



City of Madison

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

Master

File Number: 21481

File ID: 21481

File Type: Resolution

Status: Items Referred

Version: 1

Reference:

Controlling Body: LONG RANGE
TRANSPORTATIO
N PLANNING
COMMITTEE

File Created Date : 02/21/2011

File Name: To approve the Madison Sustainability Plan.

Final Action:

Title: To approve the Madison Sustainability Plan.

Notes:

Sponsors: Satya V. Rhodes-Conway, Judy Compton and
Marsha A. Rummel

Effective Date:

Attachments: Sustainability Plan_02-22-11.pdf, Studies on
Pesticides and Health.pdf,
Sustainability Plan Comments 3-10-11.pdf,
Sustainability Plan Memo-CDBG_03-31-11.pdf,
Engineering comments, BID_SustainPlan_Input.pdf,
Registration Statement Sustainable Design CDBG
April.pdf, GMCoC Sustainability Plan
Memo_04-11-11.pdf, Klafka Comments on Madison
Sustainability Plan dated October 28 11.pdf,
Widstrand Comments.pdf, Planning Division Memo
042811.pdf, ped bike .pdf,
SustainabilityReport042711.pdf,
MyMoonCitySustainPlan.docx, Green roofs
requirement in Madison Sustainability Plan.htm,
Madison Sustainability Plan.txt, sustainability plan for
Union Corners.txt, Madison Food Systems.htm,
Madison Sustainability Plan Comments 5-10-11.doc,
MadisonSoilVolume.pdf, SDE_SWAC
Meeting_110512.pdf, Sustainability Plan
recommendations APPROVED 5 12 2011 by
BOHMDC.pdf, Paul Abramson comments.pdf,
Comments emailed2.pdf, Comments emailed3.pdf,
Peak Oil.pdf, Peak Oil 2.pdf, Si Widstrand
Comments.pdf, Comments emailed.pdf,
DannaOlsenEmail.pdf,
BIDSustainPlanInputUpdated.pdf, Sustainability
pesticide .pdf, Sustainability Plan - DMI edits 6-8-11
pdf.pdf

Enactment Number:

Author: Jeanne Hoffman

Hearing Date:

Entered by: dfields@cityofmadison.com

Published Date:

History of Legislative File

Ver- sion:	Acting Body:	Date:	Action:	Sent To:	Due Date:	Return Date:	Result:
1	Council Office	02/23/2011	Referred for Introduction				
	Action Text:	This Resolution was Referred for Introduction					
	Notes:	Sustainable Design and Energy Committee, Board of Education-Common Council Liaison Committee, Board of Estimates, Board of Health for Madison and Dane County, Board of Park Commissioners, Board of Public Works, Committee on the Environment, Community Development Authority, Community Development Block Grant Committee, Economic Development Committee, Long Range Transportation Planning Committee, Madison Arts Commission, Pedestrian/Bicycle/Motor Vehicle Commission, Plan Commission, Solid Waste Advisory Committee, Transit and Parking Commission, Urban Design Commission					
1	COMMON COUNCIL	03/15/2011	Referred	SUSTAINABLE DESIGN AND ENERGY COMMITTEE			Pass
	Action Text:	A motion was made by Ald. Cnare, seconded by Ald. Bruer, to Referred to the SUSTAINABLE DESIGN AND ENERGY COMMITTEE. The motion passed by voice vote/other.					
	Notes:						
1	SUSTAINABLE DESIGN AND ENERGY COMMITTEE	03/15/2011	Refer	BOARD OF EDUCATION - COMMON COUNCIL LIAISON COMMITTEE			
	Action Text:	This Resolution was Refer to the BOARD OF EDUCATION - COMMON COUNCIL LIAISON COMMITTEE					
	Notes:						
1	SUSTAINABLE DESIGN AND ENERGY COMMITTEE	03/15/2011	Refer	BOARD OF ESTIMATES		05/23/2011	
	Action Text:	This Resolution was Refer to the BOARD OF ESTIMATES					
	Notes:						
1	SUSTAINABLE DESIGN AND ENERGY COMMITTEE	03/15/2011	Refer	BOARD OF HEALTH FOR MADISON AND DANE COUNTY		05/12/2011	
	Action Text:	This Resolution was Refer to the BOARD OF HEALTH FOR MADISON AND DANE COUNTY					
	Notes:						
1	SUSTAINABLE DESIGN AND ENERGY COMMITTEE	03/15/2011	Refer	BOARD OF PARK COMMISSIONER S		05/11/2011	
	Action Text:	This Resolution was Refer to the BOARD OF PARK COMMISSIONERS					
	Notes:						
1	SUSTAINABLE DESIGN AND ENERGY COMMITTEE	03/15/2011	Refer	BOARD OF PUBLIC WORKS		05/04/2011	
	Action Text:	This Resolution was Refer to the BOARD OF PUBLIC WORKS					
	Notes:						
1	SUSTAINABLE DESIGN AND ENERGY COMMITTEE	03/15/2011	Refer	COMMITTEE ON THE ENVIRONMENT		05/16/2011	
	Action Text:	This Resolution was Refer to the COMMITTEE ON THE ENVIRONMENT					
	Notes:						

1	SUSTAINABLE DESIGN AND ENERGY COMMITTEE	03/15/2011	Refer	COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY	05/12/2011	
	Action Text: This Resolution was Refer to the COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY					
	Notes:					
1	SUSTAINABLE DESIGN AND ENERGY COMMITTEE	03/15/2011	Refer	COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT BLOCK GRANT COMMITTEE	04/07/2011	
	Action Text: This Resolution was Refer to the COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT BLOCK GRANT COMMITTEE					
	Notes:					
1	SUSTAINABLE DESIGN AND ENERGY COMMITTEE	03/15/2011	Refer	ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE	04/13/2011	
	Action Text: This Resolution was Refer to the ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE					
	Notes:					
1	SUSTAINABLE DESIGN AND ENERGY COMMITTEE	03/15/2011	Refer	LONG RANGE TRANSPORTATION PLANNING COMMITTEE		
	Action Text: This Resolution was Refer to the LONG RANGE TRANSPORTATION PLANNING COMMITTEE					
	Notes:					
1	SUSTAINABLE DESIGN AND ENERGY COMMITTEE	03/15/2011	Refer	MADISON ARTS COMMISSION	05/10/2011	
	Action Text: This Resolution was Refer to the MADISON ARTS COMMISSION					
	Notes:					
1	SUSTAINABLE DESIGN AND ENERGY COMMITTEE	03/15/2011	Refer	PEDESTRIAN/BICYCLE/MOTOR VEHICLE COMMISSION		
	Action Text: This Resolution was Refer to the PEDESTRIAN/BICYCLE/MOTOR VEHICLE COMMISSION					
	Notes:					
1	SUSTAINABLE DESIGN AND ENERGY COMMITTEE	03/15/2011	Refer	PLAN COMMISSION	05/02/2011	
	Action Text: This Resolution was Refer to the PLAN COMMISSION					
	Notes:					
1	SUSTAINABLE DESIGN AND ENERGY COMMITTEE	03/15/2011	Refer	SOLID WASTE ADVISORY COMMITTEE		
	Action Text: This Resolution was Refer to the SOLID WASTE ADVISORY COMMITTEE					
	Notes:					
1	SUSTAINABLE DESIGN AND ENERGY COMMITTEE	03/15/2011	Refer	TRANSIT AND PARKING COMMISSION	04/12/2011	
	Action Text: This Resolution was Refer to the TRANSIT AND PARKING COMMISSION					
	Notes:					
1	SUSTAINABLE DESIGN AND ENERGY COMMITTEE	03/15/2011	Refer	URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION	04/27/2011	
	Action Text: This Resolution was Refer to the URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION					
	Notes:					
1	COMMON COUNCIL	03/29/2011	Referred	LANDMARKS COMMISSION	05/09/2011	Pass
	Action Text: A motion was made by Ald. Clear, seconded by Ald. Cnare, to Referred to the LANDMARKS COMMISSION. The motion passed by voice vote/other.					
	Notes:					

