

**Community Sustainability Council
Greensboro, North Carolina
February 8, 2010**

A meeting of the Community Sustainability Council was held on Monday, February 8, 2010 in the Plaza Level Conference Room of the Melvin Municipal Office Building, beginning at 2:30 PM. Members present were: Co-Chair Joel Landau, Co-Chair Bob Powell, Art Davis, Eric Hoekstra, Bob Kollar, Tom Duckwall, Marlene Sanford, Derrick Giles, Bob Skenes, Valerie Vickers, Tom Clary, and Carolyn Allen. Staff present were: Dan Curry and Susan Schwartz, HCD, Steve Randall, Engineering and Inspections, and Jeryl Covington, Director of Environmental Services. Also present was ad hoc advisor Phillip Morgan, Piedmont Natural Gas.

Approval of Minutes from the January 11th, 2010 Regular Meeting:

Ms. Allen moved to approve the minutes as submitted, seconded by Mr. Skenes. The Council voted unanimously 8-0 in favor of the motion.

Mr. Clary arrived at 2:34 PM. Ms. Sanford arrived at 2:35 PM.

Develop Action Plan Strategies:

Seth Jansen stated he provided the members an email last week on the Greenhouse Gas Inventory work. The goal today is to set preliminary goals, not to establish an actual target. He hopes to identify what goals are realistic, philosophical goals, and the direction the project needs to go when data is compiled.

He presented a graph of greenhouse gas emission over time to 2020. Preliminary inventory work was built off the work of the CERT group. There were no major issues with that inventory. The inventory has been expanded a little bit. Overall magnitude is approximately 5.5 million metric tons in 2007. A preliminary forecast has been developed. There are some questions about the growth rate of the line. The forecast shows the greenhouse gas emission growing to almost 7 million metric tons by 2020.

A Council member asked about the basis of the forecasted growth. Mr. Jansen stated the growth is based on 1.5% increase from the State Climate Action Plan applied to energy use, 2.4% growth of vehicle miles traveled, (VMT), and solid waste growing by 1.2% based on the County Solid Waste Plan. He said he could provide a breakdown of all the numbers. This is a forecast that is population based. It does not take into account possible energy standard changes, technology, changed behavior, and other such factors.

Foundational strategies will be explored. These include existing activities, rebates, audits, subcommittee reports and actions, the EECBG, and other existing measures. Once those are established they can be compared to the community's preliminary goals. Decisions can then be made if more measures need to be added, does the activity pool need to be more supported, and questions from the public input.

Co-Chair Landau mentioned that the EPA Sustainable Skylines grant was applied for by the City, but it was not granted. Therefore, implementation would not be possible. Mr. Jansen stated those adjustments would need to be made.

City Operational GHG Inventory

The City produced approximately 120,087 metric tons in 2007. The vast majority is from electricity. Vehicle fleets and natural gas make up a smaller portion. This represents 2.2% of community emissions. This is preliminary and more data will need to be included. The biggest gaps are defining the boundaries of the electricity and natural gas use data sets. Most of that has been taken care of. A 2007 data set needs to be compiled. The data in this inventory is from 2008. They are considering including employee commuting and business travel. Solid waste emissions also need to be compiled.

Community GHG Inventory

The total estimated emissions are approximately 5.5 million metric tons in 2007. About 60% is from electricity use. Transportation represents 24%, natural gas 13.8%, and 1.9% from solid waste. Gaps here include the electricity and natural gas data sets, applying County wide measurements to the City, and others that will be worked with over the next few weeks. He stated that growth of the City over the period of the forecast could be shown through adjustment of the baseline data. A change of 5% is a general standard. They must also consider if they want to include other emission sources.

Mr. Skenes asked if it might be beneficial to account for emissions in a way that is most beneficial to the City in regard to comparisons. Mr. Jansen stated that it was possible for comparison to be skewed between cities that have different emissions included in their inventories. Mr. Jansen stated that it was likely that they would focus on direct emissions from fossil fuel consumption and electricity use. Ms. Covington stated the State has already started these comparisons. The inventory will be designed to be compatible with State reporting. Mr. Jansen asked for any other feedback.

