



APPROVED 2/15/2023

SUMMARIZED MEETING MINUTES

City of Scottsdale
Scottsdale Environmental Advisory Commission (SEAC)
***Special* Meeting**

5:15 p.m. Wednesday, January 25, 2023
Community Development Conference Rooms
One Civic Center, 7447 E. Indian School Road, Scottsdale, 85251

Call to Order 5:29 p.m.

PRESENT: Chair Natalie Chrisman Lazarr; Vice Chair Tony Coletta; Commission Members: Tammy Bosse, Ute Brady, Walter Cuculic (virtually; left 7:42 p.m.), Ryan Johnson, Andrew Scheck

ABSENT: None

STAFF PRESENT: Lisa McNeilly, Sustainability Director; Tim Conner, Manager, Anthony Floyd and Sam Brown - Office of Environmental Initiatives; Erin Perreault, Planning, Economic Development & Tourism Executive Director; Cindi Eberhardt, Planning & Development Area Director

PUBLIC COMMENT: Three members of the public were present, and two requested to speak on Item #2. Five additional written comments (submitted in advance of the meeting) on Item #2 were shared with Commissioners, made available to attendees, and attached.

1) Approve Regular Meeting Minutes for November 16, 2022

Commissioner Brady made a motion to approve the Summarized Meeting Minutes from December 13, 2022, with Commissioner Johnson providing a Second for the motion, which carried 7-0. All members present voted for APPROVAL.

2) Development of the Scottsdale Sustainability Plan

Chair Chrisman Lazarr began with public comment on this agenda item. Kerry Olsson shared that the McDowell Sonoran Preserve Commission would like to give input on the Open Space chapter of the Community Sustainability Plan. Alisa McMahon did not think the plan was ready for adoption and needs more quantifiable goals, actions to achieve each goal, and measures of progress. Chair Chrisman Lazarr then summarized the five comments received in writing in advance of the meeting (which were shared with Commissioners and available for attendees to read) – see attached.

Lisa McNeilly, Sustainability Director, shared a presentation recapping the work to date on the plan and its intended framework and role, as well as the community input received and changes made. Ms. McNeilly shared the staff recommendation to SEAC to recommend that the City Council adopt

the Community Sustainability Plan.

A discussion ensued about the commission's views on the status of the plan. Commissioner Bosse did not feel that the implementation table was complete and should align more with actions. Other commissioners agreed that more detail on the timeline for implementation was needed. In response to Commissioner Johnson's question about SEAC's role, Erin Perreault shared that staff uses detailed input on content and prioritization to draft plans. Commissioners Johnson and Cuculic both expressed an interest in ensuring that the McDowell Sonoran Preserve Commission had an opportunity to comment on the plan. Commissioners Chrisman Lazarr and Scheck also discussed SEAC's role, with the former noting that the plan is the city's and the latter noting SEAC will be associated with the plan. Commissioner Scheck also noted the plan could be more aggressive and include dates and percentages but was a good starting point. Commissioner Brady echoed the preference for more ambitious targets and goals, additional data and measures, and descriptions of benefits. Commissioner Coletta expressed that it was difficult to judge the document.

Ms. McNeilly noted that delaying the plan will also delay implementation and the development of other priority plans (which will include additional data gathering and more detailed implementation plans). Chair Chrisman Lazarr reviewed the planning process and the resources devoted by the city to the plan and shared her thought that leadership can be about looking forward and not backward to make progress. She shared that the plan's heft is in scope and not details and that concerns raised about the need to further develop ambitious goals should be shared with City Council.

Noting that a major limitation is bandwidth, Chair Chrisman Lazarr made a motion to recommend the City Council approve adoption of the plan with supplemental sustainability staff for implementation, with Commissioner Johnson providing a Second for the motion, which FAILED 3-4. Chair Chrisman Lazarr, Vice Chair Coletta, and Commissioner Johnson voted for APPROVAL, with all other members present OPPOSING the motion.

