



# City of Madison

City of Madison  
Madison, WI 53703  
www.cityofmadison.com

## Master

**File Number: 12771**

**File ID:** 12771

**File Type:** Resolution

**Status:** Referred

**Version:** 3

**Reference:**

**Controlling Body:** PLAN  
COMMISSION

**File Created Date :** 11/14/2008

**File Name:** Sustainability goals to guide development of  
Northeast Neighborhoods plan.

**Final Action:**

**Title:** SECOND SUBSTITUTE - Establishing sustainability goals to guide the  
development of the plan for the Northeast Neighborhoods.

### Notes:

**Sponsors:** David J. Cieslewicz

**Enactment Date:**

**Attachments:** Staff Rpt to SDE Com.pdf  
,SDEmemberGarrickMainesComments.pdf  
,FWLRTPCNortheast Neighborhoods.pdf ,MPO  
Comments on VMT\_01-28-09.pdf  
,NENeighborhoodSustainabilityGoals.pdf  
,NENeighborhoodLRTPC.pdf ,Res ID  
12771\_Version1.pdf  
,ZeroNetEnergyPolicyProgReview0209.pdf ,Hoffman  
Memo to the Plan Commission\_02-16-09.pdf  
,Planning Memo to Plan Commission\_02-18-09.pdf  
,NRELZeroEnergyBuildings.pdf  
,NRELRenewableEnergyCommunity.pdf ,Boundary  
Map.pdf ,CEO Memo on NE  
Sustainability\_02-18-09.pdf ,Ald. Gruber  
Comments\_02-23-09.pdf ,Res ID 12771\_Version  
2.pdf ,NENH baseline for goal #2 032309.pdf ,Res ID  
12771- Version 4.pdf ,Add Comment 032309.pdf

**Enactment Number:**

**Author:** Rick Roll, Planning Division; Andrew Statz, Mayor's Office

**Hearing Date:**

**Entered by:** pwilliamson@cityofmadison.com

**Published Date:**

### History of Legislative File

Ver- sion:	Acting Body:	Date:	Action:	Sent To:	Due Date:	Return Date:	Result:
1	Mayor's Office	11/14/2008	Referred for Introduction				
	<b>Action Text:</b>	This Resolution was Referred for Introduction					
	<b>Notes:</b>	Plan Commission,Sustainable Design and Energy Committee, Long Range Transportation Planning Commission, Water Utility Board					
1	COMMON COUNCIL	12/02/2008	Referred	PLAN COMMISSION		02/23/2009	
	<b>Action Text:</b>	This Resolution was Referred to the PLAN COMMISSION					

**Notes:** Additional Referral(s): Sustainable Design and Energy Committee, Long Range Transportation Planning Commission, Water Utility Board

1 PLAN COMMISSION 12/02/2008 Refer SUSTAINABLE DESIGN AND ENERGY COMMITTEE

**Action Text:** This Resolution was Refer to the SUSTAINABLE DESIGN AND ENERGY COMMITTEE

**Notes:**

1 PLAN COMMISSION 12/02/2008 Refer LONG RANGE TRANSPORTATION PLANNING COMMISSION 01/15/2009

**Action Text:** This Resolution was Refer to the LONG RANGE TRANSPORTATION PLANNING COMMISSION

**Notes:**

1 PLAN COMMISSION 12/02/2008 Refer WATER UTILITY BOARD 01/27/2009

**Action Text:** This Resolution was Refer to the WATER UTILITY BOARD

**Notes:**

1 SUSTAINABLE DESIGN AND ENERGY COMMITTEE 12/08/2008

1 WATER UTILITY BOARD 12/16/2008 Rerefer WATER UTILITY BOARD 01/27/2009 01/27/2009 Pass

**Action Text:** Janet Piraino said their preference was that this be referred to the January meeting. A motion was made by Cnare, seconded by Harrington, to Rerefer to the WATER UTILITY BOARD, due back on 1/27/2009. The motion passed by voice vote/other.

**Notes:**

1 LONG RANGE TRANSPORTATION PLANNING COMMISSION 12/18/2008 Refer LONG RANGE TRANSPORTATION PLANNING COMMISSION 01/15/2009 Pass

**Action Text:** This Resolution was Refer to the LONG RANGE TRANSPORTATION PLANNING COMMISSION

Andrew Statz (Mayor's Office) asked the Commission to refer Resolution ID 12771 to the January meeting. He said that staff would like to obtain more input on the resolution from land owners and developers in the Northeast Neighborhood area.

The Commission then unanimously referred Resolution ID 12771 to its 1-15-09 meeting, on a motion submitted by Ald. Paul Skidmore/Ald. Robbie Webber.

**Notes:**

2 SUSTAINABLE DESIGN AND ENERGY COMMITTEE 01/12/2009

**Action Text:** Sherrie Gruder introduced the item and suggested that staff give a presentation first before public comment so that everyone is on the same page.

Sherrie Gruder then introduced Andrew Statz

Andrew Statz indicated that planning staff would give a presentation first to give the committee background on the area we are talking about and then Andrew would provide information on the resolution.

Rick Roll began by discussing the comprehensive plan for the city, including the peripheral area. Rick showed the committee the map of the city. As a part of the comprehensive plan, the city looked at where the city would grow including where it makes sense to grow from a public works perspective. Rick also discussed the intergovernmental agreements the City has in this area. The City also looked at growth plans of the past in creating the comprehensive plan. Red on the map is short-term growth where development could start within five years. The Northeast neighborhoods area is in this red area. Before development happens in this area, the city creates a neighborhood plan, which looks at transportation, housing, etc. This plan is then used by the City to guide development as the area develops. This area, the Northeast Neighborhoods area, is on the east side of the city. After the City plan is prepared, the plan will be referred to many committees for input with the final committee being the plan commission. There are also neighborhood meetings where staff meets with various stakeholders groups from residents and landowners to organizations and other governments. There is also a web site developed with background maps and other information. Finally, a resolution is introduced to adopt the plan. Again, a number of City committees to review the plan and then it finally will go to the plan commission then to the common council for final approval the plan.

Rick Roll the showed a more detailed map and stated that this area will take twenty-plus years to develop. Rick then showed elements of the detailed map, including the primary roads and also showing that various colors show different types of land use. This detailed map does show that the City needs a neighborhood plan for this area. The map also shows that this area is planned to be a TND, which means traditional neighborhood development. That throughout this area TND should be considered. There will also be areas for mixed-use too including neighborhood centers and town centers, where the building would be 2-4 stories with some residential but shops and offices, etc. These mixed-use areas would be transit-oriented so you could live, walk, bike, and take transit in this area to basic services. The comprehensive plan is very general while the neighborhood plan will get more specific.

On the map you can see Autumn Lake just to the west of this area. This map would be a base map for use in helping to develop the neighborhood plan.