Considering the forecast and other set targets, the inventory number in 2007 and the growth indicated shows nearly 7 million metric tons by 2020. Goals set by other communities include: Virginia – a 30% reduction of emissions over 2005 levels by 2025, Chapel-Hill - 60% reduction by 2050, Durham – 30% reduction by 2030, the Obama Pledge – 17% reduction by 2020, and the U.S. Mayors Climate Commitment – 7% reduction over 1990 levels by 2012. A graph was shown representing these commitments.

Goal Setting

The least aggressive example was the State of Virginia. That would require reducing more emissions than the projected total VMT. That is also equivalent to about 50% of the emissions projected for energy use. Even the least aggressive of goals is still fairly ambitious.

Preliminary goal setting requires a discussion. They need to discuss what type of goals Greensboro might set, how they might be structured, and a general timeline.

Mr. Davis arrived at 3:02 PM.

Mr. Jansen gave an example of 20% reduction in energy use, 10% reduction of VMT, and 6% reduction of solid waste emission. If this is implemented it would stabilize emission at projected 2009 levels in 2020.

The Council stated that it was difficult to know without the whole picture of the data. Mr. Jansen stated the questions need to be discussed because they can motivate what data needs to be captured. It also gives an unfiltered impression of a goal without the numbers.

Co-Chair Powell stated that the considerations of community passion for the issue, preferences for incentives versus regulation, and political, technological, and financial feasibility are a good starting point to discuss.

Mr. Davis said that the earlier public meetings have some information about the community's priorities. Ms. Vickers stated that the public meetings did not have the turnout necessary to gauge the community passion. Education and marketing are a vital issue. She cited Chattanooga for their action plan.

Mr. Skenes stated that looking at cities that are so different from Greensboro does not make sense. He cited the budget deficit, and stated that grandiose goals are not helpful and that any efforts need to be realistic. Mr. Duckwall stated that there was also a need to set goals that must be reached for.

Mr. Duckwall stated VMT ignores the composition that the fleet is ever changing, hopefully changing for the better. Mr. Jansen stated that the changes can be accounted for through various techniques. Changes in transportation emissions can be achieved by modifying the percentage of vehicles on the road and VMT

reductions. There is more VMT control at the local level, than a city's ability to persuade drivers to drive a different kind of car.

Co-Chair Powell laid out 3 possibilities for members to vote on as preliminary goals over a twenty year period for total numbers: 0%, 0% - 10%, 10% - 20%. The vote was as follows: 0% - 1 vote, 0% - 10% - 5 votes, 10% - 20% - 5 votes.

Mr. Jansen estimated the current efforts, based on information from the subcommittees, would result in a 2-3% reduction.

The Council discussed the fact that many of the goals from other communities were made before the numbers were looked at, making them unrealistic. Co-Chair Powell stated that some plans that have gone on longer could also provide data on outcomes of the action plans.

Mr. Giles arrived at 3:20 PM.

Co-Chair Powell stated that the local governments of North Carolina are beginning to look at these action plans. There is a conference in March with the State Inter-agency Leadership team and local community action plans. The Council indicated that it should explore getting involved.

Co-Chair Landau stated that this would lead to a round of recommendations and more actions in the future. It would be good to see what the impact has been on previous plans. The next step is quantifying these recommendations.

Annotated Outline

Dave Wortman presented an annotated outline of the process. The strategies presented are from consolidated subcommittee reports. He asked for feedback on the strategies presented.

Co-Chair Landau stated that the outline was formatted well. Mr. Wortman asked if there were certain documents they wished to use as an example. Ms. Vickers suggested the Chattanooga Action Plan.

Mr. Curry stated it was a complete outline. He suggested the level of detail included in the action plan should be discussed. The plan must be adopted, and the agreements might not be in place in advance of the plan. He suggested that the plan be concise and focus on the goals and basic activities. There are also several areas of overlap that could be combined.

Ms. Sanford cautioned that it was also easy to over simplify. How something is going to get done is also important. Mr. Curry stated that partnerships and involvement of other groups should be carefully considered. Mr. Jansen stated a plan with limits in these areas will make it more flexible.