1 BOARD OF PUBLIC WORKS 04/06/2011 Refer BOARD OF PUBLIC WORKS 04/21/2011 05/04/2011 Pass

Action Text: Lucas Dailey gave a presentation of the Report.

A motion was made by Fix, seconded by Dailey, to Refer to the BOARD OF PUBLIC WORKS, due back on 4/21/2011. The motion passed by the following vote:

Notes:

Excused: 1 Scott A. Vaughn

Ayes: 6 Paul E. Skidmore; Larry Palm; Lucas K. Dailey; Steven M. Fix; Jaclyn D. Lawton and Russell D. Pietz

Abstentions: 1 Ruben L. Anthony, Jr.

1 SOLID WASTE ADVISORY COMMITTEE 04/07/2011

Action Text: Action deferred to May 12th meeting. Committee recommended that the report include information on the status of the dane County Landfill and the need for a new landfill and talk about the need for imncreased source reduction on items such as phone books and bottled water.

Notes:

1 COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT BLOCK GRANT COMMITTEE 04/07/2011 Return to Lead with the Recommendation for Approval SUSTAINABLE DESIGN AND ENERGY COMMITTEE Pass

Action Text: A motion was made by Choudhury, seconded by Rummel, to Return to Lead with the Recommendation for Approval. Sent to the SUSTAINABLE DESIGN AND ENERGY COMMITTEE. The motion passed by voice vote/other.

Notes:

Karl Van Lith spoke about the Madison Sustainability Plan. The original group that led to the formation of the Sustainable Design and Energy Committee goes back to 2005 when there was an initiative to look at energy use and green building practices. The first report had the focus of green building practices and energy conservation. Over the ensuing years, there's been a change in how we look at sustainability, and we know that it's much more broadly sensed. The new plan now has a much more broad focus. Social resilience is now a piece of the plan.

The plan will be a guidance document that's also an adjunct to the City's Comprehensive Plan. The hope is that you as policy makers will look at the plan over the next 20 years. It will be updated annually. Van Lith asked the Committee to take a look at it and let us know if you think anything is missing. It will be going around to 14 different committees.

Van Lith said that it's also based on the Natural Step Process which is the sustainability framework that the City uses approved by the Council in 2005 or 2006. He said his office provides training on the Natural Step Process. He discussed sustainability categories, such as natural systems, energy, transportation, workforce training, green jobs, economic development, etc.

He said they would be having a public outreach process with two public meetings next week. They've also developed a survey on their website that individuals can fill out with their comments.

Choudhury said that the plan was great. She would like CDBG specifically to be aware of the plan in terms of LEED standards versus Energy Star. She's concerned that Energy Star sets the bar too low for CDBG, and CDBG can do better than that.

Rummel said that the plan presents great ideas and she loves the report, but she's afraid it will just sit on the shelf. She wondered how the CDBG Office would

implement some of the plans. She said she would also like to see the basic fundamental City process for determining where city gardens will be in the plan.

Whitesel said it is a terrific report and that he liked the response that if you don't achieve it, at least you move towards it. He said, however, there's a real disconnect in water conservation because the more you save, the more you pay. There should be some way to reward people for saving as opposed to penalizing them for not using.

Whitesel also said that where the goal of diversity is concerned, there's a danger of embracing the goal without knowing what it means.

O'Callaghan agreed with the comments that this is a terrific initiative and great work went into this report, but one of the things he was surprised the report didn't include was a discussion about density. He said urban environments are inherently sustainable because of their density, but the plan does not discuss density. There are opportunities to work it into various portions of the plan, such as transportation, planning, land use, and housing.

O'Callaghan said he's not exactly sure how this plan fits in as an adjunct to the City's Comprehensive Plan. Van Lith said the Comprehensive Plan is driven by statute. There's a transportation piece and a land use piece, and this document enhances and links them together.

O'Callaghan said his last comment relates to the memo we received from Matt Mikolajewski. He made some very excellent points and observations, and it would be nice to see if those could be addressed.

Choudhury said that to make this actionable, we should see how we can incorporate aspects of this into our Framework to inform our RFPs that we issue. She said that Community Gardens Committee would also love to receive copies of this and the memo.

1		04/11/2011					
1	LANDMARKS COMMISSION	04/11/2011	Refer	LANDMARKS COMMISSION	05/09/2011	05/09/2011	Pass
	Action Text:	A motion was made by Levitan, seconded by Rosenblum, to REFER the issue to the May 9th Landmarks Commission meeting.					
		The motion passed by a voice vote/other.					
	Notes:	Staff explained that copies of the Sustainability Plan were included in the Commissioners' packets for their review before the next meeting. Staff explained that Jeanne Hoffman would be at the next meeting to give a presentation about the plan.					
1	TRANSIT AND PARKING COMMISSION	04/12/2011	Return to Lead with the Following Recommendation(s)	SUSTAINABLE DESIGN AND ENERGY COMMITTEE			Pass

- Action Text:** Amanda White, Transportation Rep for the Sustainable City Ad Hoc Sub-Committee for the Public Sector, presented the Sustainability Plan to the TPC. She provided some background about the Plan and how it was developed.
- The new Sustainability Plan initiative began in October 2009 with the formation of the Sustainable Design & Energy Committee (SDEC); two subcommittees were created with 40 people representing many different areas of sustainability.
 - Three public meetings were held initially (at the Goodman Center, Overture Center and the Sequoya Library) to get ideas and feedback on the Plan.
 - "People, planet, and prosperity" was the theme for the Plan re-write, with the idea that these different areas affecting sustainability were all connected in one system; sustainability could not be fragmented, it was all part of a bigger system.
 - The Plan Format included: Overview, Accountability, Background, and Categories for action and change.
 - Within the three broad areas of the Plan, the following Categories for action and change were identified:
 1. ENVIRONMENT: Natural Systems; Carbon & Energy; Planning & Design; Transportation
 2. ECONOMIC PROSPERITY: Economic Development; Employment & Workforce Training
 3. SOCIAL, CAPITAL AND COMMUNITY HEALTH: Education; Affordable Housing; Health; Arts, Design & Culture
 - Each Category had six components: Vision, Goals, Action, Timeframe, Funding, Lead Agencies & Partners.

