

THE WAY WE GREEN

SUMMARY OF Public and Stakeholder Input OCTOBER AND NOVEMBER 2010

Prepared by
Bill McMillan
Principal
Defining Common Ground

mcmillan4@shaw.ca • 780 288 4234

Executive Summary

Between February, 2010 and December, 2010, the City of Edmonton team responsible for preparing The Way We Green, a city sustainability plan, made a significant effort to gather input from citizens. Prior to releasing a White Paper for review, public consultation included an initial round of questionnaires and meetings held prior to July 1 (documented elsewhere), summer community meetings and casual interviews with citizens, held during the summer.

A second round of public consultation was hosted after a "White Paper" was released in October. This round included a public forum, two stakeholder questionnaires and four stakeholder workshops. Participants raised many specific comments which cannot be briefly summarized, but the overall response can be characterized as follows:

- There was a high level of support for the policy directions indicated in the White Paper, exhibited by participants at the public forum as well as by invited stakeholders.
- There was support for proposals that the City should take action to respond to potential energy and climate change concerns, including (for example):
 - Improving building energy efficiency;
 - More stringent requirements for development of new neighbourhoods (zoning, building standards); and
 - Initiating a transition to renewable energy sources.
- Participants also supported proposals that the City should expand its efforts to protect water, air and biodiversity. For example, the following ideas were strongly supported:
 - Improving air quality monitoring and reporting;
 - Protecting water quality by improving storm water discharge; and
 - Restoring or replacing lost biodiversity.
- The proposal to create a food policy council (raised in The Way We Grow) was supported.
- Continuing Edmonton's accomplishments in waste management, participants supported greater effort to divert (recycle) commercial waste and to reduce household waste volume.

Notwithstanding the strong support, there were some cautions. For example:

- Concern about new taxes and fees;
- The possibility that zoning or building requirements will encourage people to build elsewhere if costs rise;
- Concern about actions that would distort the market place.

Table of Contents

Executive Summary	
Introduction	1
Public Forum	2
Energy (Goal 1)	3
Climate Change (Goal 2)	6
Water (Goals 3 and 4)	7
Food Security (Goal 5)	8
Air Quality (Goal 6)	9
Biodiversity (Goal 7)	9
Waste Management & Ecological Footprint (Goals 8, 9 and 10)	10
Stakeholder Questionnaires	11
Energy (Goal 1)	11
Climate Change (Goal 2)	12
Water (Goals 3 and 4)	14
Food (Goal 5)	15
Air (Goal 6)	15
Biodiversity (Goal 7)	16
One Planet Living (Goal 10)	16
Stakeholder Workshops	17
Energy (Goal 1)	18
Climate Change (Goal 2)	20
Water (Goals 3 and 4)	21
Food Security (Goal 5)	22
Air (Goal 6)	22
Biodiversity (Goal 7)	23
Solid Waste (Goals 8 and 9)	24
One Planet Living (Goal 10)	25

Appendices

- Appendix 1 Public Forum: Sample Response Form and Participant Comments
- Appendix 2 Stakeholder Questionnaires #1 and 2: Respondent Comments
- Appendix 3 Stakeholder Workshops: Participant Comments

Tables

Table 1: Number of public forum response forms received	2
Table 2: Public forum response to energy policy recommendations (improving energy efficiency) 3	
Table 3: Public forum response to energy policy recommendations (changing energy sources)....	4
Table 4: Public forum response to climate change policy recommendations	6
Table 5: Public forum response to water quality and quantity policy recommendations	7
Table 6: Public forum response to food security policy recommendation	8
Table 7: Public forum response to air quality policy recommendations	9
Table 8: Public forum response to biodiversity policy recommendation.....	9
Table 9: Public forum response to proposed waste management and ecological footprint objectives.....	10
Table 10: Stakeholder questionnaire response to energy policy recommendations.....	11
Table 11: Stakeholder questionnaire response to climate change policy recommendations	13
Table 12: Stakeholder questionnaire response to water quality and quantity policy recommendations	14
Table 13: Stakeholder questionnaire response to food security policy recommendations.....	15
Table 14: Stakeholder questionnaire response to air quality policy recommendations	15
Table 15: Stakeholder questionnaire response to biodiversity policy recommendations	16
Table 16: Stakeholder questionnaire response to one planet living policies	16
Table 17: Participation at workshops for invited stakeholders	17

Introduction

This report provides a summary of input received from the public and from invited stakeholders in response to the City of Edmonton's *The Way We Green, White Paper*, which was released for review in October 2010. The *White Paper* proposes new goals, objectives and policies for inclusion in *The Way We Green*, Edmonton's environmental strategic plan that will be taken forward to City Council in 2011 for approval.

The public and invited stakeholder input is a result of the following involvement activities undertaken by the City of Edmonton's Office of Environment:

- a public forum held on November 3 and 4 at the City Room, City Hall;
- two on-line questionnaires made available to invited stakeholders from October 21 to November 5;
- a series of four workshops for invited stakeholders held from November 16 to 18.

While this overview of results is intended to be highly representative of the response received, the reader is encouraged to review the accompanying appendices which include all of the comments submitted or captured during discussions.

Please note: For all tables presented in this report, N = the number of respondents. Also, percentages may not add up to 100% due to rounding.

Public Forum

The City of Edmonton hosted a public forum on November 3 and 4, 2010 that invited interested citizens to visit City Hall and:

- (a) learn more about the proposed plan, *The Way We Green*; and
- (b) respond to recommendations the plan might make to City Council.

The forum was advertised extensively: ads were placed in 5 daily papers (an average of 3 placements each), 3 weekly papers, and 2 university papers between October 25 and November 3. More than 325 Edmonton citizens attended the forum (a few more may not have been counted as they entered the room).