Commissioner Bosse noted that she has additional comments and would like a more interactive session to share input. She also would like more measurable goals, more compelling language, and additional accountability in the plan.

Commissioner Bosse made a motion to recommend that City Council continue the agenda item (at the City Council February 14, 2023 regular meeting) by 60 days to enable further input, with Commissioner Brady providing a Second for the motion, which FAILED 3-3 (1 abstention). Commissioners Bosse, Brady, and Scheck voted for APPROVAL, Commissioner Cuculic abstained, and all other members present OPPOSING the motion.

Commissioner Scheck made a motion to recommend that the City Council continue the adoption of the Scottsdale Community Sustainability Plan, from the February 14, 2023 regular meeting to a date to be determined by City Council, to allow for additional input on the plan including a SEAC working session, input from McDowell Sonoran Preserve Commission, and other public input, with Commissioner Brady providing a Second for the motion, which carried 5-2. Commissioners Bosse, Brady, Cuculic, Johnson, and Scheck voted for APPROVAL, and all other members present OPPOSING the motion.

3) Scottsdale's Legislative Agenda

Commissioner Brady has invited Sandy Bahr of the Sierra Club to present at the February 15, 2023 SEAC meeting on her perspective about issues before the state legislature. Commissioner Bosse asked that the handout she had shared at the Commission's December meeting be made available to Commissioners to review and requested that Government Relations staff present at a future

meeting.

4) Draft 2022 SEAC Annual Report

Lisa McNeilly, Sustainability Director, confirmed that documentation on ethics training and personal disclosure had been received from all Commissioners.

Commissioner Bosse made a motion to approve the 2022 SEAC Annual Report with one text change to include “Worked with new Sustainability Director and supported development of the Scottsdale Community Sustainability Plan.”, with Commissioner Scheck providing a Second for the motion, which carried 7-0. All members present voted for APPROVAL.

5) Earth and Arbor Day Planning

Lisa McNeilly, Sustainability Director, shared that city has just begun planning for Earth Week and Arbor Day events. The largest event will likely be on April 22nd at North Corp Yard. Commissioners indicated that they were interested in hosting an information table at that or other of the Earth Week events.

6) Staff Updates

Anthony Floyd, Sr. Building Consultant, shared that he has begun training staff on the new building codes.

7) Election of Officers

Chair Chrisman Lazarr nominated Commissioner Johnson for the position of Chair, and Commissioner Brady self-nominated for the same position. Commissioner Johnson withdrew himself from consideration for Chair, leaving Commissioner Brady as the singularly nominated candidate for Chair. The roll call vote electing Commissioner Brady as Chair carried 7-0. Chair Brady immediately took over the position of Chair.

Chair Chrisman Lazarr self-nominated and was the only nomination for the position of Vice Chair. The roll call vote electing Commissioner Chrisman Lazarr as Vice Chair carried 7-0. Vice Chair Chrisman Lazarr immediately took over the position of Vice Chair.

Commissioner Bosse raised a point of order that past elections were held closer to the beginning of the meetings and requests that practice be resumed next year.

8) Identification of Future Agenda Items

Items discussed for the February meeting include a presentation on sustainability-related state legislation and an update on the Community Sustainability Plan. Commissioners Chrisman Lazarr and Cuculic are researching possible speakers on renewable energy.

Adjournment 7:47 p.m.

Attachments:

(1) Public Comments



Persons with a disability may request a reasonable accommodation by contacting the Office of Environmental Initiatives at 480-312-2831 (if any)]. Requests should be made 24 hours in advance, or as early as possible, to allow time to arrange the accommodation. For TTY users, the Arizona Relay Service (1-800-367-8939) may contact the Office of Environmental Initiatives at 480-312-2831.

Item #2 Public Comments

Scottsdale Environmental Advisory Commission
January 25, 2023 Special Meeting

From: [Frederick T](#)
To: [McNeilly, Lisa](#)
Subject: Sustainability Plan Public Comment to SEAC
Date: Tuesday, January 24, 2023 10:18:28 AM

External Email: Please use caution if opening links or attachments!