White turned to the Transportation section of the Plan on page 20, and reviewed the six goals and related action items for Transportation. She invited members to comment on them and the overall Plan. Having developed much of this part, White felt that one of the biggest goals and the basis for the Transportation section was the first goal: to implement the many existing city, county and regional alternative transportation plans, rather than 'reinventing the wheel'. Other goals were:

- expand alternatives to driving in more neighborhoods;
- increase sustainable transportation funding and incentive programs, currently lacking but needed to implement the plans;
- establish uniform, consistent evaluation methods understanding sustainable transportation usage (in such areas as busing, ride-share, biking), and using the info to set realistic goals;
- maximize the use of alternative transportation infrastructure through marketing; and
- improve communication among City departments in order to implement ideas faster.

White and members commented on the Plan, as follows:

- Counting evaluation across different transportation modes currently included Metro counts and the Bike Counts program.
- However, there were no uniform methods for counting in all the different modes of sustainable transportation, communicating the info to the community, and using the methods to establish concrete goals on what to be working towards for reducing car miles, etc.
- For example, the City had improved the Bike Counts program by increasing the counts and establishing more uniform ways to do the counts from year to year, which provided more consistent data for comparing years.
- But more work could be done to create more uniformity and consistency, for bikes and other transportation modes as well.
- The Plan called for measuring VMT (vehicle miles traveled) and other important transportation data, but it didn't get real specific about exactly what to measure; rather, it proposed that staff develop an evaluation plan (to establish methodology and standards) for the community to review, which could include measuring carbon footprint, gas and oil consumption.
- The Natural Step framework was discussed and incorporated into the planning process; and since the City had adopted it and used it in its sustainability process, it was likely to be in the forefront of Plan efforts and public discussion.

Kamp offered suggestions for changes/additions to the Plan:

- Under Transportation Goal 1, to include the Long-Range Metro Transit Planning Ad Hoc Committee plan among the plans cited; and in conjunction with that, to add Metro to the list of Lead Agencies.
- Also, to add the Regional Transit Authority's plan to those being listed.

White mentioned other plans that might have been included here, and felt that to be consistent, perhaps all the different plans should be listed or none should be listed.

In view of Madison Central BID's concerns about requiring groups to create TDM plans and after learning that the City did not have one, Poulson thought that before imposing this requirement on such

groups as non-profits or those holding sporadic events, the City ought to have its own.

When asked, White said that rather than taking action to amend the Plan, recommendations for changes should be directed to Jeanne Hoffmann, who staffed the Sustainability Committee SDEC.

Solomon recommended that instead of asking groups to independently develop a TDM plan, a template or menu of TDM options should be made available to provide guidance. While supporting the requirement for event holders to provide TDM plans, it shouldn't create a negative burden and discourage groups from holding events, or taking their events elsewhere. He recommended that the City offer a menu tree to draw from. White cited an Action item for a Marketing person for Transportation and Sustainability, whose role might include the function of promoting alternative transportation and TDMs.

Since plans were usually used as guides rather than action plans, Hinz thought that "Actions" should be defined better at the beginning of the Plan. For example, one fairly strong Action called for free parking in the ramps for car-sharing programs. If the TPC were to approve the Plan (in general), it could later be interpreted that the Commission approved of this and other individual Actions in the Plan. Therefore, it might be better to define "Action" as "suggested action", which would need further action by the appropriate body.

White said what while the Plan was meant to have strong legs, the intent was for staff to take the "Actions" and turn them into formal action items with more substance and specificity.

Bergamini mentioned that the LRTPC had spent quite a bit of time over the past year looking at ways to evaluate and determine what makes an adequate TDM program, in part within the context of the Zoning rewrite and how it would fit. A question arose as to who review such TDM plans, TPC or LRTPC. Most at LRTPC felt that it would be appropriate for the LRTPC to do so. She suggested that people might review the LRTPC minutes related to this.

Regarding the proposed Marketing position, Bergamini pointed out that the position of TDM Director (working out of the MPO and coordinating the Ride-Share program) already existed.

Referring to BID's comments about researching the impact of toll zones (the 8th Carbon & Energy Action item on page 28), Solomon recommended that the words "downtown" and "central" be removed from the verbiage. Though he supported the idea, he felt the focus shouldn't just be solely on the downtown. The issue needed to be approached in a holistic way; there was far more congestion on the Beltline on the far east and west sides (like Verona Road) than downtown. Focusing just on the downtown would create more sprawl.

When asked about whether the Plan established a TDM program within the City, White said it required new developments, events and businesses to have TDM plans (under Transportation Goal 2 Actions, page 22). But it didn't go into any detail about how the plans should be generated or implemented. The SDEC felt that this was more a staff level project.

Ferm recommended that an Action item be added to say that the City should take the lead to establish a TDM plan and create a format for other to follow; some pieces in the creation of such a plan could even be outsourced. Many things in the planning process would work much better if there were a formal TDM process; if the City could say "follow this". Because this currently wasn't defined, when the issue came up to developers, they would say there was no process or way to evaluate it. Major developments had been repeatedly coming in with no TDM; no one had told staff to do it. Ferm encouraged the SDEC to look at making this language as strong as possible.

In terms of VMT's and reducing Carbon Footprints, Poulson thought the SDEC might revisit the issue of residency requirements for City employees (which had been gained through contracts and "me too" clauses). He would be interested to know how many City employees lived outside of Madison or outside of Dane County (or even outside of the state). With cars being the main mode of travel and until the RTA gets up and running, the SDEC might consider investigating this issue and adding Action language about it, if it thought it within the scope of the Plan. Solomon thought this comment could be put in the "Employment and Workforce" section.

Solomon remarked that no one wanted to see the Plan sit on the shelf, but with staff so busy it was likely that many Goals would not be reached before the Plan had to be redone. He wondered whether the Goals and Actions had been prioritized. White said that a loose Timeline had been developed, and the SDEC had discussed at length how to prioritize goals and make the action items "actionable".

Because of the scope of sustainability, this was challenging. But White agreed that prioritizing and having a stronger timeline would be helpful. If there were a way to do this before moving the Plan forward, with lots of intersections among Goals and Actions, Solomon thought it would be worthwhile to identify common themes repeated over multiple Goals. These inter-related, high-level areas might be the hardest places to work, but they would offer more bang for the buck and have the biggest impact.

Knobeloch made the following recommendations for additions/deletions in the Plan.