The last map is a close up of a study area. Phase one, which is the area south of Burke Road is mostly already in the City of Madison. The other areas are within the Town of Burke. The City has an intergovernmental agreement with the City of Sun Prairie and the Town of Burke which plans out how development happens and when the Town of Burke does not exist anymore. In 2036, all of the land in the Town of Burke will come into the city.

Judy Compton asked if the town develops, does that development come into the city?

Rick Roll indicated that there are some ways for the town to develop but if there is new development purposed, then these developments must come into the city.

Judy Compton worried that because we don't have control with Town of Burke lands that it would be hard to implement this plan.

Brad Murphy stated that this intergovernmental agreement with the Town of Burke is very similar to other intergovernmental agreements that the City has, such as the Town of Blooming Grove. Brad further stated that most of the large parcel will be annexed into the city before 2036, but there are some town sub-divisions that will not come in until 2036. He did not think that the Town of Burke lands would make it more difficult to develop and implement a neighborhood plan in this area.

Sherrie Gruder asked how long would this take to build out?

Rick Roll stated that the City is planning on having 30,000 to 40,000 people in this area and that this amount of density can better handle transit and also save green space. Rick also mentioned that in April of 2009, a sewer line will be extended up from the south and that there is also a sewer planned to

come up from Door Creek and also the Felland area. With sewer going in, the area will be developed. This area has been planned for development since 1990.

Judy Compton asked what transit will be there and what transit is there now?

Rick Roll indicated that there is some transit in the area but not a lot. Judy Compton also asked about bike paths.

Rick Roll indicated that there are also some bike paths, but that more bike paths would be built as part of the build out. Major bike paths could be built sooner too.

David Drummond asked for more information about what a TND is.

Rick Roll suggested that committee members think of older neighborhoods. There is a mix of houses, corner stores, etc. You don't see those on the edge of the city.

Michael Vickerman asked what school district is this?

Rick Roll indicated that this is the Sun Prairie.

Andrew Statz then began to discuss the resolution and stated that this is a unique opportunity both culturally and environmentally. This area has been slated for development for a long time. Andrew indicated he drafted these goals at the mayor's request. These goals are suppose to be high-level goals or principals. This is not where we will see a lot of details. That will be in the neighborhood plan.

Lou Host-Jablonski asked what are baseline date that helped to determine these goals and how are they measured?

Andrew Statz indicated that for goal #1 the goal is to reduce all trips made by residents that live there. So if 5000 people move into than area, 25% of their trips would be by other means that the automobile. The citywide baseline is 20%, but that includes downtown and campus, so for this neighborhood having 25% of the trips by other means than an auto is a big goal. There is a rail option that could serve this neighborhood in the future and the City is considering early transit to help meet this goal. The City is also planning on having this are be more urban/dense so that transit and rail are viable.

Judy Compton stated that this is on the far-east side of the city. She indicated that if you look at other new neighborhoods in this area such as Grand View Commons that the city tried to build it with traditional neighborhood design but that there is very little commercial/retail out there. So if the City is serious about building this new area where there are true mixed-use areas, then the City will needs to put our money where our mouth is and support efforts to achieve these goals. She is also concerned that we might delay development in this area if the City isn't able to provide the support needed because the financial requirements will be too great for the City and suggested that there is no way to get Metro Transit out there early considering the City's financial position.

David Boyer reminded the committee that at this point this is a set of goals and that the committee needs to ask whether these goals achievable?

Andrew Statz indicated that after the resolution is passed and the neighborhood plan is developed that that is the place to elaborate on what responsibilities the City has to implement the goals and the strategies laid out in the plan. However, at this point, it is the intent of the City to indeed provide additional financial support for this area for early transit, but at this point cannot guarantee financial support for other strategies. He is not ruling it out and further discussions should occur as the neighborhood plan is being put together.

Judy Compton then mentioned that in this area there would be developers that only plat the land and then sell it to builders to build and sell the homes. So in that respect the developers will not be able to control what the builders do to achieve these goals. How will the City handle that?

Andrew Statz mentioned that Mario Mendoza from the Mayor's Office has met with developers in the area including Brian Munson from Vandewalle & Associates, who is working with several developers in the area, has created a document that lays out who will be responsible for various elements. This document is a good starting point for the plan. In such a document, for example Early Transit by Metro Transit would require funding and be the responsibility of the City and that would be spelled out in the

plan.

Andrew Statz also mentioned that regarding goal #2 that he met with MGE and that generally speaking when you look to reduce electrical/natural gas load through retrofits that a 10% reduction is good and with new construction you can fairly easily meet a 20%, so for this area the goal is a bit higher or 25%.

Andrew Statz further stated that for rules #3 and #4 that for water conservation that the Water Utility has just adopted a conservation plan that calls for a 20% reduction in water use citywide, for this area 25% would be the goal. And for storm water, the idea is to move the point of infiltration closer to the source this would do a number of things including reduce icing on sidewalks and streets and reduce erosion, etc.

Michael Vickerman asked that for goal #2 it does not separate out household type?

Andrew Statz indicated that that was correct.

Peter Taglia indicated that goal number two does not emphasize energy efficiency enough that the goal could be satisfied by renewable energy purchase only and this may be achieved easily because the utilities may already be required to reach this percentage of renewable energy through a federal mandate.

Judy Compton indicated that she is very supportive of this and that she wants this to happen, but in order for this to happen, the neighborhood plan has to be successful and developers have to feel like they can build given the restraints placed on them by the plan. If this plan cost the developers money and there is no help from the city, then she is not sure if she can support this. If the city can help with such items and early transit services and bike paths, then there may be enough incentives.

Andrew Statz stated that the plan would need to work for the environment, for the buildings and the developers and for the people that will live out there. This needs to work for everyone. He also added that if elements are not working, the City can also update the neighborhood plan, but that yes the City will have to support the plan.

Lou Host-Jablonski stated that some of the goals might be too modest and he asked what is going to be different about this neighborhood? Are we looking at changing items from a regulatory point of view or incentives? Finally, he stated that if done right, this could become a model for the country.

Andrew Statz indicated that many people are asking how will this work? There are several things that come into play; a good zoning code and the plan itself will be more sustainable at this point the City is not talking about more regulations or extra requirements.

Lou Host-Jablonski indicated that the goals of the zoning code rewrite are to take into account the diversity of our current successful neighborhoods and to lower the number of PUDs in the city. He wondered if the plan would rely too much on the zoning code rewrite. The idea of these goals is great, but if we really want to do something here maybe we need to have a special zoning district for this area?

David Boyer indicated that many of these items are not zoning code related but rather building code related and that that is a big issue, but he also mentioned that the state does preempt the City on many building code issues.

Brian Munson indicated that he is working with several developers in the area. He also indicated that a lot of what these goals talk about is already happening on some level. How these goals are approached does leave questions. Primarily, what does this mean to the developers and how can this be implemented? In terms of the resolution, we are supportive. Brian indicated that they are not sure what the 25% means and they have questions on how they are going to be measured and what happens if the goals are not met?