To: Scottsdale Environmental Advisory Commission c/o Lisa McNeilly

I had submitted comments through the project webpage yesterday, but understood there may be some issue or concerns with format or success of the html submission.

Therefore, respectfully resubmit my comments as follows:

I am both a citizen of the City since 2001, and a practicing sustainability professional, focused on water and the environment. I am a licensed Civil Engineer, a Board-Certified Water Resource Engineer, and a Certified Sustainability Professional, helping plan and enact a wide range of projects and programs for public municipalities and utilities, and private developers, industries, and utilities across Arizona. I am also a proud alumnus of Scottsdale Community College and hold a Bachelor of Science Degree in Civil Engineering with a minor in urban planning, and a Masters of Science Degree in Civil, Environmental, and Sustainable Engineering, and from Arizona State University.

As a certified and licensed professional, my focus and mandate is to promote and deliver a better public realm, and healthier places and services for people and the environment. As a citizen of Scottsdale, I am proud of our community and have high expectations for city and policy planning efforts.

First, this document is light in substance and where many of the action items are things that should already be quantified and understood. In this draft I see the requirement for a metric is to be included for most items, but since apparently none have been developed, considered or proposed yet, this document is very cursory, and is not ready for publication yet.

When I compare this with our neighboring cities and towns, I perceive that others have invested more, and have more notable breadth and depth in their policies and planning to date, than Scottsdale. I also perceive that more effort is placed into the graphics than the content of this document.

Most of all it is clear that there has been zero input from each municipal department into what this actually means to them, and what they could contribute. Fleet, water parks, trash, library, pools, etc....

Leadership and culture is top down. This document does not set the bar at all and shows no vision. It does not adequately define goals that will have measurable results, nor does it quantify the benefit subsequent actions would provide for our citizens, our built and natural environments, our economy, or our quality of life.

Each strategy should have a value statement that ties it back to what the benefit is to the community.

Each action should have the following elements, otherwise it is useless:

1. A metric of what is the outcome. A percentage, number, or some quantifiable value.

2. A timeframe for when you want to achieve it, or how often it should be achieved.
3. Should be obtainable.

I have participated in one of the in-person citizen comment events and am familiar with those who have contributed on behalf of the city, and although their academic prowess may be industry leading I highly recommend also include those who are also qualified through certification and practice to develop this and I encourage you to consider what other cities have done, with implementing other existing industry programs, while you customize what is best for us all.

Cover Page

1. These are great photos representing the supposed "special place known for unparalleled leisure, amenities, and a reputation for livability."
 - a. However, this does not depict that there is any room for improvement. A little compare and contrast would add value. Trash in a storm gutter, single family home surrounded by short-term rentals. Show some of the injustices you aim to improve.
 2. I know this is adopted in the General Plan, but Sustainability is not a condition. It is a choice. It is action or inaction. It can be a philosophy, or a vision, but it is not a condition. This statement is as valid as "Capital Improvement Planning" is a condition.
 - a. Separately, it would be more fair to state we (The City) are working towards re-writing, amending, and re-aligning public policy and programs to achieve the ability for "the present generation to enjoy social well-being, a vibrant economy, and a healthy environment, without compromising the ability of future generations to enjoy the same".
 - b. We can't fix that in this document, but this statement should be deleted from the cover.