- On page 23, under Transportation Goal 3, to increase sustainable transportation funding and incentive programs, add: Promote a Smart Park policy, whereby drivers know where to find available parking, and aren't encouraged to drive unnecessary miles (some estimate as much as 20% of downtown mileage), which cause congestion and pollution while looking for a parking place. Milwaukee had received a grant for \$2.1 million for such a program, and though expensive, we could work towards this.
- On page 33, under Carbon & Energy Goal 5, to obtain 25% electricity, heating and transportation energy from clean energy sources by 2025, add:
 1. Promote solar-powered city infrastructure for such things as signs (school and crosswalk flashers) and parking meters.
 2. Encourage public and private parking facilities of over 500 (or diff #) stalls to install charging stations for electric vehicles.
 3. Encourage new above-grade parking facilities to have solar canopies and/or green areas on the top level.
 4. Curtail or eliminate free parking for people with disabilities at meters, which encourages them to drive single-occupant vehicles rather than take public transportation.
- On page 22, under Transportation Goal 2, to provide a reasonable number of free parking spaces to car-sharing programs vehicles in parking ramps, delete "free parking". Per City Asst. Attorney Anne Zellhoefer:

"The provision does not designate what entity is to provide a "reasonable number" of free parking spaces in a ramp for car-sharing program vehicles. If the goal is meant for ramps operated by the City's Parking Utility, it is unlikely the goal can be met.

Currently, there is no outstanding debt encumbering the City's parking ramps. If the city is to borrow for a new ramp, and if the revenue bonds are tax-exempt, then it will not be allowable for the Utility to offer free parking spaces to car-sharing programs. The revenue bond covenants will prohibit such a use."

Knobeloch said any bond underwriter would want it written into the covenant that free parking is not provided, without any exceptions. Over the years, he had received hundreds of requests for free parking from well-meaning entities and groups, but he had had to say no. For example, the 29 State share-ride vans at Brayton Lot received the "resident" (reduced) rate of \$121/month, amounting to \$42K/year, \$850K in 20 years. After paying \$1.4 million for the State's portion of Brayton, Knobeloch wondered if the City would want to give parking away to these vans, as suggested by this provision in the Plan. That was not to say that grants couldn't subsidize parking for car-sharing vehicles.

Kamp added the following recommendations:

- The Long-Range Metro Ad Hoc Committee had identified funding from a Regional Transit Authority as one of its top priorities (for funding, regional, and governance reasons). If the Sustainability Committee were to prioritize Goals, it might like to consider doing likewise.
- In view of some efforts in the Legislature to disband and recreate RTA's, perhaps the Committee would like to look at some of the issues related to whether the "T" in RTA should be "Transportation" or "Transit".

In discussing what motion to make, White and others didn't think that a vote specifically to approve the Plan was needed at this point, but that the Commission could simply return their recommendations regarding the Plan to the Lead. A motion was made by Solomon, seconded by Bergamini, to Return to Lead with the Following Recommendation(s) to the SUSTAINABLE DESIGN AND ENERGY COMMITTEE. The motion passed by voice vote/other. (See TPC Notes in Leg. File 21481, for a bulleted summary of the preceding recommendations and comments.)

Notes:

TPC members and staff made the following recommendations and comments:
* Because plans were usually used as guides rather than action plans, "Actions" should be defined better at the beginning of the Plan. If different bodies were to approve the Plan (in general), it could later be interpreted that these bodies

approved of all the individual Actions in the Plan, when in fact, they didn't support some of the specific items. Therefore, it might be better to define Actions as "suggested actions", which would require further action by the appropriate bodies.

* Under Transportation Goal 1, the Long Range Metro Transit Planning Ad Hoc Committee plan should be included among the plans cited; and in conjunction with that, to add Metro to the list of Lead Agencies. The Regional Transit Authority's plan should also be added to the list.

* Other plans might have been included here. To be consistent, perhaps all the different plans should be listed or none should be listed.

* The City ought to have a TDM plan before imposing this requirement on such groups as non-profits or event-holders.

* Instead of asking groups to independently develop a TDM plan, a template or menu of TDM options should be made available to provide guidance. While supporting the requirement for event-holders to provide TDM plans, it shouldn't create a negative burden and discourage groups from holding events, or taking their events elsewhere. The City should offer a menu tree to draw from.

* The role of the Marketing person for Transportation and Sustainability (as proposed in the Plan), might include the function of promoting alternative transportation and TDMs. It was noted that the position of TDM Director (working out of the MPO and coordinating the Ride-Share program) already existed.

* The Long-Range Transportation Planning Commission had spent quite a bit of time looking at ways to evaluate and determine what made an adequate TDM program (in part within the context of the Zoning rewrite); it might be appropriate for LRTPC to review TDM plans.

* An Action item should be added to the Sustainability Plan to say that the City should take the lead to establish a TDM plan and create a format for others to follow; some pieces in the creation of such a plan could even be outsourced. Many things in the planning process would work much better if there were a formal TDM process; if the City could say "follow this". Because developers had no process for developing TDMs, and with no way to evaluate them, major developments had come in without any TDM. No one had told staff to do this. The SDEC was encouraged to make TDM Action language as strong as possible.

* Under the 8th Carbon & Energy Action item on page 28), the words "downtown" and "central" be removed from the verbiage. The issue needed to be approached in a holistic way; there was far more congestion on the Beltline on the far east and west sides (like Verona Road) than downtown. Focusing solely on the downtown would create more sprawl.

* The SDEC might look at the issue of residency requirements for City employees, and investigate how many City employees lived outside of Madison, outside of Dane County and outside of the state. With cars being the main mode of travel and until the RTA gets going, the SDEC might consider adding Action language about this under the "Employment and Workforce" section, if it thought the issue was within the scope of the Plan.

* Prioritizing Goals and having a stronger timeline would be helpful. With lots of intersections among Goals and Actions, it would be worthwhile to identify common themes repeated over multiple Goals. These inter-related, high-level areas might be the hardest places to work, but they would offer the most bang for the buck and have the biggest impact.

* The Long Range Metro Ad Hoc Committee had identified funding from a Regional Transit Authority as one of its top priorities (from the standpoint of funding, regional, and governance). If the Sustainability Committee were to prioritize Goals, it might consider doing likewise.

* In view of some efforts in the Legislature to disband and recreate RTA's, perhaps the Committee would like to look at some of the issues related to whether the "T" in RTA should be "Transportation" or "Transit".

* On page 23, under Transportation Goal 3, to increase sustainable transportation funding and incentive programs, add: Promote a Smart Park policy, whereby drivers know where to find available parking, and aren't encouraged to drive unnecessary miles (some estimate as much as 20% of downtown mileage), which cause congestion and pollution while looking for a parking place. Milwaukee had received a grant for \$2.1 million for such a program, and though expensive, we could work towards this.