Brian Munson and the developers have started to look at the implementation strategies by breaking down the responsibility by the builders, developers, city and the residents. There needs to be a discussion about who is responsible for various aspects of the plan. The resolution is to set the goals and then the plan to show in more details about how we would go about doing this.

Lou Host-Jablonski asked indicated that order to have this neighborhood be successful you need to have retail, jobs and dwellings all within walking distance. You have to have schools, jobs, shopping, and residential all together. Will this plan get us there?

Brian Munson indicated that what the City has discussed thus far, the developers like and for a traditional neighborhood design to work you need everything that a city has and you need to be able to walk to it.

Lou Host-Jablonski reminded the committee that this area is about 10 neighborhoods so you really need 10 TND organized neighborhoods.

Brian Munson indicated that he believes that the city understands this.

David Drummond asked how does this happen? How do you create a Monroe Street?

Brian Munson indicated that the first step is to write a neighborhood plan then developers can plat the land and start building.

Judy Compton noted that the average price for homes on the MLS is \$240,000.

Lou Host-Jablonski indicated that on Vandewalle and Associates' handout all the points were about residential and there must be more commercial to make this work.

Judy Compton indicated that the City planned for commercial areas to the south of County Road T, but not one business has been built, yet Cottage Grove built a business park and the businesses came. We need to find out what Cottage Grove did to get businesses and do that.

Brad Murphy indicated that the plan would need to address this. The City needs commercial and jobs to make this work. The next step will be to put the plan together to achieve this.

Judy Compton indicated that we have a developer at the meeting who only does single lot development. Is this plan going to slow down the development?

Brad Murphy indicated not at this point, the plan does have an implementation plan. Right now we need to get this resolution adopted and then the plan adopted before the development can begin. We are hopeful that the plan will be done this year. We hope that the resolution stating goals is passed before we start the plan.

Peter Taglia wondered why there wasn't anything on the Vandewalle and Associates' handout about construction.

Brian Munson indicated that the handout doesn't have everything. We know there will be commercial, etc and there already are city requirements for construction sites. There is also limits regarding what a developer does, but there are others involved like the builders, the City and residents. We need to make this workable for everyone.

Peter Taglia indicated that everything is in there but construction site issues, so maybe include this in what the city needs to do?

Michael Vickerman asked if there is anything in there about street design and roof orientation for solar?

Brian Munson indicated that considering the size of this area, this is something that we will consider.

Judy Compton asked Brian considering that you are here representing – independent developers, have there been any discussions about LEED.

Brian clarified that if Judy was referring to LEED – ND (Neighborhood Design) that currently there are no green field sites that can meet the requirements. Brian worked on the redevelopment of Hill Farms and that project would have scored platinum, but you don't get many points for green field so LEED – ND will not work. LEED – Homes or other LEED for other construction can happen.

Lou Host-Jablonski asked for a Veridian new home what is the energy use? It is Green Build and Energy Star. He is wondering if goal number 2 is too low because it is using a citywide average and suggest that the goal be to do 25% better than Green Build or Energy Star.

Brian Munson indicated that there are state code issues and there is also a question about what does the market need?

Lou Host-Jablonski made a comment that City plans are not specific enough to make sure that this would really work.

Brian Munson indicated that the neighborhood plan is a guide and then we get more specifics when the developers begin working with engineers, etc. to make sure it is workable. We are working with city on this.

John Dewitt (A landowner.) indicated that he is behind this, however he would like the 25% taken out and to try to get as far as we can.

Sherrie Gruder indicated that the committee has a resolution in front of them and that people need to decide what they want to do.

Jeanne Hoffman reminded the committee that this resolution is going to go to many other committees and then to the Plan Commission for final review and then on to the Common Council.

Judy Compton indicated that this committee should move referral because this is a really important topic for this committee.

David Boyer reminded the committee that this is only the first step and will give staff some guidance so that they can begin to work on the plan with sustainability in mind. There is a part of him that thinks these goals could have no numbers because they are goals. He also mentioned that we needed to ask if we want big changes or little changes? If you have a big number it may cause everyone to think bigger and really change the paradigm.

Lou Host-Jablonski agreed with David's comment and asked whether these 25% reductions are good goals or not? He indicated that he thinks we need to do something big in this area and that for him the main challenge is to build truly mixed use where residential are really mixed-up with employment and retail, etc. That all of this is integrated and that that type of goal really doesn't lend itself to having a number attached to it. Finally, Lou commented that staff seems to be relying on the new zoning code as a way to get this truly integrated neighborhood accomplished in this area. He is not so sure that the new zoning code will be enough and mentioned that right now the zoning code rewrite committee is struggling. He thought that perhaps the resolution should have a 5th goal which lists the importance of the new zoning code and that this area may be a place where we can test it to see if it is providing the necessary zoning to accomplish true mixed-use. That is what the City did many years ago when they re-wrote the R2 district. However, the plan needs to have implementation strategies that go beyond the zoning code rewrite so that we can get to truly mixed-use.

Jeanne Hoffman and Rick Roll indicated some background work on the plan has been done but that the neighborhood plan cannot be completed until this resolution is passed so that staff know what implementation strategies to put into the plan.

Judy Compton suggested that the committee could pass the resolution tonight but ask that it be sent back to SDE before going to the Plan Commission so that SDE can see what the other committees have suggested. She feels that this an appropriate because this resolution deals with sustainability and that is the main work this committee does.

Peter Taglia commented that for goal #2 there should be more thought and strategies for energy efficiency and energy conservation. That perhaps we can think about pilot projects for this area such as real time electrical meters, etc. There are many strategies that could be done here and smart metering is just one.

Jeanne Hoffman pointed out that the committee is talking a lot about implementations strategies that could be describe in the plan. She reminded committee members that they will also be able to review the neighborhood plan when it is making its way through the legislative process for approval, so there will be a time for the committee to add suggestions to the plan. It is fine for the committee to think about strategies and to provide guidance to staff on strategies that the committee feels will be successful, but that the committee also needs to be looking at the goals in the resolution and providing input/suggestions on whether this committee feels that these goals make sense.

Garrick Maine mentioned that he has sent an email to Sherrie for last month's meeting regarding this resolution because he was not going to make that meeting. The email, which he provided a copy of (and will be posted to Legistar), talks about measures and metrics.

- 1) Do we have the right number of goals?
- 2) The committee needs to review the metrics for each goal and ask whether they make sense.

Sherrie Gruder mentioned that we are not going to have time to work on the next item on the agenda, which is the TNS work that the committee has been doing, but that we should think about that right now because the goal that the committee came up with is to be a net zero energy community by 2050. Maybe we can consider that goal when we look at this resolution at our next meeting?