Page 1

3. The quote from the citizens does not qualify the City's statement in the previous paragraph of the success.
4. Why does this document need to qualify and applaud past efforts? Unless it is being used to qualify proposed continued specific efforts. i.e.
 - a. "The City installed 30% more benches and shade cover in area with under utilized public use, which resulted in a measured increase in public use and notable increase in the use of public transportation. Therefore, we should continue or expand that program in the future."
5. It provides a common framework to improve the quality of life for all residents.
 - a. This is a well stated goal that I believe is the true mission of this document.
 - b. I recommend considering that with every portion, paragraph, metric, and implementation strategy.
6. Stating that you will by-pass all thought or action that conflicts with "growth" is your most limiting and short-sighted statement.
 - a. Access to and availability of sufficient and sustainable natural resource or social justice and unbridled growth can be highly competitive as neither are infinite.
 - b. Your statement very clearly (any maybe on purpose for certain constituents) favors all decision to award the alternative that do not compete with growth. I perceive that statement, as your conclusion as the best course of vision and goal setting based on your education, training, and experience in sustainability. Unlimited growth in the face of resource limitations, and climate variability.
 - c. I cannot find and create any example where successful outcomes for all citizens were based on not conflicting with growth in the past, current.
 - i. Do we not protect the olive trees planted by Winfield Scott, and prevent the widening of roads, even though may be needed? Did we not put thousands of acres into preservation, not to

be developed? Do we not have zoning restrictions on lot coverage, building heights and perimeter fence (or lack of) requirements that prevent growth?

d. The only way I could accept that statement as a valid policy approach is:

i. if you demonstrate, by measured metrics, across all demographics of citizens that reveal a clear result that policies that conflict with growth hurt citizens more than help, or neither; or

ii. If you qualify what growth means, i.e., vertical growth across all zones and areas to increase density and protect expanding into preserves, for the value of adding affordable housing for secondary service providers, etc...

e. Everything is a trade off. That is why we need a framework that has the flexibility to accommodate “development” in a manner aligned with City and citizen goals, while providing the opportunity for environmental, social, and financial success of private citizens and enterprises. We do not want statements that we will not conflict with the goals of development.

i. As your report states, we are unique and our landscape and opportunities are unparalleled. We do not need to bend to the will of external profit. It should bend to fit our framework.

ii. Focus your framework on the outline provided in the ENVISION program by ISI as a starting point, and/or follow the three (3) “D” for metrics and framework in planning and project delivery:

1. D = Design, is it aesthetically pleasing

2. D = Density, does it increase density (could be of plant, habitat, cars, or people)

3. D = Diversity, does it promote across demographics of people, employment, environmental, opportunity, or improve areas that are underserved.

Page 2

7. Sustainability Pathways & Topics, Pathway One: The law, science, and policy should be precise. This is listed as low emissions and climate action. Based on the rest of the document, I believe harmful emission reduction, or GHG emission reduction may be more appropriate.

8. Protecting natural resources and culture: This is in conflict with your not conflicting with growth mission statement.

9. Pathway three indicates, or may be interpreted as, the City is the only entity that builds our communities. The majority is funded and design decisions made by developers. So if this is truly important to your sustainability plan, then you should be mandating, promoting, and celebrating the use of existing and future sustainability programs such as:

a. Institute for Sustainable Infrastructure, ENVISION® program, for the planning, scoping, and delivery of public and private infrastructure projects.

b. B Corp. program to promote and provide advantage to and procurement with certified companies first.

c. Leveling the playing field for business, and either avoid tax breaks for business or equally give them to all businesses to prevent unfair practices and competition.

Page 8

10. Climate Planning 1: Isn't this document supposed to be the framework?

11. 2.1 These should be quantified by now. Did we pay for this plan and not get these?

12. 2.2 What is the metric and schedule for 2.2? What is the citizens current understanding of climate change? What mitigation strategies has the city tried to date?

13. 2.3 How is this educate different from 2.2?

14. Indicators: Public comprehension should also be measured and reported.

Due to time constraints, I was not able to address the remaining sections of this document.

Please do not hesitate to contact me with any questions.

Frederick Tack, PE, D.WRE, ENV SP, M.ASCE
8401 East Edgemont Avenue, Scottsdale, AZ 85257
Frederick.Tack@gmail.com
602-826-0509

From: [Helene Tack](#)
To: [McNeilly, Lisa](#)
Subject: Sustainability Plan Public Comment to SEAC
Date: Tuesday, January 24, 2023 9:41:24 AM
Attachments: [ScottsdaleSustainabilityPlanHTcomments.docx](#)

External Email: Please use caution if opening links or attachments!