The public forum format included six “topic stations” where an overview of each topic was available along with a response form that asked participants to indicate their level of agreement with the proposed recommendations for that topic. Participants chose which response forms they wished to complete and submit. The following table describes how many submissions were received for each topic:

Table 1: Number of public forum response forms received

	N
Energy and climate change	137
Water	137
Food security	144
Air quality	109
Biodiversity	127
Waste management	116
Total	770

The following overview of results is an indicator of public perceptions and expectations related to many of the recommendations in the proposed plan. In some cases, the policy direction offered for response was abridged from those in *The Way We Green White Paper* to reduce the number of policy statements being tested. In every case, participants were asked if the proposed policy should be recommended to City Council. Response choices provided were: Agree, Agree Conditionally, Disagree or Unsure. A sample of a public forum response form is included in appendix 1.

Overall, people who attended the forum were highly likely to agree with the proposed policies. Many also noted comments in the space provided on the response form to clarify their response. After each of the tables presented in this section, a summary of the comments received is provided to illustrate the perceptions and expectations associated with the numerical result.

The comments submitted on public forum response forms, as well as those captured during the public forum table discussions (“Conversation Café”) are included in appendix 1.

Energy (Goal 1)

The Energy goal has the highest number of proposed policies, so they were separated into two categories for public review. The first category (Table 2) describes the proposed policies that primarily address approaches to **improving energy efficiency**. The second category (Table 3) describes proposed policies that primarily address **changing Edmonton’s energy sources**.

Improving energy efficiency

Objectives:

- **Edmonton’s overall built form promotes energy-efficiency.**
- **Edmonton’s building stock is energy-efficient.**

Respondents indicated high support for taking all of these policies to City Council. In only one case (develop City Centre Airport lands), did 10% or more disagree (highlighted below).

Table 2: Public forum response to energy policy recommendations (improving energy efficiency)

PROPOSED POLICIES Ordered by % Agree	N	% Agree	% Agree conditionally	% Disagree	% Unsure
Adopt world-class energy-efficiency standards for all new buildings	136	85	15	-	1
Adopt zoning regulations that promote energy-efficiency (e.g. passive solar heating; reduced exposure to winter winds)	132	85	14	1	1
Require new neighbourhoods to be energy-efficient	134	81	16	1	2
Develop the City Centre Airport lands as a model of sustainable development	136	77	10	10	4
Use pricing and taxation to encourage densification and discourage sprawl	136	71	22	6	2

Summary of Comments

- By far the most common concern was sprawl. Many respondents felt the City should reduce or eliminate approvals of new neighbourhoods outside of Anthony Henday Drive and should concentrate on increasing density in existing neighbourhoods.
- General approval for using taxation and pricing strategies to increase density , but some respondents listed concerns:

Public Forum Results

- City should not tamper with free markets
 - How will taxation be used and who will it affect?
- Many respondents supported the idea that new neighbourhoods would be designed to be more energy efficient; some noted the following cautions:
 - New developments should still be affordable
 - Buyer must see economic benefits or they will locate elsewhere
 - Development requirements must be flexible enough to allow for varying situations.
- Comments about sustainable development of City Centre Airport lands brought forward the following ideas:
 - The development must be appealing and include ample green space and vegetation
 - If industry is excluded, there will be industrial sprawl at the city's fringe
 - Eliminating air transportation from the site may be regretted (need for STARS air ambulance; future air transportation opportunities lost)
 - The cost of reclaiming the lands may make re-development too expensive
- Respondents supported energy efficiency improvements in buildings but the following observations were offered:
 - Expectations must consider economic realities
 - Homeowners may need financial support for retrofits
 - If we take a long-term view, energy efficiency improvements will be good investments (economic and environmental savings)
 - Certification such as LEED ignores approaches that aren't high tech but make sense
- The implementation of sustainability policies must not discriminate against those with less money.
- Energy-efficient lighting has high potential for savings.

Changing energy sources

Objectives:

- **Edmonton's energy comes from renewable sources that are produced locally.**
- **Travel in Edmonton is energy-efficient.**
- **Edmonton's infrastructure can withstand energy disturbances.**
- **Edmonton advances, tests and adopts new energy technology.**

Respondents indicated high support for taking all of these policies to City Council. In only one case (local improvement charges), was there less than 75% who agreed; and in this case, an additional 24% agreed conditionally.

Table 3: Public forum response to energy policy recommendations (changing energy sources)

PROPOSED POLICIES Ordered by % Agree	N	% Agree	% Agree conditionally	% Disagree	% Unsure
Explore, test and adopt new technologies that will reduce Edmonton's dependence upon fossil fuels	126	87	8	4	1
Establish a strategy to increase the portion of	128	86	13	1	-

electrical energy that comes from renewable sources					
Encourage a transition to renewable energy sources for electricity in order to reduce our reliance upon coal for electrical energy	129	80	19	1	1
Reduce the amount of oil Edmontonians require for daily transportation (to minimize our vulnerability to future oil price shortages and price shocks)	129	78	16	3	4
Promote economic development that favours industries that do not require intensive use of fossil fuels	126	78	18	3	2
Use local improvement charges to help finance alternative energy developments	126	64	24	7	6

Summary of Comments

- Some reasons for conditional support for alternative energy proposals:
 - Depends upon sources of electricity
 - Is there a commitment to finish the LRT system?
 - Full cost accounting is required to ensure prudence
 - Not willing to risk nuclear
 - Realistically, this should include natural gas
 - Affordability and practicality: recognize that we currently depend on an oil-based economy
- Some reasons for conditional support of local improvement charges:
 - Gives the impression that alternative energy is “special” and not affordable
 - Unclear what is meant
 - Allocation must be transparent
 - Fees may polarize the community
 - Municipalities should not interfere with market mechanisms
 - Incentives more desirable than fees
- Edmonton's density and sprawl is just fine and offers good quality of life. The only true detriment is the proliferation of gasoline burning transportation. Once the mode of transport is changed (i.e., electric cars or bio-engines, etc.), things (i.e., sprawl) are fine the way they are.
- Some reasons for conditional support of new technology development:
 - Isn't this a provincial role?
 - Technology already exists/copy other cities
 - Out of City's scope
 - Private sector involvement is necessary
- Comments about changing transportation habits:
 - City-owned vehicles are not using current technology (e.g., hybrid, electric)
 - Safe bike lanes are needed
 - More emphasis upon efficient public transit (especially LRT)
 - Make downtown idle-free
 - It is impossible to change commuting patterns
- Comments about alternative energy sources:

Public Forum Results

- Feed-in tariffs are important
- Geo-thermal energy should be part of the plan
- Alternative energy must be developed systematically to ensure there is storage capacity to even out supply variations

Climate Change (Goal 2)

Objectives:

- City operations have no net greenhouse gas contribution.
- As a city, Edmonton has no net greenhouse contribution.
- Edmonton is prepared for significant risks arising from climate change.

Participants responded to four proposals regarding climate change. There was a high level of agreement that three of the proposals should be recommended to City Council. The proposal to purchase electricity from carbon-neutral sources received conditional support—over 30% of respondents indicated they would agree if certain conditions were met.

Table 4: Public forum response to climate change policy recommendations

PROPOSED POLICIES Ordered by % Agree	N	% Agree	% Agree conditionally	% Disagree	% Unsure
Adopt world-class energy-efficiency/carbon emissions standards for municipal fleet and transit	129	86	12	2	1
Establish and implement a climate change adaptation plan for Edmonton	123	80	15	2	3
Establish and implement a greenhouse gas management plan for Edmonton	126	79	18	2	2
Purchase electricity from carbon-neutral sources	128	60	33	5	2

Summary of Comments

- Some reasons for conditional support for purchase of carbon-neutral electricity:
 - As long as it is not prohibitively expensive
 - City should be generating and providing carbon-neutral electricity
 - Reduce consumption first, before seeking new electricity sources
 - Examine local electricity production first
 - Do not allow EPCOR to reap all the benefits
 - Finding carbon-neutral sources is less important than other objectives
 - Must be a long-term contract and not renewable energy credits
- Respondents supported the formal recognition of climate change threats by City of Edmonton. Although there were requests to clarify what is meant by “climate change adaptation,” there was no stated resistance to the phrase “climate change.”
- Education was mentioned by many respondents as an important part of the strategy.

- Several respondents indicated that many current paradigms (one commuter per vehicle, one family per home) will have to change in order to meet these objectives.

Water (Goals 3 and 4)

Objectives: (*NSR = North Saskatchewan River*)

- Edmonton's watershed ecosystem remains healthy.
- The NSR and its tributaries are protected from pollution and erosion resulting from storm water runoff.
- The NSR and its tributaries are protected from pollution resulting from combined sewer overflow.
- The NSR and its tributaries are protected from pollution caused by discharges from the Goldbar Waste Water Treatment Plant.

Respondents agreed that all six proposals in this category should be recommended to City Council. Two proposals (Low Impact Development and risk management plan) were supported but had a higher percentage of conditional support.

Table 5: Public forum response to water quality and quantity policy recommendations

PROPOSED POLICIES Ordered by % Agree	N	% Agree	% Agree conditionally	% Disagree	% Unsure
Protect groundwater quality and quantity	135	95	5	-	-
Support water quality and flow objectives for our river and its tributaries (e.g. waste water treatment; storm water runoff)	135	93	7	-	-
Support aquatic ecosystem health for water bodies and riparian (shore) areas	135	93	5	-	2
Maintain, restore and protect wetlands and riparian (shore) areas	136	90	8	-	2
Give priority to Low Impact Development (LID emphasizes conservation and use of on-site natural features to manage storm water flow and protect water quality)	136	84	14	-	2
Develop a risk management plan to deal with possible reduced flows in the North Saskatchewan River	135	84	12	-	4

Summary of Comments

- Several respondents expressed concerns about current (or possible) practices that could be harmful to water quality:
 - Use of pesticides, especially for the purpose of maintaining the cosmetic appearance of lawns
 - Possible human health effects of grey water recycling

Public Forum Results

- Combined sewer overflows during rain
 - Effect of storm water ponds on ground water quality
 - Petroleum products entering storm water runoff from streets
 - Salt and sand pollutants in storm water as a result of winter street maintenance
- There were also several mentions of the need for greater cooperation with other municipalities that affect water quality and water flows in the North Saskatchewan River.
- The need to reduce or eliminate the use of bottled water was mentioned in several responses.
- Several respondents indicated that Low Impact Development is an important concept that should be a high priority. Wetland protection and wetland reconstruction were also mentioned.

Food Security (Goal 5)

Objective:

Increased access to local food through regional, city-wide and neighbourhood-level approaches and resilience built into the food and urban agriculture system (stated in “The Way We Grow”).

Respondents indicated a high level of agreement, though 10 % indicated they would agree conditionally. Comments suggest the largest condition is the protection of agricultural lands.

Table 6: Public forum response to food security policy recommendation

PROPOSED POLICIES Ordered by % Agree	N	% Agree	% Agree conditionally	% Disagree	% Unsure
Establish a Food Policy Council, responsible for a food charter and a food and agriculture strategy	138	87	10	2	2

Summary of Comments

- Most respondents supported the establishment of a Food Policy Council, but one respondent questioned whether an adjunct organization could be effective.
- Several respondents noted the need for improved measures to protect existing agricultural land and prevent stripping and development of agricultural lands. Some felt that current practices do not protect agricultural lands. Others wondered whether or not the City can do much about this.
- There is a need to help Edmonton residents identify which foods are local.
- There is an opportunity to develop community gardens and use spaces such as vacant lands, backyards, and rooftops within the city for growing.
- Many respondents felt that sprawl is the greatest threat to existing food capacity.
- It was suggested that regional coal power plants could be an important source of heat for year-round gardening.