Judy Compton moved referral to the next meeting and as that staff provide at the next meeting more information on the following:

- Articulate why these goals were chosen and is something missing? Why the 25% was used for each of the goals and how staff plans on measuring these goals?
- Provide more information on goal #2. What exactly is 25% better than the average home in Madison? How does that compare to Green Build and/or Energy Star homes? What is the likelihood of having a goal that is achieving x% better than Green Build or Energy Star
- And a list of possible implementation strategies that the City can provide to help make sure that these goals can be achieved. Articulate how the City could implement these strategies.

Lou Host-Jablonski seconded the motion

Michael Vickerman indicated that it is easy to build housing and not retail and he wanted to know how can the City help bring businesses to this area and earlier than they would otherwise come?

Paul Muench indicated that we also needed to talk about goal #1 more because it will be hard to achieve.

The motion passed unanimously

**Notes:**

2	LONG RANGE TRANSPORTATION PLANNING COMMISSION	01/15/2009	Return to Lead with the Following Recommendation(s)	PLAN COMMISSION	02/23/2009	Pass
---	--	------------	---	--------------------	------------	------

**Action Text:** Ald. Tim Gruber/Mike Rewey submitted a motion to recommend adoption of Resolution ID 12771.

Mike Rewey/Michael Basford recommended adding a new "be it further resolved" (BIFR) clause at the end of the resolution: "BE IT FINALLY RESOLVED that, as part of the Northeast Neighborhoods planning process, staff will develop specific implementation strategies to achieve these goals."

Eric Sundquist/Ald. Tim Gruber then submitted a motion to modify the BIFR clause referencing the sustainability goals (suggested text in "quotes" below):

Mike Rewey/Ald. Tim Gruber suggested adding "and/or" in that BIFR clause below, to allow for the possibility that either or both measure would be possible (depending on further evaluations with staff and LRTPC).

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the development of the plan for Madison's Northeast Neighborhoods will be guided by the following goals:

Capturing 25% of all trips made by persons living in the development area by walking, bicycling or transit "and/or reducing household motor vehicle miles of travel (VMT) by 25% (in comparison to a baseline to be determined by staff)", through the use of transit oriented development, traditional neighborhood development, mixed use development, transit access for early neighborhood residents, transportation demand management plans, walkable environments, bike facilities, or other transportation demand management practices.

On the amendments, the Commission voted 7-1 to include the suggested amendments (Bob Schaefer voted "no").

On the main motion, the Commission voted 7-1 (Bob Schaefer voted "no") to recommend adoption of Resolution ID 12771 (as amended) - the original motion having been submitted by Ald. Tim Gruber/Mike Rewey.

**Notes:**

Excused: 2 Melanie Hampton and Satya V. Rhodes Conway



Ayes: 7 Michael A. Basford; Eric W. Sundquist; Michael W. Rewey; Paul E. Skidmore; Tim Gruber; Robbie Webber and Mark N. Shahan  
Noes: 1 Robert J. Schaefer

2	WATER UTILITY BOARD	01/27/2009	Return to Lead with the Recommendation for Approval	PLAN COMMISSION	02/23/2009	Pass
---	---------------------	------------	---	-----------------	------------	------

**Action Text:** A motion was made by Harrington, seconded by Mr. Melton, to Return to Lead with the Recommendation for Approval with the amendment "strongly encouraging the use of EPA WaterSense-labeled water fixtures, and strongly discouraging the use of outdoor lawn irrigation systems.". The motion passed by voice vote/other.

Andrew Statz of the Mayor's Office said he was here to -discuss Resolution 12771: Establishing sustainability goals to guide the development of the plan for the Northeast Neighborhoods, to help set the stage for the development areas we're talking about.

Brian Grady of City Planning displayed several maps showing the areas of development and potential development. It is a large area on the northeast side of the City with a total of 2,800 acres. It could take 20 to 30 years to develop this area. More explanation of this is in the action text of the resolution.

Andrew Statz of the Mayor's Office said he does a lot of special research projects for the Mayor and tries to identify ways of improving city services and saving tax payer dollars. One of the parts of that is the sustainability initiative. This area is a unique opportunity and it is feasible the population could be larger than the City of Sun Prairie. It's very much long-range; you're talking 30 years. There will be a variety of uses and densities, things that are good for the environment and the neighbors.

Andrew said we need a better name than Northeast Neighborhood. We need a guiding framework to help plan with 4 or 5 principles. The goal is to have something that is easy to understand, easy to convey and easy to remember. High level goals that give you a general idea of where we want to be and the means for getting there, the people who are responsible for getting us there; these are the types of things that are explained. Adoption of this resolution has to come first.

The four goals are to reduce neighborhood vehicle trips, reduce household use of fossil fuels, reduce residential per capita water use and increase storm water infiltration. They are looking for 25% per capita reduction in these areas.

Brian Munson, urban designer with Vandewalle & Associates, on behalf of Benchmark Development Group, was present. He said he's been working with the City for several years on neighborhood plans. They are in favor of moving the general resolution forward to help frame the neighborhood plan. The key players will be the City, the developers, the builders and the end users. All four groups have to work together to make this successful.

Using public transportation will be encouraged as will biking and walking. Reducing household consumption of natural gas and fossil fuel generated electricity through the use of energy efficient construction, alternative energy sources, on-site energy production, conservation education and outreach will be recommended. Reducing residential water use through the use of low-flow appliances and fixtures, dual-flush and low-flow toilets, rain barrels, low-impact lawn care design, conservation education and other water saving practices will be recommended. Infiltrate storm water volume on or adjacent to points of generation through the use of rain gardens, green roofs, porous sidewalks and drives, or other on-site storm water management practices will also be recommended.

The final pages of his handout looks at goals and how to achieve those goals. The mixed use will take time. As the project matures and projects are added into the neighborhood, each one will be evaluated against the goals to make sure that they are beginning to raise the bar further and create a neighborhood that exceeds the sustainability goals and helps to push this forward.

Tom said the board needs to support the resolution, that there are more details in his report about strongly supporting WaterSense-labeled water fixtures, etc. Michael said everyone wants to achieve these goals but listing 25% arbitrarily concerns him. If this board agrees to this, how much is enforceable and how much is more a set of recommendations. Andrew said these are goals, not requirements. A project wouldn't be turned down but would be done on a case-by-case basis. State Law preempts the actual building code. Al said we work closely with Planning and use their projections. Rick said when the plan is closer to adoption, the Water Utility would have to work with Planning. Greg asked if this includes anything that would represent an urgent need to change our Master Plan. Al said several wells are planned for that area, none of which have been drilled of course. That whole northeast corner has run a little light on water as we deal with the situation on Well 29.

Andrew said this is all new, not something that we've done before, that the Mayor's Office and City Planning drafted it for Council approval. It's similar to any other resolution.

