

## **Sustainability Task Force March 16, 2009 Meeting Notes**

### STF Members Present:

Ann Schwab, Jon Luvaas, Jason Bougie, Ken Grossman, Tom DiGiovanni, Jim Stevens, Chris Giampaoli, Scott McNall, Lindsey Buckley, Julian Zenner, Tami Ritter

### City Staff Present:

Brendan Vieg, Linda Herman, Meredith Williams, Steven Peterson, Hillary Herman

### PMC Staff Present:

Daniel Hamilton, Scott Friend

#### 1. General Plan Outline:

- A description was provided regarding how the Sustainability Element will work with the rest of the General Plan Elements.
- Clarified that the sustainability plan is different than the Climate Action Plan.
- Daniel Hamilton said “Sustainability Process” would be a better name.
- Include emphasis on restoration, not just protection.
- Make the automobile the alternative; don’t reference bikes, buses, walking as “alternative”. Call it “zero-emission transport” or “renewable resource transport”. Also call it “renewable energy”, not alternative.
- Should we shoot for greater reductions for 2030 than what we are targeted for 2020? Make it incremental (pro-rated).
- Group discussed whether or not to include numeric goals in the General Plan. Much cross-education about State laws. Pros and cons associated with the inclusion of numeric goals discussed.

#### 2. State Law Compliance

- AB32, SB375, and SB97 will all affect the General Plan and its implementation
- Sustainability Element, along with the other elements of the General Plan, will include both policies and action items to set the City up for success in implementing these laws.
- Climate Action Plan (CAP) is being prepared concurrently to help ensure Chico is meeting goals of AB32.
- SB375 and SB97 may necessitate changes to processes in Chico moving forward, but the General Plan is working to stay ahead of these changes and provide appropriate direction for future decisions.

#### 3. Whole Systems Approach:

- 4th model: (McNall Method) – Use the combination of the Marin and Santa Monica models, but create a Sustainability Scorecard, with a point scoring system for each “E” of sustainability. City score would get points in each area to determine overall effect on or assessment of sustainability.

- Marin and Santa Monica require many resources for monitoring and reporting. Instead, break goals into sections with goals explicitly benefiting one area: equity, economic, environmental (3 Es).
- Some interest in having the assessment of meeting the 3 Es in the General Plan vs. Climate Action Plan and other documents and/or project by project review.
- Interest in making the requirements associated with triple bottom line predictably so that staff can approve projects or more projects can be approved ministerially.
- Focusing on meeting a letter grade is illusory, and it becomes the goal instead of other more important components such as quality design or community building.
- Marin's General Plan is very general.
- The focus should be on measuring the big goals or policies.
- Task Force needs to have better information on the tracking of these from other plans. Staff to circulate links to the Marin and Santa Monica websites and monitoring plans and reports.
- Measurable goals are good, but measure them outside the General Plan
- Share a small number of topics for each of the 3 Es.
- Keep the systems consistent between the General Plan and all subsequent documents.
- Have Marin and Santa Monica's programs been working well? They are the approaches that are most applicable to Chico's needs.
- Change the hybrid system to point to about 5 indicators that explain how the LOS "grade" is assigned.
- Don't evaluate each project on a 3E point system.
- Follow up for next meeting will include a clarification for project review versus General Plan assessment (annual).