Air Quality (Goal 6)

Objective:

Edmonton's air quality is managed to meet the highest standard in a manner that supports health and ecosystem wellbeing.

Respondents agreed that both proposed policies should be recommended to City Council. There was some conditional support, generally indicating concerns that air quality monitoring and standards are implemented effectively.

Table 7: Public forum response to air quality policy recommendations

PROPOSED POLICIES Ordered by % Agree	N	% Agree	% Agree conditionally	% Disagree	% Unsure
Adopt higher air quality standards for Edmonton – i.e., air quality guidelines recommended by the World Health Organization	105	84	11	3	3
Increase air quality monitoring throughout Edmonton and make information available to Edmontonians on a real-time basis	106	79	14	4	3

Summary of Comments:

- Many of the factors that influence air quality are beyond the City's control.
- The City should adopt World Health Organization air quality standards.
- Traffic is a major contributor to air quality changes and efforts to reduce vehicle congestion will contribute to improved air quality.
- Many Edmontonians do not know where to find information about their air quality.
- Need to do more than just monitor air quality—need to make changes to improve air quality where necessary.
- Real-time monitoring is important. Monitoring has to occur where people actually live. Street level pollution is different than the pollution level at monitoring stations.
- Engine idling is an unnecessary contributor to air pollution. What happened to the anti-idling by-law?

Biodiversity (Goal 7)

Objective:

The City integrates biodiversity considerations into all aspects of its governance and development planning.

Respondents agreed (77%) that the proposed biodiversity policy should be recommended to City Council; 14% agreed conditionally.

Table 8: Public forum response to biodiversity policy recommendation

Public Forum Results

PROPOSED POLICIES Ordered by % Agree	N	% Agree	% Agree conditionally	% Disagree	% Unsure
Establish biodiversity offset approaches that require the replacement of biodiversity that is lost through developments	124	77	14	7	3

Summary of Comments

- Not sure what “biodiversity offset approaches” include.
- Biodiversity must emphasize native species; caution about introduced and invasive species.
- Concern about costs; need for flexibility (e.g., no net loss).
- Rather than replace biodiversity, City should inventory current biodiversity and natural areas and ensure they are protected.
- “Offsets” must not provide trading rights (like carbon credits).
- Stopping sprawl is a major step toward conserving biodiversity.
- Permaculture should be encouraged.

Waste Management & Ecological Footprint (Goals 8, 9 and 10)

Respondents agreed that the proposed policies under waste management and ecological footprint should be recommended to City Council. For two of the proposed policies, more than 10% indicated there were some conditions on their agreement.

Table 9: Public forum response to proposed waste management and ecological footprint objectives

PROPOSED POLICIES Ordered by % Agree	N	% Agree	% Agree conditionally	% Disagree	% Unsure
Edmonton's ecological footprint is reduced	113	84	11	3	3
Edmontonians generate low levels of residential waste; on par with their waste-efficient peer cities/countries	113	82	8	4	5
Non-residential sectors achieve the same waste diversion rate achieved by Edmonton's residential sector	112	81	13	4	2

Summary of Comments

- Proud of Edmonton's achievements in recycling and waste diversion.
- Focus on improving diversion of industrial and commercial waste.
- Promote methods to re-use items before they are taken to recycle centres.
- “Ecological footprint” should have its own category.
- Education can help people understand their role in waste management.

Stakeholder Questionnaires

On October 21, 2010 invited stakeholders were e-mailed a copy of the *White Paper* and provided with links to two on-line questionnaires. Questionnaire #1 asked for their response to the proposed energy and climate change policies in the *White Paper*. All other proposed policies in the *White Paper* were tested in Questionnaire #2. Stakeholders were asked whether or not they agree that the proposed policies be included in the City of Edmonton's strategic environmental sustainability plan. The questionnaires were available on-line until November 5, 2010.

The following tables summarize the numerical response to the questionnaires. The comments received are included in appendix 2. The questionnaire was sent to 350 stakeholders and the 53 respondents represented a wide range of organizations (see table on page 13).

Energy (Goal 1)

Respondents demonstrated a high level of agreement with most, but not all, of the suggested policies listed in table 10 (below). In cases where less than 60% of respondents agree or agree with conditions to the proposed policy, the result has been highlighted. As well, in cases where more than 10% of respondents either disagreed or were unsure, the result has also been highlighted.

Table 10: Stakeholder questionnaire response to energy policy recommendations

PROPOSED ENERGY POLICIES Ordered by % Agree. Reference numbers refer to <i>White Paper</i> .	% AGREE	% AGREE w/Conditions	% DISAGREE	% Unsure
1.6.1 Explore, test and (where feasible) adopt new energy technologies that will reduce dependence on fossil fuels.	79	13	4	4
1.5.1 Promote distributed energy generation (localized generation of heat and power with district heating).	77	9	2	11
1.3.3 Create incentives for businesses and residents to install renewable power generating equipment/infrastructure.	76	17	7	-
1.2.1 Adopt world-class energy efficiency standards for all <u>City-owned</u> buildings.	74	23	4	-
1.2.5 Adopt zoning regulations that promote energy efficiency.	74	11	4	11
1.1.1 Improve "energy density" by requiring new neighbourhood developments to be designed and developed to be energy efficient.	72	23	2	4
1.3.1 Recognize the risk of Peak Oil and identify how the rate of oil consumption in Edmonton can be reduced.	70	13	9	7

