

Summary of Submitted Public Comment

Climate Action and Resilience Plan
Updated 10/1/2018

This summary is broken into four different sections, just as the plan is. For each of the sections there is a staff comments summary and a community comments area. The “key” for staff comments is below. The number in parenthesis references the comment number that can be found in the All Submitted Comments Excel/Google file.

Department/Division Comments

- Engineering Bureau of the Public Works Agency (E)
- Community Development (CD)
- Health and Human Services Department (HHS)
- Parks, Recreation and Community Services (PRCS)
- Facilities Management Division of Administrative Services (AS)
- Purchasing Division of the Administrative Services (PAS)

Mitigation

Community Comments

1. Zero Waste: Implementing a straw-free policy was supported by many of the comments, but also brought up some concern for those who have a physical disability and depend on straws to access foods, so a by-request-only policy idea was discussed (1, 47). In addition, many comments discussed the amount of waste that could occur from demolishing Harley Clark and other properties within Evanston and asked how these materials would be reused and/or recycled (38, 51, 55, 61, 64). Finally, there was support for a tax when using plastic bags within Evanston. There was substantial and very specific recommendations on more aggressive and specific approaches to managing and legislation related to deconstruction, demolition and reuse (51, 55). There was also a comment calling for attention to be brought to the “historic (and current) racialized decisions about waste dumping and management.” (38). The idea of a pay as you throw service/program was brought up (54)
2. Transportation: Overall there was large support for the amount of sidewalks and the increasing number of bike lanes within Evanston. However, many comments addressed implementing a stronger no-idling policy (54, 58, 59) and improving congested traffic areas within Evanston. In addition, there was general support for adding and improving the electrical vehicle infrastructure within the city. There was also some skepticism and substantial examples of how the use of VMT is an inadequate measure of impact (54).
3. Urban Canopy: This goal received overall support of enlarging Evanston’s urban canopy. Also, some comments mentioned companies within Evanston that could help with this task (9). However, some comments advocated for using non-native tree species that

would grow faster than native tree species (53, 4). Overall, while these comments were supportive there were many questions of how to implement this goal and how to educate residents on the importance of expanding the urban canopy (4, 53, 63).

4. Building Efficiency: Support for stronger building efficiency standards and numerous options provided such as AIA 2030, LEED, Living Buildings, and IECC or 90.1, (4, 5, 57). There was acknowledgement and concern about the delicacy of requiring strict retrofit standards and the potential unintended consequences (52, 62). Ideas about limiting scope of historic preservation to allow other older buildings to be updated (52). Interest in making more ambitious goals such as 35% increase in efficiency by 2025 (63).
5. Renewable Energy: Overwhelming support for 100% clean and renewable energy, a dozen or so comments indicating support. A clarification was requested in terminology used between 100% emissions reduction vs. carbon neutrality (7). Additional interest in more ambitious timelines to 100% renewable energy (63), interest in the City creating its own municipal electric utility (36) and some misconceptions around the scope of municipal aggregation and its potential impact. It was noted the City should be advocating to the state for support for solar on homes (61).
6. Outreach, Education, Behavior Change: Overall a lot of enthusiasm for this section with many commenters mentioning the critical importance of education, outreach and behavior change at creating long term impacts. Commenters indicated the value of providing more tangible individual steps that residents could take beyond simple steps as bicycling and recycling (45, 53, 58). Specific items called out were support for further enforcement and phase out of gas powered leaf blowers, transition to hybrid and clean fueled vehicles for City fleet (15) and working with school districts to establish zero waste lunchrooms (59).

Staff Comments

1. Zero Waste: None.
2. Transportation: This section included comments that clarify some aspects within the draft Plan. These comments include an explanation about why some of the City's vehicles idle for quite some time and cannot follow the no-idling policy. On the other hand, these comments mentioned that the City does not have the capability to run the study that this section is asking about and asked for more information about the Public Health Plan that this section mentioned.
3. Urban Canopy: This section raised questions within the City staff members. These questions include asking what this action means by "expansion" and what it is prioritized over. In addition, comments asked how this expansion of an urban canopy will take place, wondering if additional staff must be hired and if any legal battles will occur with landowners on private property.
4. Building Efficiency: Questions arose as to what scope of a retrofit would trigger net-zero greenhouse gas emissions standards? Could CARP realign net-zero goal around an existing framework, like AIA 2030 Challenge? Amend to include the call for an update to the water efficiency plan, not just implementation. Additionally, clarification was given as to the City's current cycle (9 years) in updating the building codes.
5. Renewable Energy: No comments.
6. Outreach, Education, Behavior Change: No comments.