* On page 33, under Carbon & Energy Goal 5, to obtain 25% electricity, heating and transportation energy from clean energy sources by 2025, add:

1. Promote solar-powered city infrastructure for such things as signs (school and crosswalk flashers) and parking meters.
2. Encourage public and private parking facilities of over 500 (or a different # of) stalls to provide charging stations for electric vehicles.
3. Encourage new above-grade parking facilities to have solar canopies and/or green areas on the top level.
4. Curtail or eliminate free parking for people with disabilities at meters, which encourages them to drive single-occupant vehicles rather than take public transportation.

* On page 22, under Transportation Goal 2, to provide a reasonable number of free parking spaces to car-sharing programs vehicles in parking ramps, the words "free parking" should be deleted. Per City Asst. Attorney Anne Zellhoefer:

"The provision (under Transportation Goal 2) does not designate what entity is to provide a "reasonable number" of free parking spaces in a ramp for car-sharing program vehicles. If the goal is meant for ramps operated by the City's Parking Utility, it is unlikely the goal can be met.

Currently, there is no outstanding debt encumbering the City's parking ramps. If the city is to borrow for a new ramp, and if the revenue bonds are tax-exempt, then it will not be allowable for the Utility to offer free parking spaces to car-sharing programs. The revenue bond covenants will prohibit such a use."

Though the Parking Utility could not provide free parking due to bond covenants, perhaps parking for car-sharing programs could be subsidized through grants, etc.

1	MADISON ARTS COMMISSION	04/12/2011			
	Notes:	Introduced for vote at the May meeting.			
1	ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE	04/13/2011	Return to Lead with the Following Recommendation(s)	SUSTAINABLE DESIGN AND ENERGY COMMITTEE	Pass

Action Text: A motion was made by Ald. Schmidt, seconded by Clear, to Return to Lead with the Following Recommendation(s):

Recommend adoption of the Madison Sustainability Plan, with the following changes, as noted in the April 7th BID memo;

- Delete the TDM plan requirement for events over 200 people (page 22)
 - Delete the downtown toll zones (page 28)
- and incorporate into the plan the following changes from the March 11th memo from Matthew B. Mikolajewski, Office of Business Resources Manager:
- Goal 4 - Add Mr. Mikolajewski's comment on the second page of his memo about connecting the City in the surrounding agricultural economy.
 - Goal 7 - Delete the action calling for City ED staff to monitor and promote informal economic activities.
 - Address the other concerns and questions outlined in the memo.

Sent to the SUSTAINABLE DESIGN AND ENERGY COMMITTEE. The motion passed by the following vote:

Notes:

- Absent: 1 Alfred L. Zimmerman
- Excused: 3 Peng Her; Joseph W. Boucher and Douglas S. Nelson
- Ayes: 6 Mark Clear; Victoria S. Selkove; Julia Stone; Gabriel A. Sanchez; Chris Schmidt and Joseph R. Clausius
- Noes: 3 Sandra J. Torkildson; Edward G. Clarke and Matthew C. Younkle

1 SUSTAINABLE DESIGN AND ENERGY COMMITTEE 04/13/2011

Action Text: Marc Kornblatt and Kassie Remo gave the presentation.

Ed Blume – Representing Peak Oil Group.

Showed a chart of oil production – and that we are at the peak of production – including all kinds – tar sands, etc. This is a finite resource. There is not a lot of recognition of peak oil in the plan. There is a lack of urgency. What did you envision for oil use going up or down? Do we have enough in the food section to deal with the idea that we have to grow a lot more of our own food? Same thing with electricity – we should have distributed power. It is hard to imagine our world with a lot less oil. Ed – handed out two hand-outs

Davi Post – how people are going to use the plan and the layout – As a general citizen – this is a huge document. Too complex. Strongly request that this is converted into HTML. I don't see where the teeth are – I don't understand how it will be implemented – will the common council adopt some of this – how does the public plug in. Climate Change is taken seriously but that will not happen right away – the plan should be looking at other issues that we need to address sooner. What is our plan going to be if we have national issues – sustainability we are prepared for the future whatever that future is – economic disruption. Madison can lead by example on this issue. How do we look at the future. Browser-Shot.com... so you can see how your page looks in different browser. What to be more explicit on how this plan will be implemented – and how the public can get involved. Here are 5 things that council can pass

John Stolzenberg

1) Partners – need to talk about NA as partners – actions are place-based – there is a role for them. This educates them.

2) Implementation – light on implementation. Future steps. Should be a discussion about how often the plan will be updated – in regards to the city budget cycle. There needs to be a public education component which needs to be strengthened. This also fits into accountability. The first revision – metrics are at the heart at this. This needs to be done at the first revision – a stronger commitment to doing that up-front.

3) Adaptation – how does WI climate change initiative – resilience how does that relate to the plan.

Page 34 – report carbon footprint – what are the targets based on. Target should be the desired amt – back calculate to Madison's share. 80% by 2050 – wants to see the calculation.

Dan Kerkman – lived in Madison on and off for over 20 years – a parks volunteer for many years. The changing political and economic changes you need to update the plan. You need markers – that you are moving forward. Natural Systems - the city buys a natural areas – removing invasive – and planting natural plants – we need to rely on volunteers – not enough money in the budget – natural is you leave it alone – you can't do that first you have to fix it... need a management plan... once nature gets a handle on space then it can take care of itself. Some people against chemicals – but you have to treat stumps so that the invasive species come back.

Worked to remove garbage from the E-way and then try to bring back to conservation.

Richard – moved approved with amendments.

We heard from members of SDE members that went to EDC.

Sherrie gave some points for Kassie and Marc's presentation.

General Discussion about timeline, presentations, updates to the plan. Priorities – etc. Collaborations are also important.

Metrics are really important.

Notes:

1 COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY 04/14/2011

Notes:

A motion was made by Thompson-Frater, seconded by Fike, to refer to the May 12 meeting. The motion passed by voice vote.

1 04/14/2011

- | | | | | | |
|---|---|------------|-------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| 1 | BOARD OF HEALTH
FOR MADISON AND
DANE COUNTY | 04/14/2011 | | | |
| 1 | BOARD OF PUBLIC
WORKS | 04/21/2011 | Refer | BOARD OF
PUBLIC WORKS | 05/04/2011 05/04/2011 |

Action Text: This Resolution was Refer to the BOARD OF PUBLIC WORKS. Due back on 5/4/2011.

Si Widstrand - 7226 Branford Ln - see recommendation submitted by Widstrand (attached to file)

Notes:

- | | | | | | |
|---|--|------------|-------|--|--|
| 1 | LONG RANGE
TRANSPORTATION
PLANNING COMMITTEE | 04/21/2011 | Refer | LONG RANGE
TRANSPORTATI
ON PLANNING
COMMITTEE | |
|---|--|------------|-------|--|--|

Action Text: This Resolution was Refer

Notes: LRTPC member Lucas Dailey provided a brief overview of the key transportation-oriented components of the draft Madison Sustainability Plan. David Trowbridge distributed some staff comments on the Plan - including from City Engineering, Office of Business Resources and transportation-oriented comments from the Planning Division. However, he noted that the Planning Division comments are still draft and not yet complete.