Dan Melton said the Sustainable Energy Committee referred this to their February 9 meeting. Alder Compton had a problem with how you would measure it. He said it seems fairly clear as to how it's going to be measured, and asked if that isn't very clear language at the bottom of page 11-10. Dan said he's worried that the actual market is not ready for some of the actions that would be necessary to reach that goal. Brian said what does it mean if you're using more or less water; it's just some clarity in the neighborhood plan that would define whether 25% is achievable. The goal is much less of an issue for us. From my standpoint as a developer, they really have a very small role. Sadly, whether or not a house will have the kind of fixtures that achieve this because by not being a builder, they're not involved in that transaction. So we're looking at the framework of how these things are going to be

measured, who is going to measure it and what are the end results so there is clarity in the plan of how we go about implementing it. Their concern is how does this process move forward so that buyers have a process they can understand. Maybe when we get into the discussion of how to do that, that might be where to say by how much.

Dan asked Andrew if he'd say the 25% number is arbitrary. Andrew said he doesn't know, and Ken asked if he needed definition for that. Ken said at 73 gallons a day per person for residential use now based on a five-year running average, and we're taking 20% out 11 years from now, you'd want to get that down to the 58 gallons per day. You may want to start at 55 rather than 58 because if this is a 20, 25 year project, we don't want to say 25% of where we are in 2020 or you'd be up 45%. Jon said there was some arithmetic that went into the 20%; if you take a 3.5 gallon toilet and replace it with a 1.28 and everyone flushes four times a day, you can figure out if 12-16 gallons per day per person. And low-flow fixtures save more.

Michael Schumacher said we looked at the growth of the City of Madison and the usage of water, and based on that we didn't increase usage but did increase population. Andrew said with the population projections we looked at, and if our average daily production today is 30+ million gallons per day, the growth up to 2020 would leave us at the same average daily production that we are at today. He's talked to Brad Murphy about reviewing the goals periodically.

Jon said putting a number on this is one way to do it, but the way people have had successes is they changed ordinances and zoning, and have WaterSense labeled fixtures required, not just suggested. And rain barrels and infiltration of 50% of storm water is required, not just a suggestion. Jon said that is sort of what Tom is saying, there are definitions of what makes a good appliance for saving water and it's a federal program. There are other support agencies, like the Alliance for Water Efficiency, that give advice on this. Jon thinks we need to go with zoning and ordinance changes that say all new construction will use this. If we do that, we'll get 25, maybe even 30%.

Michael said if he were a developer, he would not be required to have to do that because code in the State of Wisconsin does not yet require it, and he doesn't think there is any City Ordinance that can force him to do that. He said we're really approving outreach, education, etc. He does not think what is being recommended is permitted under law and he'd like clarification on that. Jon said he would also. He said other municipalities require WaterSense but that's in other states, so we need to have Attorney May weigh in on why he thinks we can't require WaterSense fixtures. Andrew said at this point we're not advocating for any additional legislation, any additional requirements, ordinance changes, and things of that sort. They think they have a market that is moving more and more in this direction. He thinks there will be a strong market tendency to have these things in place. Jon said this is more guidance and goals and where the city wants to go which is good. Brian said he understands it's a minimum-maximum code, that we can't require EnergySense but it's a marketable expense. Many builders are recognizing that. There could be incentives out there to encourage the use of these.

George Meyer said he'd like to move the Water Utility's support of the Legislative File 12771, with an addition of the phrase, "strongly encouraging the use of WaterSense-labeled water fixtures, and strongly discouraging the use of outdoor lawn irrigation systems." Dan Melton seconded.

Michael said we have to figure out some incentives to work hand-in-hand with water conservation. Right now, we're going back to the folks out there and saying your water is going to be more expensive because you're conserving more. We have to figure this out. He's nervous about the 25% that is arbitrary. He doesn't like the performance benchmarks because for anyone who doesn't like this, it becomes an easy package to say, where did they get this 25%. How can we reward people who are conserving?

Dan said to Brian, as he understands it, you are comfortable with this except you'd like to take the 25% out. Brian said we don't have enough information to understand all the pieces that are going to be necessary. These are goals that are going to happen over time.

Michael asked if they'd feel comfortable removing the 25% and using some other language. Jon said to him, the 25% doesn't matter; he sees it as some sort of statement. We want to make a significant reduction; it's a goal that doesn't have to be measurable. It's a way of saying a significant reduction. George said you have a measurable goal, it's best to have a numerical target. Michael said sometime these goals also become ceilings. Greg said he's uncomfortable with the 25% also.

George said he would like to make a motion to approve with language added from Item 3 on Tom's report, and is silent on items 1 and 2 for lack of expertise. Jon said he'd like to see 100% on storm water, that 25% is a very modest goal compared to the water goal of 25%. He said it's interesting to him that the Commission on the Environment hasn't seen this yet and he's sure they'd like to weigh in on it. Andrew said the Commission on the Environment may yet be added as a referral.

George Meyer moved that this Board indicate support of the text of Resolution 12771, and specifically the portion we have responsibility for, which is Item 3, of the Now Therefore be it Resolved clause, with the friendly amendment of the words from the General Manager's report that states "strongly encourage the use of EPA WaterSense-labeled water fixtures, and strongly discouraging the use of outdoor lawn irrigation systems." More discussion was held on this.

Greg Harrington made a motion to approve the resolution with the addition of the friendly amendment made by George Meyer to include the following language: "strongly encouraging the use of EPA WaterSense-labeled water fixtures, and strongly discouraging the use of outdoor lawn irrigation systems." Dan Melton seconded the motion; unanimously passed.

**Notes:** Approved with the addition of a friendly amendment made by George Meyer to include the following language: "strongly encourage the use of EPA WaterSense-labeled water fixtures, and strongly discouraging the use of outdoor lawn irrigation systems."

2 SUSTAINABLE DESIGN 02/09/2009  
AND ENERGY  
COMMITTEE

**Action Text:** Ed Blume (222 S. Hamilton Street, Madison) indicated that he has done some work with Peak Oil and also on the Zoning Code rewrite specifically on issues related to sustainability in the zoning ordinances. Ed asked if this area needs to follow current zoning or does in get to do things differently?

Jeanne Hoffman indicated that yes, the developments will have to follow all ordinances/regulations but that the plan will be the place where staff can recommend additional regulations/incentives if needed to meet these goals.

Karl Van Lith also indicated that the staff report tries to answer some of the questions that committee members brought up at the last meeting.

Brad Murphy went through the staff report for committee members. The intent with the staff report is to provide additional information to the committee given the discussion at the last meeting. The resolution has Sustainability Goals that will inform how the neighborhood plan is written and then adopted by the Common Council.

There are various parts in the plan including implementation strategies on how the goals in this resolution will be met.

The report talks about all the ordinances that are needed to implement development in this area. Staff has not yet identified specific changes to regulations, but the plan may suggest ideas for changes to regulations/ordinances. There is a suggestion of an ordinance change regarding storm water in the staff report. The staff report also talks about how frequently the staff plans to review the plan. Facilities Management staff indicated that Energy Star homes are about 25% below the average energy use of a home in Madison and suggested that there could be an incentive program to award developers that go beyond that.

