people to buy locally
- 8 and 9 - Challenge is not in providing education and information, but in making it meaningful
- 8 and 9 - Nice, non-odour landfill site
- 8 and 9 - Tends to be resistance to composting
- 8 and 9 - Concerns over compost and home or nursery use – need a separate green bin to ensure hi-grade compost
- 8 and 9 - Current system takes all in black bags – leaves and batteries
- 8 and 9 - Tag a bag/clear bags incentives to increase composting and decrease garbage
- 8 and 9 - Periodic circuits to pick up toxic waste (improvement over drop-off system)
- 8 and 9 - Community-placed on-site composting
- 8 and 9 - User pay system – has St. Albert's worked?
- 8 and 9 - Different bin sizes
- 9 Costs/taxes on garbage collected? Will this cause illegal dumping? Will business dumpsters end up full?

Internal

- 8 Already happening – where's the stretch?
- 8 Why separate residential and non-residential we want to address both
- 8 Increase waste management services to commercial sector
- 8.1 Support this – logical – as long as residential diversion stays high; otherwise, need targets for non-residential
- 8 and 9 - Opportunity to look at community initiatives – increase ownership at neighbourhood community level? (reduce trucking, GHGs, etc.) – showcase success
- 9 Continually – point of diminishing returns
- 9 Like it – need to reduce
- 9.1 Residents and commercial sector – need buy in – what's available, packaging, etc.
- 9.1 Shifts beyond consumer
- 9.1 How do we define waste-efficient?
- 9.1 Punitive aspect to companies that produce paper cups, i.e., tax

Gaps

External

- 8 and 9 - Consider city to city challenge; community vs. community; business vs. business – Green Awards – written up in publications, dinner with Mayor
- 8 and 9 - Policies to address packaging – influence suppliers and producers to pressure manufacturers (tie to 10.1 – educate)

Solid Waste

- 8 and 9 - Ways to incent good behaviour and reduce waste generated
- 9 Needs to consider non-residential waste, too
- 9 Need an objective for commercial/business sector

Internal

- 8 Harvested to produce energy?
- 8.1 Do we want a regional objective (is waste generated inside city being moved outside the city? Room for a regional component)
- 9 Do we want to set a target?

Measures and Milestones

External

- 9 Milestone: Amount of cloth being reprocessed into paper

Internal

- 8.1 Percentage of diversion rate, staged over X years
- 8.1 75% diversion in 5 years (can move faster than on Energy)
- 8.1 Continuous effort, ongoing education
- 8.1 Adoption of targets/objective by private landfills (may require provincial legislation)
- 9.1 Local community initiatives, swaps, etc.
- 9.1 Cultural shifts, too? (non drive-thrus, take out coffee in Europe)
- 9.1 Waste generation per capita is decreasing
- 9.1 Less waste pick up per household
- 9.1 Education component (info and communication provides sources for community sectors to enable action) to address consumption
- 9.1 All festivals follow Folk Fest lead – no disposables

Time Lines

External

- 8 Going to happen anyway
- 8 Perhaps send kudos to government on C&D waste management and encourage to industrial
- 9 Incremental reductions in time

One Planet Living

Overall

External

- Low public understanding of this
- Some moral issues – we say we’re a cold climate as if that excuses us – equity issue – consumer issue
- Tax structure - cheaper taxes if you build downtown, lower taxes for multi-family vs. single-family
- Zoning legislation – look to Vancouver for success – additional suites
- Opportunity for City Airport to showcase on-site management of materials (e.g. compost)
- Create more ownership over final product
- Rigid science, but presented for citizens
- Review/update processes
- Will require a shift in attitudes
- Require that products have a number reflecting footprint

Internal

- Make the goal the objective
- Why is this goal even necessary – tends to restate other TWWG goals
- Insinuates that lifestyle will affect climate
- “global bio capacity equity” – huh?
- What can the City influence? – demo sites such as airport, quarters, expo site
- Preface statement with “On the balance... Lifestyles of Edmontonians...”
- Goal is complicated; switch and itemize the goal as objectives
- Climate neutrality – we can reduce emissions
- 10.1 – Make this the goal
- 10.1 – Aspirational
- 10.1 – Reduce while we grow?

Gaps

Internal

- One Planet Living may already be redundant – covered by other objectives.
- Is there a definition?

Measures and Milestones

External

- Urban sprawl, land use planning, density milestones; legislation regarding sprawl and infill
- Measurement must be available, understandable, visual
- Edible landscaping within yards
- Composting toilets? – demos at City facilities
- Do we use Anekkis Genuine Progress Indicator Report (2008)?

One Planet Living

- Financial incentives
- Can we assume the company we buy from has accounted their own footprint?
- Need to track: local food production; trees to capture carbon; agricultural land; and wetlands

Internal

- 10.1 - Consensus among residents, business and industry to work toward this
- 10.2 - Pilot/demo sites

General Comments about *The Way We Green*

Overall

External

- Consider the concept of “smart centres” (i.e., parking locations where electric cars can park and be re-charged during the day from solar panels.
- Zoning is the key
- A number of major pilot projects are needed to demonstrate the livability and desirability of more sustainable neighbourhoods. Need “icon” initiatives
- Some policies in the strategy are conflicting with one another. Review the entire plan to identify these and reconcile where possible.
- TWWG needs to set out clear benchmarks of sustainability for Edmonton
- When implementing TWWG, identify the strategic levers that the City can control. Prioritize them
- When implementing TWWG, identify the issues that the City can influence. Prioritize them (e.g., building code, greet trades, financing, provincial feed-in tariffs)
- Find ways to engage the community at the grass roots level
- More videos and u-tube technologies
- Implementation should have clear sense of priorities
- The following are possible short term wins that should be pursued: more rigorous building standards, more mixed use in new neighbourhoods, rewarding green behaviour, penalizing non green behaviour
- Find ways to convert non-believers ... through demonstration projects
- Create a sustainable culture ... an emotional connection to “place”

Internal

- Many of the policies in the White Paper will have major repercussions for our departments and others (resources). Those policies should at the very least be run by our City managers before going to Council. Will that affect your time line? A. *We are meeting with branches, but good point. Need to know how doable these are.*

Gaps

External

- TWWG needs a glossary
- TWWG should take a closer look at the social and economic impacts that could result from the proposed strategies. Particular attention needs to be given to how new policies will affect the poor.
- TWWG needs to have a much stronger emphasis on public education and awareness
- TWWG needs to have a clearer strategy about building a sustainability culture in Edmonton. An important part of culture building will involve celebrating success
- Strategy milestones need to be defined, reported and celebrated
- Accountability is needed. Could include a reporting of progress relative to approved goals, objectives, measures and targets. May also involve an independent audit of these results
- Implementation of TWWG will require a better social media campaign. Help citizens to understand “What’s in it for me?”

Overall Comments about *The Way We Green*

Time Lines

External

- Need short term and long term implementation plans and expectations. Need a short term vision. Need a long term vision
- TWWG needs to be very clear about its short and long term expectations
- TWWG needs to deliver significant and practical results in the short term