To: Scottsdale Environmental Advisory Commission c/o Lisa McNeilly

As a Scottsdale resident, sustainability professional and graduate student working toward a MS in Resilient and Sustainable Communities from Prescott College, I have been engaged with the development of the Sustainability Plan and attended several of the planning meetings. Having such a plan for the city is long overdue, and I am very excited that we are at this stage where we can review this draft of the plan. As exciting as it is for Scottsdale to have a draft of a plan, I feel there is still quite a bit of work that needs to be done. It is too important of a document for it to be adopted as-is. My general thoughts are listed below and I have attached a document with more specific thoughts.

The main problems I have with this document is a lack of metrics and a lack of detail in the implementation process. The words “support” and “encourage” are used frequently but both are vague. How is the city supporting or encouraging said action - through funding, staff time, incentives, regulations? I understand that some actions will likely be determined once certain actions are implemented and data is collected but there can be more specific information in many of the actions that say “support” and “encourage.” I hope that “support” and “encourage” don’t simply mean the city agrees with these items but is not taking specific actions on them.

Regarding implementation, this section needs much more detail. The items listed in Table 1 do not match the items outlined in each pathway. Does this mean that the actions that are missing from Table 1 are not getting implemented? I really hope that a plan that outlines actions the city can take means the city is actually going to take action on them. I would encourage Table 1 to be revised so that it includes the action items listed in the plan, cost estimates, the time frame of implementation, more specific details as to who will be responsible for the actions and the “lever” needed to make it happen (ex: policy, infrastructure, education, etc). Please review the city of [Flagstaff's Climate Action and Adaptation Plan](#) that provides an excellent implementation summary and schedule on pages 131-156. Several items from their plan that would be important to add to Scottsdale's Sustainability Plan include cost estimates ranging from very low to high, co-benefits, and potential partners. Flagstaff has devoted over 20 pages to implementation compared to Scottsdale's 7 pages.

I also feel the introductions to each pathway should be revised. They share a lot about what Scottsdale is doing well, which is good to mention so that people can see that sustainability has benefited the city. However, this verbiage should be balanced with the negative environmental impacts so that people understand the need for action. Otherwise these new actions might come across as nice things to do, but not really necessary. The comment on page 9 regarding how Scottsdale residents use twice the amount of energy per capita than Phoenix is eye-opening. It is very impactful to have information like this to show how we stack up with other cities, for better or worse. This can encourage action in areas where Scottsdale is doing worse than other cities.

I look forward to seeing the next draft of this plan.

Sincerely,

Helene Tack
8401 E. Edgemont Ave
Scottsdale, AZ 85257

Specific comments regarding the draft Sustainability Plan for City of Scottsdale
Helene Tack, Scottsdale resident

Pg 5:

- Re: verbiage that implementation of the Sustainability plan will be done with a high level of transparency & stakeholder participation. - How is transparency & participation achieved? Through community feedback sessions like previously held or opportunities for comments to be sent in? I am signed up for city newsletters but I feel like I still miss these opportunities. The city should be more proactive about reaching citizens, especially those that may not have access to computers, speak languages other than English and work hours that do not align with city meetings.
- Under specifics section it is stated that progress will be updated in an annual statement. This is great but can updates be more frequent, possibly quarterly?
- Under specifics section it is stated that Scottsdale will use an equity lens for program implementation & future planning. What does “equity lens” mean? How is the city going to get feedback from residents who are not part of the city’s dominant group -white, English speaking, college educated?
- “The City will seek funding for priority projects...” - what happens if funding is not available?

Pg 6:

- Re: “To obtain perspectives from multiple stakeholder groups, presentations were made to other resident commissions and boards as part of the broader input process.” Public input also sought via work study sessions, online surveys and a survey. - Is there any demographic data on input? Are you hearing primarily from residents who are in a higher income bracket? Any input from residents who are not part of the city’s dominant group (white, English speaking, college educated)? If this plan is developed around the needs of the upper class then it will likely be challenging to change course if the Plan negatively impacts lower income people. Engaging with a nonprofit like [Chispa](#) that focuses on climate justice for Latino community would be really beneficial.