Co-Chair Landau stated that the Skylines initiative may no longer be appropriate because the City did not receive the grant that would have provided the needed funding for those measures. Mr. Curry stated there was very similar information related to the EECBG. The process now is to consolidate the information.

Ms. Vickers stated that best practices to achieve goals should be explored. She asked if there are a set of best practices. Mr. Wortman stated that there are examples of best practices, and at this point the outline is more specific to Greensboro and the Council's wishes. A list of the practices will be forwarded to the Council members.

Mr. Jansen asked for feedback on what areas of the outline needed major revision and other general comments. Co-Chair Landau asked that *3.1 Methodology* be moved to the Appendix. Co-Chair Landau stated that one recommendation was for the City to adopt a cash flow sustainability account, which needs City Council approval. The account would show savings from these measures and provide funding for future use.

Mr. Giles stated one area is the incentives for consumers to obtain more efficient equipment and a business development aspect from the revolving loan fund. Mr. Wortman stated that was included in the outline.

Co-Chair Landau asked if the Council approved the approach of a summary of strategies, table of data, and then details of each one. Co-Chair Landau suggested a short definition of the qualitative items. The Council agreed with the general approach. All communications and suggestions should be forwarded to Co-Chair Landau.

Mr. Giles suggested to focus on the costs and benefits of the efforts and use that to help guide strategies. Priority must be to identify the causes, the costs and benefits, and the strategies that are most effective. Mr. Kollar stated that public education about the outcomes come through sustainable efforts.

Discuss Next Steps for CSC, and Provide Feedback to the Consultants:

Co-Chair Powell stated the next steps include the following: incorporate the feedback in the annotated outline by the end of the week, further quantify foundational strategies, and from there identify the gap between the goals and the present condition. The plan is to have that for the March CSC meeting, but that may need to be moved back.

Mr. Jansen stated that the gap would be discussed at a special March meeting. During the March meeting the Council can discuss and review the outline. Hopefully the Council can adopt an almost finalized plan. The plan will be finalized by early April and presented to the public.

Possible dates for a special meeting were discussed; March 29th at 2:30 PM was suggested. Ms. Vickers suggested that the group present best practices and creative practices during the meeting on the 8th.

Co-Chair Landau asked if the phone conference for March 3rd was still planned. Mr. Curry said that it was.

The Council went into recess for five minutes.

Co-Chair Landau called the meeting back to order.

Develop a Greensboro Sustainability Mission Statement for the Action Plan:

Co-Chair Landau stated that the use of a mission statement had come up in planning. There is a mission statement for the Council, but there has not been a mission statement developed for the plan. The Council discussed different statements and mission statements related to the group. They agreed to some combination of what was already prepared. The full mission statement will be added to the action plan.

Reports from Subcommittees:

Waste, Reduction, and Recycling

Item 2 was amended as follows: A. All users of solid waste pickup services be charged on the same basis. That is all users be charged solely through property tax assessments, or all users be charged through property tax and a fee basis that is the same for all. B. Recycling services be provided to all users at no extra charge than through property tax assessments. C. To modify the Land Development Ordinance to sensitize to provision of recycling facilities on site. After 2.A. and 2.B. are achieved modify the Land Development Ordinance to require new developments to provide recycling facilities on site. After the three preceding recommendations have been implemented Greensboro would then consider how to achieve the goal of mandatory recycling with an appropriate enforcement technique. A typo was corrected. Item 3.C. was amended to read recommend to make waste reduction a priority to consider resources, emissions, and reduced waste pick up and disposal expenses.

Mr. Davis moved to accept the reports as amended, seconded by Ms. Sanford. The Council voted unanimously 12-0 in favor of the motion.

Education and Outreach

There was a slight rewording in Items 3, 6, and 8. The Items were approved last moth. Mr. Skenes read the minutes into the record and are available upon request.

Green Technology

The report will be entered next Month.