Stakeholder Questionnaire Results

PROPOSED ENERGY POLICIES Ordered by % Agree. Reference numbers refer to <i>White Paper</i> .	% AGREE	% AGREE w/Conditions	% DISAGREE	% Unsure
1.3.2 Establish a Renewable Energy strategy for Edmonton to reduce reliance upon coal and increase the use of renewable sources of electricity generation.	68	26	4	2
1.2.3 Improve the energy efficiency of <u>existing</u> building stock.	66	30	4	-
1.5.2 Seek partnerships to develop a “resilience centre” (a building complex designed for its micro-climate, which integrates multiples uses and recycles heat and water for year-round urban agriculture).	66	11	9	13
1.1.2 Use pricing and taxation strategies to encourage densification and discourage sprawl.	62	21	11	6
1.1.4 Re-develop inner city neighbourhoods to increase density and improve alignment with sustainability requirements (energy efficient configuration, durable building stock, community amenities such as schools).	62	34	2	2
1.2.2 Adopt world-class energy efficiency standards for all <u>new</u> buildings.	62	28	6	4
1.7.1 Promote economic development that favours industries that do not require intensive use of fossil fuel energy.	60	4	26	9
1.1.3 Support re-development of the City Centre Airport as a model for future development in Edmonton.	55	26	8	11
1.3.4 Introduce municipal feed-in tariffs.	43	7	4	45
1.3.5 Use local improvement charges to help finance alternative energy developments.	40	17	11	32
1.5.3 Require new buildings to be designed for 200+ years of use.	36	30	23	11
1.3.6 Take action to eventually switch to electricity for all energy end uses in City operations.	23	23	25	30

Climate Change (Goal 2)

Several potential climate change policies were also tested as part of Questionnaire #1. Respondents agreed that all but one proposed new policy should be included in the strategic plan to be submitted to City Council.

The exception was the proposal that the City should not sell carbon credits from its operations (highlighted in Table 11).

Stakeholder Questionnaire Results

Table 11: Stakeholder questionnaire response to climate change policy recommendations

SUGGESTED CLIMATE CHANGE POLICIES Ordered by % Agree. Reference numbers refer to <i>White Paper</i> .	% AGREE	% AGREE w/Conditions	% DISAGREE	% Unsure
2.1.3 Adopt world-class energy efficiency/carbon emission standards for municipal fleet and transit.	76	19	4	2
2.2.1 Establish a Community Greenhouse Gas Management Plan for Edmonton.	76	4	2	19
2.3.1 Establish a Climate Change Adaptation Plan.	68	11	4	17
2.1.1 Purchase green power for City operations to meet its greenhouse gas reduction targets.	64	26	8	2
2.1.2 Do not sell carbon credits from City operations.	43	2	25	30

Respondents to Questionnaire #1 identified their organization as follows:

- Alberta Professional Planners Institute
- Anonymous
- Aspen Gardens
- Canadian Federation of University Women Edmonton Environment Committee
- CBR (Community Building Resources)
- CEDA International Corp.
- City of Edmonton Youth Council
- City of Edmonton - Capital Construction - Building Design & Construction
- City of Edmonton - Community Services
- City of Edmonton - Edmonton Transit
- City of Edmonton – Waste Management Branch (2)
- City of Edmonton (12)
- City of Edmonton, Planning & Development
- Climate Change Central
- Drainage
- Ducks Unlimited Canada
- Earth Legacy Inc.
- Edmonton Federation of Community Leagues
- Edmonton Naturalization Group
- Edmonton Nature Club
- Formerly with NAIT and now Encana
- Greater Edmonton Alliance, Transition Edmonton, Parkallen Community League
- ISL Engineering and Land Services Ltd.
- Konscious Enterprise Solutions
- Land Use Secretariat
- Lehigh Cement
- Natural Areas Advisory Committee
- Old Strathcona Business Association
- ONPA Architects
- OXEYE Net Zero Homes
- RePower Edmonton - Sierra Club Prairie
- River Valley Alliance
- Select Engineering Consultants Ltd.
- Sierra Club
- Sierra Club Canada - Prairie (Edmonton Group)
- Stantec
- Sustainable Works
- U of A, Deliberation on Campus Sustainability
- Urban Development Institute
- Vital Engineering
- Westmount Community League

Stakeholder Questionnaire Results

Twenty seven (27) stakeholders responded to Questionnaire #2 that asked for their feedback on the balance of suggested policies in *The Way We Green White Paper*. These included water, food, air, biodiversity and one planet living. *Note: Although there are goals and objectives for solid waste in the White Paper, there are no recommendations characterized as new policies.*

Water (Goals 3 and 4)

Respondents to questionnaire #2 indicated a high level of agreement that all but one of the proposed water policies should be included in the strategic plan to be forwarded to City Council. Policy idea 4.1.1 did not receive overwhelming support is therefore highlighted below. As well, there was a relatively high percentage of respondents who were unsure of how to respond to policy 3.1.2 (instream flow needs), also highlighted. Note: NSR = North Saskatchewan River.

Table 12: Stakeholder questionnaire response to water quality and quantity policy recommendations

SUGGESTED WATER POLICIES Ordered by % Agree. Reference numbers refer to <i>White Paper</i> .		% AGREE	% AGREE w/Conditions	% DISAGREE	% Unsure
3.2.2	Establish "Low Impact Development" guidelines for all developments in Edmonton.	96	4	-	-
3.4.1	Reduce water pollution from all sources to promote a healthy river ecosystem.	96	-	-	4
3.1.1	Support development, implementation and enforcement of reach-specific water quality objectives for the NSR.	89	4	-	7
3.1.4	Support development of aquatic ecosystem health objectives for all water bodies and riparian (shoreline) areas.	89	7	-	4
3.1.5	Support development of programs to maintain, improve, restore and protect wetlands and riparian areas that are part of our watershed.	89	7	-	4
3.1.6	Support implementation of a range of strategies to prevent/mitigate damage to the watershed (including groundwater) from municipal, commercial, industrial, agricultural, forestry activities.	89	7	-	4
3.1.3	Support development, implementation and enforcement of water quality objectives for all tributaries of the NSR.	85	7	-	7
3.2.1	Establish a storm water management strategy that gives priority to "Low Impact Development" approaches, which minimize storm water impacts on natural water bodies.	85	11	-	4
3.3.1	Reduce and eventually eliminate combined sewer overflows to the NSR.	85	11	-	4