Pg 8:

- 1.1: “update regularly” - be more specific, ex: update monthly/bi-monthly.
- 2.3: “Educate the public verbiage” can be removed since that is in 2.2

Pg 9:

- Re: verbiage regarding energy efficiency saving households \$500/year - what is the data source for this stat?
- The stat about Scottsdale residents using twice the amount of energy per capita than Phoenix is eye-opening. It is very impactful to have information like this to show how we stack up with other cities, for better or worse. This can also encourage action in areas where Scottsdale is doing worse than other cities.
- 1.1: How was a 15% reduction decided upon? Can we aim for higher?
- 2.1: How will this data be shared with the public?

- 2.3: Why only 50%?
- 2.4: how is clean energy defined by Scottsdale?
- 2.5: how much? Is the goal to convert 100% or less of the existing lighting?

Pg 10:

- 1.2: how will it be determined where increased frequency of transit service is needed?
- 2.1: how will streets be modified? Will bike lanes be developed or barriers built to protect bikers & pedestrians?
- 2.2: how will walkability be increased? What specific actions will be taken?
- 2.4: Safety needs a lot of work. I do not feel safe riding my bike in Scottsdale and as car traffic increases I feel even less safe. I am even experiencing more traffic and people driving faster in my neighborhood in south Scottsdale. There is little to protect me from vehicles, and I find drivers are largely unaware of how to operate a vehicle with biker safety in mind. If the city is serious about increasing the amount of bike commuters & riders, bike safety needs to be the very top priority. I would like to see specifics around what safety education will include, and how auto drivers would be educated. Regarding infrastructure for bikers, ensuring they are protected with strong barriers to prevent car collisions is extremely important.

Pg 11:

- 1.1: what are the regional efforts & how will Scottsdale participate? By attending meetings? Providing data?
- 1.3: how will these be supported? Will staff be more active in finding people burning on no-burn days, setting off fireworks?

Pg 13:

- It's alarming that there is only one page dedicated to water. We are in a water crisis.
- 1.3: is this for municipal, residential or commercial?
- 1.5: support how?
- Incentives are focused on turf removal and irrigation equipment. It would be great to see rainwater collection systems including here, and greywater systems. Rainwater barrels are quite expensive.

Pg 14:

- 1.1: encourage how?
- 2.2: support how?

Pg 16:

- I'm not a fan of the term "Scottsdale brand." This is my home, not something I care to brand. I understand making the case that preserving open space attracts tourism dollars but I think a better phrase than "Scottsdale brand" could be used in a Sustainability Plan that is focused on citizens. How many people living here care about Scottsdale as a brand?

- "Low and moderate income households may face employment barriers, financial instability, or lack of access to healthcare or other basic services, so additional effort may be needed to serve them." This wording makes it sound like these residents are a burden to the city. Stating that its "additional effort" to care for people in our community feels elitist. The challenges outlined here are indeed felt more by low-moderate income folks, but higher income residents can lose their jobs, healthcare, financial stability too. Scottsdale should be a city that cares for every one of their residents no matter what their income level, employment status etc. It is not an additional effort to make sure lower income people have a quality lifestyle, it is the right thing to do. The wording here matters. It is well researched that people in lower income communities will feel the impacts of climate change more than middle - upper class people.
- There is nothing listed here to assist community members with disabilities. Actions to improve the quality of life for people with disabilities should be included here.
- Actions to improve access to health services are not addressed
- 1.1: I am not sure what designates a "low-income qualifying applicant." My comment here is to make sure that whatever those designations are should be reviewed to make sure they are in line with current economic conditions.
- 1.4: I'm very glad to see this but include how?
- 1.7: this is great but I would like to see Spanish language translations of city materials available without someone asking. The City of Phoenix's entire website is available in Spanish with the click of a button.