Public Presentation of the Action Plan:

Co-Chair Powell stated that the Council needed to approve a public presentation of the plan before the release to City Council. Mr. Kollar stated that the website would be a good starting point for public presentation. Ms. Schwartz stated that staff would like to explore several modes of communication. The point is to inform the public about what has been planned, but there will be feedback from what is presented. Co-Chair Powell stated that constructive criticism can be considered.

Mr. Kollar asked if the document presented would be the final preparation ready for City Council approval. Co-Chair Powell stated that the document would be a living document, but the overall plan will largely be laid out. Co-Chair Landau stated they needed to decide if they wished to have a public presentation or a public hearing. He feels that there has been public input from the beginning of the project. The public needs to be involved with the final document to help with support from the City Council, and feedback will be considered from the public meeting. The presentation will be an executive summary of the 200-300 page document.

Ms. Sanford suggested posting a draft on the website and inviting feedback from groups that have had involvement in the project. The public meeting could be held in mid-April. Bring the document back to the Council for the May meeting, and have the document ready for City Council to consider the document by late June or July. Co-Chair Landau said that he and Co-Chair Powell had met with the Mayor and the City Manager and they seemed receptive to the process of having the Plan before City Council at its second April meeting.

Ms. Vickers stated they needed to decide if they would be represented at Greensboro's Earth Day celebration. The event could also be a good mode for public presentation. Mr. Kollar asked how this fits in with the deadline to meet with City Council. Co-Chair Landau stated that a briefing might be booked before April 20th. Ms. Sanford stated it would be beneficial to highlight areas in the action plan that might have a budget impact for the City Council.

Mr. Curry stated that the City Council will not be having budget discussion that early; the Manager will be preparing budget recommendations. As they get deeper into the draft it will be easier to identify what budget requests might be in there. Those could be moved into budget requests while they are completing the plan. Budget requests for this year would need to go to the Manager by the end of this month.

Mr. Kollar asked if a briefing session with the City Council was necessary. Ms. Covington stated that in her previous experience it was important to have the briefing to let the City Council know what the plan is all about and the implications of the plan.

Co-Chair Powell summarized the consensus from the Council. There is a process that needs to take place to get all budget implications and requests in front of the Council. That needs to happen soon and can happen without the completed action plan. Also, the overall approval of the action plan does not follow the April 20th schedule but will get extended for several weeks. Ms. Sanford suggested looking at budget items during the next meeting. Mr. Curry stated that staff recommendations will also be presented at the next meeting concerning budget items.

The Earth Day involvement was discussed, and the Council agreed that the event would be a good venue for public involvement. Ms. Vickers said they would have to set that up by the end of the week. Co-Chair Landau stated that Pat Boswell had agreed to help produce some materials. Mr. Kollar suggested advising the public that the draft plan will be available on the website to allow review before attending the Earth Day event.

Ms. Vickers and Mr. Hancock agreed to be on the Earth Day committee. Ms. Vickers stated that they discussed doing both the Greensboro and Winston-Salem Earth Days. They suggested focusing on the Greensboro event. It was also suggested that as many members as possible attend the event to help with presentations.

Emails Sent to the CSC Website:

Mr. Kollar asked if there were term expirations coming up. Co-Chair Landau stated that there may be some terms up in May; he will check into it for next meeting.

In another email the corporate manager from Enterprise Rental Company is interested in talking about ride-sharing programs. Mr. Curry stated he would forward the email to Adam Fischer.

Items from the Co-Chairs:

Co-Chair Landau mentioned they met separately with the Mayor and the City Manager. They seemed receptive to the Council and its plans. They discussed the fact there will be a budget plan, and likely some budget implications.

Items from Group Members:

Co-Chair Powell stated that the Housing Coalition will have a summit on February 23rd. He encouraged all to come.

Ms. Vickers announced the Sierra Club is having an event at the Kathleen Clay Library, at 7:30, tomorrow having an objective look at the landfill.

Acknowledgement of Absences:

Ms. Sanford moved to acknowledge the absences of Terri Hancock, Debbie Leiner, and Davis Montgomery, seconded by Mr. Skenes. The Council voted unanimously 12-0 in favor of the motion.

Adjournment:

There being no further business before the Group, the meeting adjourned at 5:05 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Joel Landau
Co-Chairman

JL/jd