Stakeholder Questionnaire Results

SUGGESTED WATER POLICIES		%	% AGREE	%	%
Ordered by % Agree. Reference numbers refer to <i>White Paper</i> .		AGREE	w/Conditions	DISAGREE	Unsure
3.1.2	Support development, implementation and enforcement of Instream Flow Needs (IFN) objectives in the NSR.	78	4	-	19
4.1.2	Develop a risk management plan to deal with possible reduced flows in the NSR.	78	19	-	4
4.1.1	EPCOR will lead Edmonton's efforts to conserve and reduce water usage in Edmonton.	41	15	22	22

Food (Goal 5)

Respondents indicated a high level of agreement that the proposed food security policies should be included in the strategic plan to be forwarded to City Council. Since 15% of respondents were unsure about policy 5.1.1 (Food Policy Council), it has been highlighted below.

Table 13: Stakeholder questionnaire response to food security policy recommendations

SUGGESTED FOOD POLICIES		%	% AGREE	%	%
Ordered by % Agree. Reference numbers refer to <i>White Paper</i> .		AGREE	w/Conditions	DISAGREE	Unsure
5.1.2	Develop a city-wide food and agriculture strategy.	74	19	-	7
5.1.1	Establish a Food Policy Council to develop a food charter and city-wide food and agriculture strategy.	59	22	4	15

Air (Goal 6)

Respondents indicated a high level of agreement that the proposed air quality policies should be included in the strategic plan to be forwarded to City Council.

Table 14: Stakeholder questionnaire response to air quality policy recommendations

SUGGESTED AIR POLICIES		%	% AGREE	%	%
Ordered by % Agree. Reference numbers refer to <i>White Paper</i> .		AGREE	w/Conditions	DISAGREE	Unsure
6.1.2	Determine, through studies, the quality of air in Edmonton, the sources of emissions and how the health of Edmontonians and the urban ecosystem is impacted.	89	7	-	4
6.1.3	Adopt and strive to achieve air quality guidelines recommended by the World Health Organization.	85	7	-	7
6.2.1	Support and participate in management activities designed to address specific local air quality issues, including (but not limited to) developing and	85	7	-	7

Stakeholder Questionnaire Results

SUGGESTED AIR POLICIES		%	% AGREE	%	%
Ordered by % Agree. Reference numbers refer to <i>White Paper</i> .		AGREE	w/Conditions	DISAGREE	Unsure
implementing air quality management plans.					
6.1.1	Increase air quality monitoring throughout Edmonton (per the recommended 2009 Ambient Air Management Strategy of Alberta) and make information available to Edmontonians on a real time basis.	82	15	-	4

Biodiversity (Goal 7)

Respondents to questionnaire #2 indicated a high level of agreement that the proposed biodiversity policies should be included in the strategic plan to be forwarded to City Council. Since 22% of respondents either disagreed or were unsure about the use of biodiversity offset requirements (policy 7.1.1), these two boxes have been highlighted in the table below.

Table 15: Stakeholder questionnaire response to biodiversity policy recommendations

SUGGESTED BIODIVERSITY POLICIES		%	% AGREE	%	%
Ordered by % Agree. Reference numbers refer to <i>White Paper</i> .		AGREE	w/Conditions	DISAGREE	Unsure
7.1.2	Develop a Biodiversity Strategy that encompasses the existing Natural Connections Strategic Plan and provides additional focus on non-traditional ways of increasing biodiversity in Edmonton.	82	7	4	7
7.1.1	Establish biodiversity offset requirements, making it necessary for developers to replace biodiversity lost through development.	63	15	11	11

One Planet Living (Goal 10)

Respondents to questionnaire #2 indicated a high level of agreement that the proposed one planet living policies should be included in the strategic plan to be forwarded to City Council.

Table 16: Stakeholder questionnaire response to one planet living policies

SUGGESTED ONE PLANET LIVING POLICIES		%	% AGREE	%	%
Reference numbers refer to <i>White Paper</i> .		AGREE	w/Conditions	DISAGREE	Unsure
10.1.1	Promote the concepts of "one planet living" through social marketing, outreach, education and awareness campaigns.	74	11	4	11
10.1.2	Set an ecological footprint target for Edmonton.	74	11	4	11

Stakeholder Workshops

At workshops held from November 16 to 18, 2010 invited stakeholders showed broad support for the proposed goals, objectives and policies contained in the White Paper. Invited stakeholders agreed that *The Way We Green* should be finalized and taken forward to City Council, but also identified many suggested improvements and a few cautions. Participants urged the policy team to craft the policies carefully in order to support successful implementation.

Four workshops were hosted for invited stakeholders. Participants sat at discussion tables of 5 to 8 people where a facilitator asked them to consider the direction in the *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. Approximately 350 stakeholders/stakeholder organizations were invited to attend. The following table describes participation at the four workshops.

Table 17: Participation at workshops for invited stakeholders

Date	Time of Day	Attended	Invited
November 16	Morning	29	City of Edmonton staff
November 17	Morning	29	External stakeholders
November 17	Afternoon	16	External stakeholders
November 18	Evening	8	External stakeholders
Total		82	

A broad range of internal and external stakeholders attended the meetings. External stakeholders included representatives of community leagues, chamber of commerce, youth and student organizations, environmental organizations, university staff, engineering and planning companies, and EPCOR representatives (among others).

This section of the report provides a brief summary of the extensive discussions that occurred at the stakeholder workshops. A full reporting of the comments recorded at the workshops is provided in appendix 3 and the reader is encouraged to refer to this appendix to gain the benefit of the many specific comments made during the workshops.

The following summary is organized by the same major categories previously used for reporting public forum input and stakeholder questionnaire results. The first workshop involved City of Edmonton staff and these 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*.