Pg 17:

- Under Character & Arts 1, the language around expanding programs for low income applicants should be removed
- 1.2: encourage how?
- 2.1: It would be great to see public art that is made with sustainable materials be a priority for funding.

Pg 21:

- 1.6: What are some of these strategies? How would they be supported?

Pg 22:

- Built Environment 1.3: support how?
- Built Environment 1.4: strengthen how?
- Built Environment 1.6: encourage how?
- Housing 1.1: encourage how?

Pg 25:

- 1.1: support how?
- 1.2: support how?
- 1.4: how?
- 2.3: encourage how?
- 4.3: reduce where? In city buildings? In residential homes? In businesses?

- 4.4: rather than create a reuse program for building materials, partner with Stardust Building Supplies. They are the pros in this area. Let's not recreate something that already exists.
- I would like to see more transparency around the city's waste diversion. This should be reported publicly so residents can see how we are doing. Mentions on the city website, in newsletters, social media etc would help achieve this. The only mention of the city's diversion rate on the [city website](#) is oddly stated as, "Scottsdale's citizens participating in the city's recycling programs successfully divert over 20% or over 31,000 tons of municipal waste and 15% of green waste from the landfill annually, making Scottsdale a leader in landfill diversion." Does this mean Scottsdale's diversion rate is 35%? Are businesses included in this metric?

Pg 27:

- In the header, you state a goal of supporting "farm to table to farm by encouraging local farmers" yet none of these actions listed are targeted at encouraging local farmers. Does the city want to attract farmers, and if so, how? Does the city have land that farmers can lease or buy? Does the city want to contract farmers to grow food for food banks? As someone who works for a small farm in Maricopa County, using language as stated to encourage local farmers comes across like you are using a buzzword with zero substance here. If you want to understand how to encourage local farmers, meet with some local farmers. Farming obviously has a direct connection to water use, so at a time when the region is experiencing drought restrictions Scottsdale needs to be very clear about their initiatives regarding farming in the city.
- 1.2: in my experience, grocery stores need more than encouragement to divert food waste from the landfill. I have seen several pilot studies done with groceries on composting but when it comes time to pay for compost services or devote extra staff time to the process, the stores generally do not follow through. I would like to see a stronger approach, which would likely also have to include some incentive or recognition for grocery stores that are making a dedicated effort. Restaurants are important to include here as well but sharp attention to food costs by many chefs equate to less food waste than you may imagine, and most of their food waste is perishable food that is hard to donate (although this is a solvable challenge). Event food waste should also be included on this list.
- 1.5: encourage how?
- 1.6: What will the food policy council do?

Pg 28:

- 1.4: how often is "regularly"? Once a month, once a quarter?
- 2.2: How?
- 3.1: annual report is great but I would like to see more frequent reporting on progress that is publicly available.
- 3.4: how often is "regularly"? Once a month, once a quarter?

Pg 33: Environmental is misspelled under "Category"

From: [WebServices](#)
To: [Conner, Tim](#); [Brown, Sam](#); [McNeilly, Lisa](#); [Gulsvig, Caitlyn](#)
Subject: Scottsdale Environmental Advisory Commission Public Comment
Date: Tuesday, January 24, 2023 12:34:06 PM
Importance: High

Name: Laurie LaPat-Polasko
Address: 12090 E Columbine Dr., Scottsdale, AZ 85259
Email: llapat@mnwe.com
Phone: (480) 476-1005

Comment:

Dear SEAC, I am the current Chair of the McDowell Sonoran Preserve (MSP) Commission. I have been contacted by citizens of Scottsdale as well as other MSP commissioners. We were disappointed that the MSP commissioners were not asked to be involved in the review of the Scottsdale Sustainability Plan. There are several concerns with the Sustainability Plan and the MSP commissioners would appreciate the opportunity to participate as a commission in the review and recommendations for this document. Thank you very much. Cheers, Laurie LaPat-Polasko, PhD, QEP

From: [Gerald Leenerts](#)
To: [McNeilly, Lisa](#)
Date: Tuesday, January 24, 2023 7:35:16 PM

External Email: Please use caution if opening links or attachments!