Resilience

Community Comments

This section received comments for all goal areas except Resilience Regulations. Overall, the comments were positive and included constructive criticism for how to adjust the goals. Within Green Infrastructure, declining bird populations (2, 36) and managing stormwater runoff (comments 1, 57, 60, 62, 63) were mentioned frequently. As for Emergency Preparedness and Management, a majority of the comments expressed concern for how to help neighbors during a disaster because the Plan does not outline specific steps to follow (54, 62). These resonate with the concerns within Community Networks and Education because comments discussed implementing educational initiatives that teach the community how to prepare themselves for these instances and avoid a “re-hash of the education initiatives mentioned elsewhere in the document” (53).

Staff Comments

City of Evanston staff members provided comments to all goal areas. Within Green Infrastructure, questions arose about the benefits that Evanston’s local environment would receive due to even stricter stormwater runoff regulations. In addition, comments were made to correct that the City does not have control over CSOs and that the algal bloom was not unexpected. On the other hand, within the Vulnerable Population goal area many questions were about what the City can do to better be prepared to help those that fall within this category, such as the appropriate role for the City during these situations. This role of the City relates to comments within the Emergency Preparedness and Management section because it was mentioned how Facilities and the Fire Department have been working toward this for some time.

Municipal Operations

Community Comments

Primary comments focused on strengthening the sustainable procurement section so that it encompasses more than just purchasing items made of recycled material (comment 31). Interest in providing more accessible year round composting service (comment 36) and comments related to requiring that historic structures are deconstructed rather than demolished and that City facilities should be designated as such immediately. Recommendations (comment 13) that the NWF and Monarch Proclamation add language to “achieve and maintain” the certifications rather than a one-time achievement.

Staff Comments

Overall staff comments were supportive but there was a persistent request to make some of the actions more flexible and responsive to potential constraints such as misaligned technology (i.e., are LEDs always a better option or just a better option 90% of the time?). Skepticism on the timeline of achieving 100% LEDs. There were questions related to prioritizing deconstruction and the use of reclaimed materials, including recommending that usage of reclaimed materials apply not just to facilities but to other projects like roads, sidewalks, etc. There were a few issues in Green Infrastructure, resistance to a tree permitting process, the position mentioned doesn’t

exist and questions about how reducing mowed areas would impact recreational access and opportunities.

Implementation

Community Comments

Only two goal areas received comments, Implementation and Accountability and Partnerships. Within Implementation and Accountability, the overall sentiment was supportive for the City to act as a role model during the implementation process (22, 64). Furthermore, some residents expressed concern about the potential harm of the demolition of Harley Clark (comments 22 and 64). As for Partnerships, a majority of the comments consisted of suggestions for additional organizations to partner with and express approval of the corporations mentioned within the Plan that demonstrated their support.

Staff Comments

None.

Additional Comments

Community Comments

Overall, many of these comments were positive and included “thank you” and “great work” about the pressing issues addressed within the draft Plan. Some of the remaining questions include target goals for minimizing pesticide use (2), what the cost in taxes might look like (14), implementing carbon-pricing (8, 21), and where demolition material will go to be recycled and reused (30, 45, 59, 61, 64). In addition, concern was expressed for children being exposed to lead when older buildings are demolished (30, 51, 59). Finally, comments addressed that the Plan needs to keep a consistent language and make it easier for the general public to read (39, 54).

Staff Comments

These comments included ideas of other elements to add into the Plan. These concepts are the City conducting health campaigns geared toward the benefits of walking and biking and holding trainings for mental health first aid if disaster should strike. In addition, the idea of developing a job creation section that creates a plan for reinvestment of savings that occur from reduced utility and operational costs for homes, businesses and government. Finally, increasing education throughout the City on the importance of green infrastructure, planting native vegetation to increase pollinator numbers and general environmental-friendly behaviors were mentioned within these additional comments.