Staff also suggested a new WHEREAS clause that talks about zero net energy.

Brad emphasized that in the plan there will be implementation strategies on how to meet these goals.

Satya Rhodes-Conway asked about the information in the staff report regarding the average energy use of a home in Madison vs. an Energy Star home. Do you know what is the difference between a home built to current code and Energy Star would be?

Brad Murphy indicated that staff does not have that information available right now, but could work with the utilities to get that type of information.

Satya Rhodes-Conway indicated that that would be good. She further stated that she would like to see these types of goals extended to all planning process in the City. She asked if staff have any plans to do this? She realizes that this is somewhat off topic, but wanted to flag this as something that SDE should talk about in the future.

Brad Murphy indicated that it is staff's intention to try having these goals in the NE Neighborhoods and as we see success, staff can look to use these goals in other neighborhood planning processes.

Judy Compton made a comment that the City needs to make sure that the State and BI know what the City is doing in this area. She stated that we are trying to create a poster child for the State and we want other developments to do this in other areas. She then stated that there would be additional costs that will be passed down to the residents/businesses. She is concerned about this because those people/businesses can go up the road to another city and find similar living/commercial space for cheaper. She wants to know what is the City doing to address this?

Brad Murphy indicated that right now staff and committee members are talking about it and that in the plan staff will be able to get into the details and look at potential ways to mitigate this issue. Brad

further stated that there is a marketing advantage of building to these goals and that using less energy and having a better designed home may be something that people/businesses want.

Judy Compton indicated that Veridian can do energy efficiency at little to no cost because Veridian is a developer/builder and they can control costs, but the smaller builders, the ones that buy alot from a developer can't do what Veridian does. It is these builders that can go up the road and build the home for less (in another community.) Inclusionary zoning failed because the City could not subsidize it. New Urbanism doesn't work because the City doesn't support it. So we need to do the research to find what works and what the City needs to do to make it work.

Michael Vickerman indicated that he drove the area. There isn't anything out there now. He wanted to know what assumptions are being made about the projected population and employment? He also went through Grand View Commons to get to this area. There are only three non-residential uses out there. How is the City going to make sure that this area isn't going to be like everywhere else?

Brad Murphy indicated that the staff does not have time to show the committee all of the background information to explain why this is the area that is being planning for development, but the short answer is that this area was and has been slated for growth since the 1990's because it was shown on the 1990 Peripheral Development Plan. The Comprehensive Plan also indicated that this was slated for growth/development. This led the Plan Commission and Common Council to the recognition that this is a place for development in the future. There isn't a lot of non-residential use right now, but there are groups looking at retail, commercial, office, etc in the area. It is slower to happen because this area does lack Interstate access. Hopefully, we will be able to get transit out there early to help accomplish these goals.

Karl Van Lith reminded committee members that all of these details would come out in the neighborhood plan.

Sherrie Gruder stated that we are right now framing the larger issues/goals so that staff will know how the neighborhood plan should be written.

Judy Compton stated that the interchange was going to be there, but the WisDOT backed off on that idea. There is a business park in the area. The Village of Cottage Grove has an industrial park and they really a focus on getting that industrial park going and now the homes are coming after the businesses. Madison is good at developing plans, but it then takes 20-30 years to see what we want in the plan built.

Lou Host-Jablonski suggested that the committee get on with talking about the goals.

Peter Taglia indicated that there are a lot of innovative ideas that we could look at. He also noted that just because you have an Energy Star home, how you use energy is so important, so having technologies like smart metering etc would be good to look at and we need to explore partnerships with utilities.

Sherrie Gruder added that there are builders, developers, residents, and businesses all responsible for energy use.

Sherrie Gruder then talked about Zero Net Energy. She indicated that SDE has adopted Zero Net Energy and staff has suggested that we add this language in the resolution, so I wanted to talk with the committee about the concept.

This will help the committee answer the question if a 25% reduction is a useful goal or should we should be looking at this differently. A building or a community meets zero net energy if it produces just as much energy as it consumes. A building can be green, but can still use a lot of energy. LEED is better than code there are however, buildings that create as much or more energy than they use and that is a zero net energy building.

With zero net energy buildings, commercial buildings are 60-70% better than code for energy; then the

buildings are also creating energy, like PV.

In Austin, TX there is a plan to have all single-family homes be zero-net energy and use 60% less energy by 2030.

Massachusetts is looking into having a policy of zero net energy by 2030.

California is looking at a policy of zero net energy for residential by 2020 and commercial by 2030.

In Alberta, Canada they have a net zero energy development. 90% of the heating is done by a district solar system. Solar hot water systems are installed on each house and large solar PV for the community has also been developed. This is how they heat and power the homes. They also store the solar hot water underground and then use it to heat the homes. There is also a place in England that has district heating, but they use wood. Sherrie showed hot water solar and the heat solar storage concepts.

In California, none of the zero net energy communities have district heating/cooling. The homes are built to 60% better than code; they then also have PV on the home. Sherrie showed a list of ways to make the homes energy efficient. Another California example, the energy bills are 70% less than average and again PV is built right into the mortgage. The expensive counter tops, etc is extra but not the PV.

Sherrie finally showed a couple of places in WI that are zero net energy, including homes and commercial sites.

Sherrie concluded by saying that zero net energy is happening now and she feels that a building that is doing 25% better than code is not that great. Sherrie indicated that Karl Van Lith would facilitate the discussion.

Karl Van Lith suggested that the committee review the resolution and suggested that committee members consider what can SDE do to this resolution to put or stamp on this? The SDE has adopted zero net energy, but the Common Council has not. Are there other things we can do to put our stamp on this?

Andrew Statz indicated that the Water Utility made two additions to the resolution one was to encourage Water Sense and the other was to discourage irrigation of lawns and the LRTPC made changes to the resolution and asked staff to prepare a the plan that includes looking at VMT. Judy Compton asked what that meant.

Brad Murphy indicated that passing this the resolution does not itself restrict water usage. The plan would need to be drafted and adopted by the Common Council. After that there may need to be some changes to our regulations that would also need to be acted on.

Judy Compton wanted to reiterate that the resolution would help frame how the plan will be written. This is for NE neighborhoods not everywhere and this resolution will say what we are going to do.

Karl Van Lith stated again that these are the targets and in the plan there will be the details of how we reach our goals. The SDE would be able to review these plans. Karl made a comment about how Satya Rhodes-Conway suggested that we look at other plans, maybe what SDE needs to do is update the Building a Green Capital City plan? This resolution is a very high level framework that will inform the plan.

Satya Rhodes-Conway asked what the most current version of the resolution is?

Andrew Statz indicated that the Water Utility was working off of the original language and they wanted to add language that would encourage the use of Water Sense and discourage the use of irrigation and LRTPC changes are available to the committee.