Hi Lisa McNeilly,

I did submit the following as public comment, however I was informed that sometimes there were technical issues with how comments show up when done that way.

If my comment did come through all jumbled, please forward the following comment to the Environmental Advisory Commission, for the January 25 meeting, Agenda Item #2.

Name: Gerald Leenerts
Email: Gerald.leenerts@hey.com
Phone: (480) 455-7200
Address: 6835 E Almeria Rd, Scottsdale, AZ 85257

This Scottsdale Community Sustainability Plan, as written leaves a lot to be desired. Please push back for more changes.

I have three primary issues with this document.

First, the overview of each section. These overviews are too vague and lack any substance. They often don't create a good tie to Scottsdale and use vague "green" language instead. For example, take the "Climate Planning" section:

"Emissions from burning fossil fuels are increasing global average temperatures..." -- This is just for context, see the full (short) paragraph in the current document.

You could use that sentence for any city. Sure it's not wrong, but how does this relate to Scottsdale?

Where are the stats about how Scottsdale is seeing more high pollution days due to global warming, or heat islands are getting more extreme?

This just seems to be a lack of effort and research.

Second is that there are a number of "Strategies and Actions" points being made that call for a plan to be made. See "Climate Planning 1" or "Energy 1", or "Mobility 1". Are we passing a plan or a plan to make more plans? Again, this is a lack of effort and research. If we can't get a baseline for where we are currently at, then maybe we don't know where we are going to go. Use these base lines towards my first point about making the overview relate to our city.

Last is the structure of the "Strategies and Actions" sections, as they don't give us enough information. To me, each main point (e.g. "Climate Planning 2") should provide a clear goal, target and baseline.

After that, each sub-point (e.g. 2.1 or 2.2...etc) should have a very clear title, description, timeframe, lead party and related partners if any. This does a few things:

- The title/description ensure there is clear background as well as direction where to go.
- The timeline (ongoing, short, medium and long) would provide an idea of when/how long this work will persist.
- The lead party defines who is responsible for the point.
- The related partners show who they will need to coordinate with, basically giving everyone a clear heads up.

If we can't do the above, then it's not worth having a sustainability plan, because what's worse than sustainability is using resources to accomplish nothing.

Please push back on this plan so we can make it better.

If you have any questions, please let me know. I'm always happy to send this another way.

Cheers,
-Gerald

From: [WebServices](#)
To: [Conner, Tim](#); [Brown, Sam](#); [McNeilly, Lisa](#); [Gulsvig, Caitlyn](#)
Subject: Scottsdale Environmental Advisory Commission Public Comment
Date: Wednesday, January 25, 2023 11:15:35 AM
Importance: High

Name: Janet P. Brock
Address: 20100 N. 78th Place, Unit 2080, Scottsdale, AZ 85255
Email: jpbrock@mac.com
Phone: (517) 282-7873

Comment:

I own a condominium in The Edge which is part of the Grayhawk community. Recently the recycling bins located in the parking lot at Thompson Peak Park have been removed. The next closest area for recycling is at Scottsdale Ranch where I could only find one bin, and it was full. The HOA does not provide for recycling in our community because the service they did provide was misused. That is evidently the reason that the bins were removed by the city. For those of us who follow the guidelines for proper recycling (washing food containers, flattening boxes, removing styrofoam and plastic that can't be recycled), it is very frustrating to not have this service. I have contacted the city about this and was told to go to my HOA. My HOA told me to call the city. Right now I appear to only be able to add my recycling to the land fill. I read in the plan you are considering, Pathway 5: Circular Systems, that recycling is part of the plan to reduce landfill use. I hope that a solution can be found so that residents of Scottsdale who choose to live in condominiums and apartments can receive the same services as this who live in single family dwellings.