Committee members wished to have more time to review the existing staff comments on the draft Sustainability Plan, and looked forward to receiving the completed comments.

The Committee then voted unanimously to refer ID 21481 to a future meeting, on a motion submitted by Mark Shahan/Eric Sundquist.

- | | | | | | |
|---|----------------------------|------------|--|--|------|
| 1 | URBAN DESIGN
COMMISSION | 04/27/2011 | Return to Lead with
the
Recommendation for
Approval | LONG RANGE
TRANSPORTATI
ON PLANNING
COMMITTEE | Pass |
|---|----------------------------|------------|--|--|------|

Action Text: A motion was made by Huggins, seconded by Rummel, to Return to Lead with the Recommendation for Approval. Sent to the LONG RANGE TRANSPORTATION PLANNING COMMITTEE. The motion passed by voice vote/other.

Notes:

- | | | | | | |
|---|--|------------|--|--|--|
| 1 | PEDESTRIAN/BICYCLE/
MOTOR VEHICLE
COMMISSION | 04/28/2011 | | | |
|---|--|------------|--|--|--|

Action Text: A motion was made by Holloway, seconded by Maniaci to refer to next meeting. The motion passed by voice vote/other.

Notes:

- | | | | | | |
|---|-----------------|------------|--|--|------|
| 1 | PLAN COMMISSION | 05/02/2011 | Return to Lead with
the
Recommendation for
Approval | SUSTAINABLE
DESIGN AND
ENERGY
COMMITTEE | Pass |
|---|-----------------|------------|--|--|------|

Action Text: A motion was made by Sundquist, seconded by Gruber, to Return to Lead with the Recommendation for Approval. Sent to the SUSTAINABLE DESIGN AND ENERGY COMMITTEE. The motion passed by voice vote/other.

Notes: The Plan Commission recommended approval of the draft plan with the following revision:
 - That the recommendations that all stormwater runoff from building sites be captured on-site be removed.
 - That the Sustainable Design and Energy Committee consider the recommendations and comments contained in the Planning Division staff memo.

Members of the Plan Commission also offered the following comments for consideration by the Sustainable Design and Energy Committee:

Fey:

- In the Natural Systems section, Goals #3 and 7: Use recommendations in Si Widstrand's correspondence to conform those two goals.
- Same section, Goal #4 regarding zoning should be removed.

- Same section, Goal #6 should use recommendations in Si Widstrand's correspondence to add to that goal.
- Planning & Design section, suggest that plan recommend using the existing staff inventory of underdeveloped lands
- In the same section, recommend that community gardens be established where possible or appropriate.
- In Carbon & Energy section, provide more rationale for some of the recommendations in this section.

Rummel:

- Are we building our neighborhoods on the edge in an urban fashion or in a suburban fashion? We need evaluate development patterns and the importance of connectivity.
- Need to include a recommendation to review our existing neighborhood plans frequently, which she feels would be sustainable.
- The edge of the City needs more density.
- Need to define "zero net energy."
- Need to address the air quality impacts of the materials burned in people's yards.
- Include a recommendation to create a process to help identify and entitle community garden sites around the City.

Andrezjewski:

- Questioned why the 1/2-mile radius was chosen on Page 17; was that distance realistic?
- Give thought to overlap between recommendations in draft plan and the need for ordinance changes.
- Note that tax credit programs are already available to assist in rehabilitation of existing buildings.

Sundquist:

- Need to better define "sprawl growth" in plan.
- Recommendation to detain all stormwater runoff on site may be unrealistic and it may be detriment to other recommendations for compact development.
- Include a recommendation that planners be much more involved in the transportation improvement project selection process.
- Include specific guidance for what issues the City should work with the State Dept. of Commerce on building codes on; pull together building code issues.

Gruber:

- Evaluate other programs for encouraging dense development and limiting sprawl beyond the transfer of development rights recommended in the draft.
- Not all new developments need a transportation demand management (TDM) plan.
- The threshold for TDMs should be lower for park use and street use permits.
- The Plan is great but it needs additional work.

1	BOARD OF PUBLIC WORKS	05/04/2011	Return to Lead with the Recommendation for Approval	SUSTAINABLE DESIGN AND ENERGY COMMITTEE	Pass
	Action Text:	A motion was made by Ald. Skidmore, seconded by Fix, to Return to Lead with the Recommendation for Approval. The motion passed by the following vote:			
	Notes:	A motion was made by Ald. Skidmore, seconded by Fix, to Return to Lead with the Recommendation for Approval. The motion passed by the following vote:			
		Excused: 1 Aye: 5 Abstain: 1			
		Ayes: 5 Paul E. Skidmore; Anita Weier; Lucas K. Dailey; Ruben L. Anthony, Jr. and Steven M. Fix			
		Abstentions: 1 Jaclyn D. Lawton			
1	LANDMARKS COMMISSION	05/09/2011	Return to Lead with the Following Recommendation(s)	SUSTAINABLE DESIGN AND ENERGY COMMITTEE	Pass
	Action Text:	A motion was made by Rosenblum, seconded by Ald. Rummel, to Return to Lead with the above Recommendation(s) to the SUSTAINABLE DESIGN AND ENERGY COMMITTEE. The motion passed by voice vote/other.			
	Notes:	Jeanne Hoffman, City Engineering briefly presented the Draft Sustainability Plan. Ms. Hoffman explained that the Sustainable Design and Energy Committee is collecting comments from Committees and Commissions and outside interest groups.			
		Mr. Levitan noted that including a county program in a city plan is problematic (page 17 and 18). He suggested that "mixed-income buildings" become "mixed-income housing" and that Goal 3 might be a place to reference the			

preservation and/or reuse of existing buildings (page 18). Ms. Gehrig suggested that the Plan use the National Trust for Historic Preservation statement on sustainable treatment of historic buildings as a benchmark. Mr. Levitan suggested that historic preservation and the Landmarks Ordinance could be referenced on page 29.

Mr. Stephans noted that the similarities between preservation and sustainability are numerous and that sustainable design does not need to destroy cultural resources to make a building energy efficient. He suggested that the Plan recognize the cultural resources inherent in the built environment and not ignore the importance of the existing building.

Ms. Gehrig commented that historic preservation is an important part of the Plan and should either be included in each section or have a new goal related specifically to historic preservation issues. Mr. Rosenblum suggested that the Arts, Design and Culture section would be an obvious place to include preservation issues and that the Planning and Design section could use a phrase about preservation.

Ms. Gehrig suggested that the Sustainable Design and Energy Committee should discuss the Plan with the Madison Trust for Historic Preservation.