Satya Rhodes-Conway suggested that SDE add staff's language regarding zero net energy. She further stated that goals number 2 and number 3; instead of using current citywide average that we use levels if built to current code and that we want to do better than that.

Andrew Statz indicated that the average energy and the 25% reduction is from MGE and that for retro-fits you usually get a 10% return, so the thought was that a 25% improvement would be something that was doable but also a good goal. For water, the Water Utility already has a plan for 20% reduction of water use city wide, so going to 25% for this area is better.

Satya Rhodes-Conway indicated that she did not think that 25% reduction was good enough.

Andrew Statz stated that in talking with developers they thought this would be a goal they could make but it would be hard.

Lou Host-Jablonski asked how does zero net energy and goal #2 work together?

Satya Rhodes-Conway clarified that currently staff is suggesting that the language regarding zero net energy be in the whereas clause of the resolution, so it would not impact the goals at all.

Lou Host-Jablonski then suggested that zero net energy should be a fifth goal because it deals with everything.

Sherrie Gruder suggested that the area be designed to be net zero energy "ready".

Karl Van Lith reminded the committee that zero net energy goals that the committee adopted was for the entire community.

Satya Rhodes-Conway asked if increasing the building code with regard to energy efficiency is one of the things in the Gov. Task Force on Climate Change recommended and asked how does that impact this?

Sherrie Gruder informed the committee that the housing code was just changed.

Michael Vickerman stated that he just finished a white paper on hot water solar. The paper includes information on why hot water solar is good for WI and why WI needs policy to support hot water solar. The only way hot water solar will really be available for people in WI is if we have a better residential code because currently the structures are not strong enough to have hot water solar system on them, so there does need to be a change at the state level so that homes are strong enough.

Karl Van Lith stated that through TNS you ask yourself is it a step in the right direction? Is it flexible? And will we see a return on investment? Staff has indicated that they will review the plan on an on going basis. The resolution provides a target for people to shoot at and keeps these goals on the top of people's minds. This is what we struggle with at the City level too with all of our TNS projects.

Sherrie Gruder stated that this resolution is moving us in the right direction, but she doesn't know if it is flexible. We are designing a new development and if we say yes we want a zero net energy, then how do we get there from where we are now. That planning would be different if we are planning for zero net energy than if we are planning for the goals in this resolution.

Michael Vickerman said, " I know that I am forecasting and not back-casting, but to some extent you need to because the development in this area will be driven by the region and state economy."

Sherrie Gruder stated that the comprehensive plan is done, the neighborhood plan will be written, so the question for the committee is what do we want the goals to be for this area?

Lou Host-Jablonski suggested that we have zero net energy and zero storm water and we need better numbers for traffic.



Satya Rhodes-Conway moved to forward this resolution as amended by LRTPC and Water Utility to the Plan Commission. Peter Taglia seconded the motion.

Satya Rhodes-Conway then amended the resolution to replace goal number two with the following:

“The neighborhood will be a zero net energy community, which means the energy used by the neighborhood equals the amount generated through renewable energy applications.”

Lou Host-Jablonski seconded the motion

Michael Vickerman asked if it matters if the energy is created on-site or off-site?

Satya Rhodes-Conway stated that her personal desire would be that wherever possible renewable energy should be made on site.

Peter Taglia suggested keeping some of the language that is still in #2.

Satya Rhodes-Conway – restated the amendment and made some minor changes to deal with committee members’ suggestions:

“The neighborhood will be a zero net energy community, which means energy used by the community will equal the amount generated through renewable and/or carbon neutral applications. This can be accomplished through the use of energy efficient construction, on site and/or district renewable and/or carbon neutral energy generation, conservation education and outreach, utility partnerships, or other energy practices.”

Lou Host Jablonski seconded the motion.

The motion passed unanimously.

Lou Host-Jablonski moved that the resolution be changed for goal number 4 to 100%.

Satya seconded the motion.

The motion passed unanimously.

Lou Host-Jablonski stated for goal number 1 25% of the trips by other modes is not good enough, so how can we look for a better goal. We don’t know how to get a baseline.

Bob McDonald indicated that for this area to do better than the downtown will be impossible.

Lou Host-Jablonski moved that the language for goal #1 read:

“(In comparison to a baseline, based on neighborhoods of comparable density, to be determined by staff),”

Satya Rhodes-Conway seconded the motion

Yes – Sherrie Gruder, Garrick Maine, Cathy Mackin, David Boyer, Peter Taglia, Michael Vickerman, Leslie Schroeder

Abstain – Bill Bremer, Judy Compton

No – David Drummond

Judy Compton moved that the be it finally resolved clause read:

“Staff will investigate and make recommendations in the final development plan for infrastructure, financial incentives and recognition for encouraging the achievement of these goals.”

Cathy Mackin seconded to motion

The motion passed unanimously.

Sherrie Gruder now asked the committee to vote on the main motion and to approve the resolution as amended tonight.

Judy Compton abstained

Everyone else approved the motion.

**Notes:**

2	PLAN COMMISSION	02/23/2009	RECOMMEND TO COUNCIL TO ADOPT - REPORT OF OFFICER	Pass
---	-----------------	------------	--	------

**Action Text:** A motion was made by Cnare, seconded by Kerr, to RECOMMEND TO COUNCIL TO ADOPT - REPORT OF OFFICER. The motion passed by voice vote/other.

**Notes:** The Plan Commission recieved a presentation about the Northeast Neighborhood Planning Area by Rick Roll of the Planning Division, followed by a presentation on the sustainability goals for the neighborhood plan by Andrew Statz of the Mayor's Office. The Commission also discussed the stormwater objectives in the resolution with Larry Nelson, City Engineer.

Following the presentation, the Plan Commission recommended approval of an Alternate of the Substitute Resolution with the language approved by the Water Utility Board and the Long Range Transportation Planning Commission and the addition of an eleventh Whereas clause. The Plan Commission-approved version includes the following revisions or additions:

- "Whereas [#11], the development of the neighborhoods will likely take place over several decades and will require continual revisions to achieve these goals:"

- #1 in the first "Now Therefore Be It Resolved" clause shall read:  
 "1. Capturing 25% of all trips made by persons living in the development area by walking, bicycling or transit and/or reducing household motor vehicle miles of travel (VMT) by 25% (in comparison to a baseline, to be determined by the staff) through the use of transit-oriented development, traditional neighborhood development, mixed-use development, transit access to early neighborhood residents, transportation demand management plans, walkable environments, bike facilities, or other transportation demand management practices."

- #3 in the first "Now Therefore Be It Resolved" clause shall read:  
 "3. Reducing residential per capita water use by 25% compared to current City-wide per capita levels through the use of low-flow appliances and fixtures, dual-flow and low-flow toilets, rain barrels, low-impact lawn care design, conservation education and outreach, or other water conservation practices, and to strongly encourage the use of EPA Water Sense-labeled water fixtures, and strongly discouraging the use of outdoor lawn irrigation systems."