Stakeholder Workshop Results

Comments recorded at the workshop attended by City staff were similar to those made by external stakeholders at the other workshops, with one minor difference. City employees were more likely to be concerned about the specific wording and intent of objectives.

Stakeholders attending the workshops indicated that the policy direction in the *White Paper* is acceptable, and urgently necessary. Comments recorded at the workshops are largely about how to improve the policies and ensure that they can be effectively implemented.

Energy (Goal 1)

Are there concerns about the direction identified in the *White Paper*?

Participants at workshops were **highly supportive of the direction** indicated by the energy goal and objectives. There was no controversy about the direction, but there were several cautions about unintended consequences that could result if policy and implementation is not carefully worded. The following statements are examples of the cautions that emerged during workshop discussions:

- More attention to the business case for these initiatives. Need full cost accounting (cradle-to-cradle) approach. Difficult to measure environmental costs, but Council must be aware of the costs of doing nothing.
- Make sure that the approach is integrated; don't focus on individual objectives.
- The establishment of new (higher) energy standards for buildings and neighbourhoods must happen very soon. Does the City have the authority it needs? How will the City work with the Province?
- There should be more detail about how the business community participates and is affected.
- Efficiency does not automatically reduce overall energy use.
- Consider that many existing city policies do not support these directions. Undertake a policy audit. How will conflicts be dealt with?
- More clarity is needed about which policies affect City buildings and land, and which policies affect all citizens directly.
- Baseline information will be necessary if we want to confidently report progress. Need agreement about how to measure carbon emissions and energy efficiency, for example.

Are there gaps or oversights in the direction?

No major gaps or oversights were identified. However, a new objective (1.7) was added to the paper to address the value of implementing energy-efficient lighting on Edmonton's streets. Participants focused on factors such as clear wording, business case

and measurement, and the need to more carefully consider how energy reductions can be achieved with a growing population and economy.

Are any specific objectives (or policies) problematic?

Participants identified the following concerns with objectives:

- Objective 1.5 (resilient infrastructure) was questioned by City employees. Participants cautioned that the terms “resilience,” “infrastructure” and “disturbance” need to be more clearly defined. Is this really just risk management that is necessary for all the objectives?
- Objective 1.1 (built form): While the direction was supported (most respondents interpreted this objective as a need to reverse current sprawl and this was called “a very important objective”), there were questions about what “built form” means and what “energy efficiency” means in this context. The need for standardized baseline and measurement was emphasized.
- Objective 1.3 (renewable energy): Strong support, but some pointed out the need to be more specific than stating that: “Edmonton is not overly reliant on fossil fuels...”
- Objective 1.6 (new technology): Several respondents cautioned that “Edmonton is a leader” is problematic – (1) what is a leader? (2) leader in comparison to whom? (e.g., cold city leader).

Timelines

Respondents were asked to comment on timelines and milestones so that City administration could understand whether they were thinking about immediate, gradual or long-term implementation. In general, respondents advocated that implementation should begin immediately, with the establishment of formal city policies and the allocation of staff time. The timelines required to achieve the goal and objectives were estimated as follows:

- Objective 1.1 could be accomplished within 10-20 years. Some of objective 1.1 (built form) could be started immediately and accomplished within 1-5 years (specifically, suggested policies 1.1.1, 1.1.2, 1.1.4 and 1.1.6). Important benchmarks: implementation of policies initiated, regional coordination to curb sprawl, establishing zoning and area structure plans, implementing infrastructure changes.
- Objective 1.2 could be largely achieved within 25 years. City of Edmonton programs described in 1.2.1 and 1.2.4 could be implemented within a year. Policies that require new building standards (1.2.2 and 1.2.3) will take longer. Implementing new energy standards in new buildings should be the norm within 5-15 years (mean estimate of 8 years), while changes in existing buildings will take longer (10-40 years; mean estimate 23 years). Establishment of policies and standards are good milestones, but the measure of success will be reporting of number of buildings that meet the new standards.

Stakeholder Workshop Results

- Objective 1.3 is a longer term objective (e.g., 50% of energy from alternative sources within 50 years), but short-term milestones are critical (e.g., 20% of energy from alternative sources within 20 years).
- There were few estimates of timelines for other objectives, other than suggestions that policies 1.4 and 1.6 are longer term objectives. It was pointed out that Expo 2017 provided a very good timeline for demonstrating global standards in energy technologies.

Climate Change (Goal 2)

Are there concerns about the direction identified in the *White Paper*?

Participants at workshops were **highly supportive of the direction** indicated by the climate change goal and objectives. There was no controversy about the intent, but there were concerns about whether the goal is clear and achievable. It was suggested that the goal should address “carbon” neutrality (as in objective 2.1 and 2.2) rather than “climate change” neutrality. The following views were also noted:

- As stated, the goal is difficult to understand. How can you determine whether Edmonton is “climate change neutral”? What does “Resilient to the disturbances...” mean?
- Climate change is global. Edmonton can only address carbon neutrality. Perhaps only new developments can be carbon neutral. Perhaps the goal should be reduction of carbon emissions.

Are there gaps or oversights in the direction?

While no major gaps were identified, participants noted some changes they felt would be important:

- Need a baseline and a way to measure current outputs
- Include pollutants other than carbon pollutants
- Carbon sequestration should be included

Are any specific objectives (or policies) problematic?

No specific concerns about objectives or policies were raised. However, some participants noted that the objectives and policies should affect more than just the City corporation. There was also mention that targets should realistically address what a northern (cold) city can achieve.

Timelines

Only a few participants ventured to identify a timeline for this goal. Most of these felt that although it is likely a 40 year timeframe, it could only be achieved if we start immediately. Milestones would include the establishment of a regional commitment, ISO certification,

and a series of reduction targets for total carbon-based emissions originating within city boundaries.

Water (Goals 3 and 4)

Are there concerns about the direction identified in the *White Paper*?