Mr. Levitan noted that removing existing buildings is not something the Landmarks Commission would want to endorse (page 58). Alder Rummel suggested that heritage tourism be included (page 39) as a way to encourage economic development.

Ledell Zellers, 510 North Carroll, registered to speak in neither support nor opposition about the Plan. Ms. Zellers read from the report by Charles Quagliana that was written about the historic importance of the Steensland House and suggested that similar language be included in the Plan.

Jason Tish, 2714 Lafollette Ave., registered to speak in neither support nor opposition about the Plan. Mr. Tish noted that the demolition of existing buildings accounts for substantial green house gas emissions. The Plan must address the issues of construction and of demolition, but should incorporate the issues of historic preservation. Mr. Stephans added that there should be a recommendation about waste management or recycling.

1	MADISON ARTS COMMISSION	05/10/2011	Return to Lead with the Following Recommendation(s)	SUSTAINABLE DESIGN AND ENERGY COMMITTEE	05/18/2011	Pass
	Action Text: A motion was made by Sober, seconded by Elson, to Return to Lead with the Following Recommendation(s) to the SUSTAINABLE DESIGN AND ENERGY COMMITTEE. - Replace public art images with examples that will better illustrate the ideas being recommended (staff will forward to Van Lith) - On page 71 replace goals with the first goal from page 72 and the goal on page 73 - On page 72 remove the second goal as it is listed internally as an action item The motion passed by voice vote/other.					
	Notes: Karl Van Lith, staff to the Sustainability planning effort, presented.					
1	BOARD OF PARK COMMISSIONERS	05/11/2011	Return to Lead with the Recommendation for Approval	BOARD OF PUBLIC WORKS	05/18/2011	

Action Text: This Resolution was Return to Lead with the Recommendation for Approval to the BOARD OF PUBLIC WORKS. Due back on 5/18/2011.

Karl Van Lith of the city's Human Resources Department and representing the Sustainable Design and Energy Committee presented the update to the 2005 Madison Sustainability Plan that looked at green buildings and energy conservation in order to meet the needs of citizens today and in the future. There are 10 different sustainability categories which are to be used as a guideline by policy makers when looking at sustainability efforts for the next 10 years. There have been five public hearings on the Plan as well as presentations to 10 committees. The Park Commission was asked to look at the goals and actions to determine if there was anything missing and to identify those areas in which the Parks Division and Commission might like to partner.

The city uses a sustainable framework called The Natural Step (TNS) that looks at ways to decrease use of fuel, electricity, natural gas and water. It also covers herbicides and pesticides and using natural repellants.

Superintendent Briski stated that the Parks Division does support the plan with the exception of the goal of committing 4% of the land area to be used for urban agriculture by 2020. The Parks Division supports urban agriculture and hosts/partners with community gardens in many of our parks. Four percent of the city area is approximately 2000 acres; that compares to all of the conservation park acreage or all of the park fields green space. He asked that land throughout Dane County be part of this initiative.

A motion was made by Clear/Scarborough to approve Resolution ID#21481 to approve the Madison Sustainability Plan. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

Notes:

1	COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY	05/12/2011	Return to Lead with the Following Recommendation(s)	SUSTAINABLE DESIGN AND ENERGY COMMITTEE
---	---------------------------------	------------	---	---

Action Text: This Resolution was Return to Lead with the Following Recommendation(s): Recommend approval of the plan with more emphasis on the CDA and, in particular, Levitan's changes to the actions relating to Goal 4: Decentralize Social Services/Actions on page 60 and the CDA taking advantage of Jeanne's Department.

Notes: Jeanne Hoffman, Facilities and Sustainability Manager, provided an overview of the plan. The new Sustainability Plan acts as an adjunct to the City's Comprehensive Plan and will cover three broad areas: Environmental, Economic Property and Social/Community Initiatives. The Plan is meant to provide guidance for current and future decision makers, City employees, Committee members, residents, businesses, and other entities. Levitan noted that in reference to Goal 4: Decentralize Social Services/Actions, the CDA would have opposed including social services agencies in any new affordable housing development. The CDA supports the idea of providing social services as deemed necessary, but believes those services should be appropriately located elsewhere in the neighborhood. Also, there needs to be clarification on the definition of affordability, i.e., low-income, very low-income, public housing, etc., vs. just working-class families. Shimanski noted that he was quite impressed with the plan and offered his commendation. CDA members felt that as the CDA goes through new development, it should involve Jeanne's office. Real role of the CDA is to lead by example. Shimanski raised the idea of using a development checklist. Hoffman will get copy to Shimanski. Hoffman noted that a new draft will be produced after comments are incorporated. Ellingson expressed reservations about recommending approval of the plan without giving it proper review and analysis within the context of the CDA's mission. Shimanski felt that the best approach would be to apply goals toward a specific project. The plan sets some standards by which the CDA can measure what we do. The ideas were raised that the CDA would assign this project to a work study student, or it could be incorporated in the CDA Strategic Action Plan.

1	SOLID WASTE ADVISORY COMMITTEE	05/12/2011		
---	--------------------------------	------------	--	--

1 BOARD OF HEALTH 05/12/2011 Return to Lead with SUSTAINABLE Pass
FOR MADISON AND the Following DESIGN AND
DANE COUNTY Recommendation(s) ENERGY
COMMITTEE

Action Text: This Resolution was Table
Notes:

1 SUSTAINABLE DESIGN 05/16/2011
AND ENERGY
COMMITTEE

Action Text: Marc – Provided presentation to Public Health. They understand the systems-approach. We believe Public Health referred it and will bring forward a more through memo.

PBMVC – will take it up next week.

EDC – Already reported.

Arts – What does sustainable art mean? Approved it with some suggestions.

Parks – Approved it – with some suggestions – recommendations for conservation parks.

Plan – Approved it – with several suggestions.

Landmarks and CDA – both gave comments but did not “pass it”

LRTPC – wanted to fully read the report and then will provide comments.

BOE – will also take it up next week.

Karl showed everyone how he is tracking changes – everyone thought the document would work.

The idea is to work on these edits June and July and hopefully be done for August.

We will try to highlight and discuss where committees have suggested that something be removed. Karl will send it out before the June meeting so everyone can review before our meeting.

COE – Approved it. Enforce existing laws or go beyond it?

SWAC – Garrick provided comments that need to be loaded to Legistar. Need to face need for new landfill. Concerned about cost.

Hard to Reach Organization
Chamber and BID - have memos on Legistar.
Karl emailed Latino group.

Notes:

1 COMMITTEE ON THE 05/16/2011 Return to Lead with SUSTAINABLE Pass
ENVIRONMENT the Recommendation for DESIGN AND
Approval ENERGY
COMMITTEE

Action Text: Sue Jones, from the Lakes and Watershed Commission and Garrick Maine made a presentation regarding the draft sustainability plan. Noting that as a result of some of the comments from other groups, there will now be an attempt to collate all the questions received and all the background data and publish it as an appendix to the report.