- A second resolved clause that shall read:  
"Be It Further Resolved that as part of the northeast neighborhoods planning process, the staff will develop specific implementation strategies to achieve these goals."

A motion was made by Cnare, seconded by Kerr, to RECOMMEND TO COUNCIL TO ADOPT - REPORT OF OFFICER. The motion passed by voice vote/ other.

4	COMMON COUNCIL	03/03/2009	Refer	PLAN COMMISSION	03/31/2009	03/23/2009	Pass
	<b>Action Text:</b>	A motion was made by Ald. Bruer, seconded by Ald. Clear, to Refer to the PLAN COMMISSION, due back on 3/31/2009. The motion passed by voice vote/other.					
	<b>Notes:</b>	Additional Referral(s): Board of Park Commissioners. Due back at the 3/31/09 Common Council Meeting.					
4	PLAN COMMISSION	03/03/2009	Refer	BOARD OF PARK COMMISSIONERS	03/31/2009	03/11/2009	
	<b>Action Text:</b>	This Resolution was Refer to the BOARD OF PARK COMMISSIONERS due back on 3/31/2009					
	<b>Notes:</b>	Due back at the 3/31/09 Common Council Meeting.					
4	PLAN COMMISSION	03/09/2009	Rerefer	PLAN COMMISSION	03/23/2009	03/23/2009	Pass
	<b>Action Text:</b>	A motion was made by Cnare, seconded by Boll, to Rerefer to the PLAN COMMISSION, due back on 3/23/2009. The motion passed by voice vote/other.					
	<b>Notes:</b>	This matter was referred at the request of the Mayor's Office to allow the Board of Parks Commissioners to review the resolution at their March 11, 2009 meeting.					
4	BOARD OF PARK COMMISSIONERS	03/11/2009	Return to Lead with the Following Recommendation(s)	PLAN COMMISSION		03/23/2009	
	<b>Action Text:</b>	Item was before Board of Park Commissioners for information only per request of Ald. Schumacher.					
	<b>Notes:</b>						
4	PLAN COMMISSION	03/23/2009	RECOMMEND TO COUNCIL TO ADOPT - REPORT OF OFFICER				Pass
	<b>Action Text:</b>	A motion was made by Sundquist, seconded by Basford, to RECOMMEND TO COUNCIL TO ADOPT - REPORT OF OFFICER. The motion passed by the following vote:					
	<b>Notes:</b>	Recommend to Council to adopt an alternate resolution with the following revisions to the substitute resolution:					

-That Goal 2 be revised to state the following: "Reducing household consumption of natural gas and fossil fuel-generated electricity by 25% compared to a baseline reflecting recent residential construction, which will be established and included in the Northeast Neighborhoods Development Plan."

-That a new goal (Goal 5) be added to state the following: "That the City deliver services in the most energy efficient method possible."

The addition of Goal 5 was approved on a motion made by Olson and seconded by Ald. Gruber to amend the main motion. Both the amendment and the main motion passed by the following vote 6:0 (AYE: Bowser, Sundquist, Ald. Gruber, Ald. Cnare, Olson, and Basford; NON VOTING: Fey; ABSTAINING: Boll)

Excused: 3 Julia S. Kerr; Beth A. Whitaker and Michael G. Heifetz

Ayes: 6 Judy Bowser; Eric W. Sundquist; Tim Gruber; Lauren Cnare; Judy K. Olson and Michael A. Basford

Abstentions: 1 James C. Boll

Non Voting: 1 Nan Fey

---

## Text of Legislative File 12771

### Fiscal Note

City costs associated with urban development in this area will be included in future operating and capital budgets subject to Common Council approval.

### Title

SECOND SUBSTITUTE - Establishing sustainability goals to guide the development of the plan for the Northeast Neighborhoods.

### Body

**WHEREAS**, the City of Madison adopted its Comprehensive Plan in January of 2006; and

**WHEREAS**, the City of Madison's Comprehensive Plan includes a provision that a special area plan or other detailed plan be adopted by the City prior to the City extending services and approving development in peripheral areas lacking such a plan; and

**WHEREAS**, the City of Madison is preparing a neighborhood development plan for the area known as the Northeast Neighborhoods which generally includes the lands located east of Interstate Highway 39/90/94, north of Interstate Highway 94, west of Thorson Road, and south of existing Lien Road and the Village at Autumn Lake plat, and approximately 1/2 mile north of and a proposed extension of Lien Road east to Thorson Road; and

**WHEREAS**, the Comprehensive Plan identifies the lands within the Northeast Neighborhoods planning area as planned near-term City of Madison expansion and future urban development areas; and

**WHEREAS**, the Northeast Neighborhoods Neighborhood Development Plan will strive to achieve the goals and objectives of the Comprehensive Plan for new neighborhoods; and

**WHEREAS**, the Comprehensive Plan includes a goal calling for Madison to grow and develop in a sustainable way that will protect the high quality natural environment, promote energy efficiency and conservation of natural resources and create a built environment that is adaptable to future changes in conditions; and

**WHEREAS**, the City has adopted "Building a Green Capital City: A Blueprint for Madison's Sustainable Design and Energy Future" plan; and

**WHEREAS**, the Building a Green Capital City Plan recommended that the City adopt a sustainability framework for guiding City decision making; and

**WHEREAS**, the City has adopted a framework for sustainability called the Natural Step; and

**WHEREAS**, the Northeast Neighborhoods Neighborhood Development Plan will strive to help implement the principles outlined in the Natural Step;

**NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED**, that the development of the plan for Madison's Northeast Neighborhoods will be guided by the following goals:

1. Capturing 25% of all trips made by persons living in the development area by walking, bicycling or transit and/or reducing household motor vehicle miles of travel (VMT) by 25% (in comparison to a baseline to be determined by staff), through the use of transit-oriented development, traditional neighborhood development, mixed-use development, transit access for early neighborhood residents, transportation-demand management plans, walkable environments, bike facilities, or other transportation-demand management practices.
2. Reducing household consumption of natural gas and fossil fuel-generated electricity by 25% compared to current city-wide household levels through the use of energy efficient construction, alternative energy sources, on-site energy production, conservation education and outreach, or other energy conservation practices.
3. Reducing residential per capita water use by 25% compared to current city-wide per capita levels through the use of low-flow appliances and fixtures, dual-flow and low-flow toilets, rain barrels, low-impact lawn care design, conservation education and outreach, or other water conservation practices.
4. Infiltrating 25% of the storm water volume on or adjacent to points of generation through the use of rain gardens, green roofs, porous sidewalks and drives, or other on-site stormwater management practices.

BE IT FINALLY RESOLVED, that, as part of the Northeast Neighborhoods planning process, staff will develop specific implementation strategies to achieve these goals.