Participants at workshops were **highly supportive of the direction** indicated by the water goal and objectives. There was no controversy about the intent; the only major concerns were about ensuring that the goal and objectives can be effectively implemented. The following suggestions were raised:

- Reword goal 3 to emphasize that water quality and quantity will be maintained to protect healthy aquatic ecosystems. (Another take on this: “sustain a healthy ecosystem and meet the needs of Edmontonians.”)
- Reframe policies to say that the City will be a partner in the development of the North Saskatchewan River management plan and will commit to working with others to achieve objectives.
- Provide clear priorities (there were suggestions that “repair wetlands” or “pollutants from combined sewer overflow” should be priorities).
- Describe an approach to partnerships that recognizes that everyone uses the water and that there are specific communities that can play a role in protecting the watershed. How will the City work with other stakeholders?
- Include a commitment that the City will work with other communities upstream and downstream.
- Reframe goal 4 to emphasize protection of water sources.
- Corporatization of water is a major concern.

Are there gaps or oversights in the direction?

While no major gaps were identified, participants noted some changes they felt would be important:

- Include an objective to “protect riparian areas.” Note: There is currently a policy statement under 3.1 that addresses this.
- Define “healthy” ecosystem and “healthy” river.
- Mention importance of chemicals (e.g., pesticides) in runoff.
- Add a policy that specifically addresses sedimentation and erosion.
- Education is important and should be mentioned.
- Mention Regional Advisory Committees.

Are any specific objectives (or policies) problematic?

Objective 3.1 refers to the North Saskatchewan River watershed. As a result, some participants felt that the City should participate in and support the watershed plan being created by the North Saskatchewan Water Alliance.

Stakeholder Workshop Results

Timelines

No timelines were discussed for goals 3 and 4.

Food Security (Goal 5)

Are there any concerns about the direction identified in the *White Paper*?

Participants at the workshops were **highly supportive of the direction** indicated by the food goal and objectives. There was no controversy about the intent, but the following suggestion was made about ensuring effective implementation: *Ensure that the Food Policy Council has appropriate authority, represents the grass roots (growers, owners, distributors), and that the consultation process is transparent.*

Are there gaps or oversights in the direction?

While no major gaps were identified, participants noted some changes that they felt would be important:

- Food production and use education should be mentioned
- Specific use of land zoning to protect/encourage food production (on agriculture lands and on available lands within the city)
- Link to biodiversity
- Urban farming should be linked to societal health and cohesion

Are any specific objectives (or policies) problematic?

No specific concerns about objectives or policies were raised. However, there was a suggestion that an additional policy should be added to identify how zoning will be used to protect/encourage agricultural use.

Timelines

Immediate action is required to stop the urbanization of high quality agricultural lands. The Food Policy Council should be operating within 2 years. The City should monitor and report changes in land area used for local food production and should monitor local sales of locally-produced food.

Air (Goal 6)

Are there any concerns about the direction identified in the *White Paper*?

Participants at workshops were **highly supportive of the direction** indicated by the air goal and objectives. However, there was suggested it must be clear that air quality

monitoring is undertaken to meet specific required outcomes. Objective 6.2 is linked to objective 6.1 (i.e., the highest standards are the target), and monitoring is a way of ensuring we are meeting the target.

Are there gaps or oversights in the direction?

No major gaps were identified.

Are any specific objectives (or policies) problematic?

Some participants worried that objective 6.1 could be interpreted to mean that everything is “ok” with air quality and that monitoring is simply undertaken to placate everyone. They wondered if there should be more emphasis on specified outcomes.

Timelines

Participants assumed air quality protection is current and ongoing. No timeline was suggested for objective 6.2.

Biodiversity (Goal 7)

Are there any concerns about the direction identified in the *White Paper*?

Participants at workshops were **supportive of the direction** indicated by the biodiversity goal and objectives but indicated a few concerns:

- How much biodiversity is possible within a highly urban area?
- Biodiversity must be looked at holistically: biodiversity efforts go beyond city boundaries.

Stakeholder Workshop Results

- Is biodiversity at odds with increased urban density? Clarify how biodiversity can be accommodated within the vision of our city.
- Is there any way to measure biodiversity in an urban setting?

Are there gaps or oversights in the direction?

It was suggested that forestry, endangered species, and protection of endangered ecosystems should be addressed. Also, the *White Paper* should be more specific about what we want to protect.

Are any specific objectives (or policies) problematic?

One participant felt the objective does not reflect biodiversity management.

Timelines

Participants suggested that an inventory and a strategy should be completed within 3 years.

Solid Waste (Goals 8 and 9)

Are there any concerns about the direction identified in the *White Paper*?

Participants at workshops were **supportive of the direction** indicated by the solid waste goals and objectives. They wondered, however, whether the *White Paper* provides any new direction. Some felt the *White Paper* should emphasize that reducing waste comes first; diversion of waste is the second strategy.

Are there gaps or oversights in the direction?

No major gaps were identified. There were many suggestions about how to ensure success (education, charges on rubbish bags, user pay, community compost centres, improved services to commercial sector, tighter trash regulations).

Are any specific objectives (or policies) problematic?

The objectives were accepted, as long as the emphasis on non-residential waste does not interfere with the current success with residential waste.

Timelines

No timeline was suggested for objective 9.1. It was suggested that objective 8.1 could be achieved quite quickly—within 5 years.

One Planet Living (Goal 10)

Are there any concerns about the direction identified in the *White Paper*?

Participants raised questions about whether this goal is needed. Some felt that it re-stated intention already addressed elsewhere in the *White Paper*. There were concerns that this is beyond the influence of the City. The phrase “bio capacity equity” is not well understood. There was a suggestion that the objective could be a simple statement of the goal.

Are there gaps or oversights in the direction?

There were several cautions about low public understanding of this direction and about the fact that the direction is ambiguous.

Are any specific objectives (or policies) problematic?

See comments in 1, above.

Timelines

No timeline was suggested for objective 10.1