There were multiple questions and comments from the group, including but not limited to comments agreeing with existing comment #11 on the website from Planning (Mike Waidelich) that the plan seems uncomfortable between recommending actions and listing actions currently being taken, to comments regarding conflicts between this plan and currently adopted plans.

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

Notes:

1	LONG RANGE TRANSPORTATION PLANNING COMMITTEE	05/19/2011	Refer	LONG RANGE TRANSPORTATI ON PLANNING COMMITTEE	Pass
	Action Text:	A motion was made by Bergamini, seconded by Gruber, to Refer. Sent to the LONG RANGE TRANSPORTATION PLANNING COMMITTEE. The motion passed by voice vote/other.			
	Notes:	Margaret Bergamini/Tim Gruber submitted a motion to refer Resolution ID 21481 to the June 16th meeting, and asked Committee members to email specific comments to David Trowbridge, and to focus review of the draft Plan primarily on the Transportation section (pp. 20-26)". The motion passed unanimously.			
1	BOARD OF ESTIMATES	05/23/2011	Return to Lead with the Recommendation for Approval	SUSTAINABLE DESIGN AND ENERGY COMMITTEE	Pass
	Action Text:	A motion was made by Ald. Rhodes-Conway, seconded by Ald. Clausius, to Return to Lead with the Recommendation for Approval of the plan, and requests that Facilities and Sustainability Coordinator Jeanne Hoffman convey to the lead committee all of the comments shared both in public testimony and in the Board of Estimates discussion. Sent to the SUSTAINABLE DESIGN AND ENERGY COMMITTEE. The motion passed by voice vote/other.			
	Notes:	A motion was made by Ald. Rhodes-Conway, seconded by Ald. Clausius, to Return to Lead with the Recommendation for Approval of the plan, and requests that Facilities and Sustainability Coordinator Jeanne Hoffman convey to the lead committee all of the comments shared both in public testimony and in the Board of Estimates. Sent to the SUSTAINABLE DESIGN AND ENERGY COMMITTEE. The motion passed by voice vote/other.			
1	BOARD OF EDUCATION - COMMON COUNCIL LIAISON COMMITTEE	05/31/2011			
1	LONG RANGE TRANSPORTATION PLANNING COMMITTEE	06/16/2011			
1	SUSTAINABLE DESIGN AND ENERGY COMMITTEE	06/20/2011			
1	PEDESTRIAN/BICYCLE/ MOTOR VEHICLE COMMISSION	06/28/2011			

Text of Legislative File 21481

Fiscal Note

There is no fiscal impact associated with the adoption of the plan. However, the report includes a number of recommendations for which the implementation will have fiscal impacts in the future, some quite significant. Implementing these specific recommendations within the plan will require inclusion in future capital and operating budgets, subject to Common Council approval at that time.

Title

To approve the Madison Sustainability Plan.

Body

WHEREAS, in September 2004, the "Building a Green Capital City: A Blueprint for Madison's Sustainable Design and Energy Future" report was accepted by the Common Council; and

WHEREAS, the report was developed by the Mayor's Energy Task Force, a group formed in October of 2003 and charged with *making Madison a green capital city and creating a city that is a national leader in energy efficiency and renewable energy that also supports the city's economic vitality*; and

WHEREAS, many of the recommendations of the report have been implemented, particularly those that City government could implement itself or those for which the City could play a “leading by example” role; and

WHEREAS, in 2005, the City of Madison adopted The Natural Step (TNS) as a sustainability framework; and

WHEREAS, the framework focuses on systems thinking allowing discussions about Madison as a sustainable community to evolve beyond energy efficiency and renewable energy; and

WHEREAS, in 2009, it became evident that the Green Capital City report needed to be updated and expanded; and

WHEREAS, in October of 2009, the Sustainable Design and Energy Committee (SDEC), took on the task of updating the report, with the assistance of a diverse group of stakeholders including experts from the following groups: financial, legal, residential construction/remodeling, building materials, faith-based, electric/gas utilities, commercial construction, water quality, urban planning, education, transportation, healthcare, renewable energy, architects, green building, university, and two members of the Common Council; and

WHEREAS, the City of Madison defines sustainability as meeting the current environmental, social and economic needs of our community while ensuring the ability of future generations to meet their needs; and

WHEREAS, the new Sustainability Plan acts as an adjunct to the City’s Comprehensive Plan, covers three broad areas: Environment, Economic Prosperity and Social/Community initiatives, and tries to balance these three interrelated areas, recognizing that *a healthy environment underpins economic and social well-being*; and

WHEREAS, the City of Madison’s efforts in sustainability will focus on three key areas that enhance our community’s quality of life: environment, economic prosperity and social equity, and in its implementation will focus on the science-based principles of the sustainability framework, the Natural Step; and

WHEREAS, the goals and associated actions in the Plan are not meant to be prescriptive, but rather an attempt to lay out a series of priorities and directions that will help Madison become more sustainable and should be used and modified as innovation brings new technologies and new practices; and

WHEREAS, unforeseen events and changes may also have an impact on our community, therefore this plan also calls on Madison to be a *resilient* community that is able to withstand shocks, like an ice storm or a depressed economy, and rebuild itself when necessary by building resilience into our systems and seek directions and solutions that enable our community to adapt to change, utilize our resources effectively, and meet the challenges of the future; and

WHEREAS, a review of City boards, commissions and committees that regularly deal with sustainability issues should be conducted and a recommendation for streamlining the governance structure should be made and implemented. Common Council support of initiatives will also be a key to on-going success; and

WHEREAS, City agencies alone cannot implement all the strategies outlined. The City of

Madison is committed to leading by example and is open to partnering with anyone interested in working on elements of the Plan;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Common Council hereby adopts The Madison Sustainability Plan: Fostering Environmental, Economic and Social Resilience; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that current and future decision makers, City employees, committee members, residents, businesses, NGOs and other entities are encouraged to look to the Sustainability Plan for guidance; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that City agencies shall incorporate the Plan goals and actions into their on-going regular and annual work plans; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Mayor shall discuss sustainability work plan items during his quarterly meetings with agency heads and presentations on sustainability efforts, and the City shall continue to create awareness on sustainability issues at community meetings and internal staff meetings; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that sustainability training will continue to be a part of the annual training schedule offered to all City employees and shall be given during new employee orientation; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that The Natural Step staff team shall, over the next two years, present information on The Natural Step and this Plan to all City committees and discuss with them how to incorporate sustainability into their work; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that The Natural Step staff team shall report to the Common Council Organizational Committee and the Common Council on whether the current committees that deal with sustainability issues are the most effective structure to forward sustainability issues and on any improvements that could be made; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that public reporting on the outcomes of the Plan will be given to the community, the Mayor and the Common Council on a regular basis; and

BE IT FINALLY RESOLVED that the Sustainable Design and Energy Committee shall work on and monitor the implementation of this plan.