

**Name of Group:** Environment

**Meeting Date:** March 17, 2022

**Meeting Time:** 5:30PM

**Meeting Location:** Zoom

**Members Present:** Carl Kolosna, Lisa Miller, Tobin Freid, Summer Alston, Celeste Burns, Jennifer Hill Carrington, Pilar Hurtado

### **Icebreaker and Group Agreements Refresher**

#### **Update from Staff**

- Staff is working on brainstorming upcoming Spring Engagement for the draft policies we are creating. We are partnering with the Office on youth to do some intentional youth engagement as part of this. Community-wide engagement on the draft policy recommendations will happen in Spring 2022, roughly from late April through June 2022.

#### **Policy Discussion**

- Group Reminders
  - Meeting purpose: reviewing draft policies to be shared during community-wide engagement in Spring.
  - Focus on our group's topics first – noting high-level comments, any red flags that you may see, any small edits/refinements that staff can change quickly. (Staff has a quick turnaround time to get these draft policies finalized and formatted before engagement begins in April.
  - Focus on policies from other groups – again noting high-level comments/suggestions that staff can quickly draft before community-wide engagement.
  - Remember that the action item we've been developing in the google document will be incorporated – but aren't currently included in the policy spreadsheet
  - Please let us know if you see anything in the policy spreadsheet that is missing that is NOT covered in the action items in the google document.
  - Plan to look through what came from other PWGs that's related to Environmental policy – 27 policies like this
  - Anything we lost from Google doc to spreadsheet, how can we better incorporate equity, health and sustainability in these?
  - Need to freeze them by March 24 from PWGs
  - Focus on big picture, things that are missing or that feel really wrong that we can fix before sharing for community engagement

- Question: compatibility between this and other plans that Durham has in the books; reduce residential solid waste policy (suggestions around how to do that faster, however this policy syncs up with other plans) should this be the most ambitious plan?
  - The answer is complicated, not an inherent hierarchy with different plans but don't want plans in conflict (different reductions in different time frames), maybe can include action of reassessing the metric included in the sustainability road map.
  - Older goal doesn't seem ambitious enough given our current situation
  - Agree on where you're coming from, we should be more ambitious because that plan was from 2007, there seems like good justification for moving faster than previous plan, but may need to explicitly say that we're doing that and why; City and County don't always have the same goals and we're trying to make one overarching goal here for both City and County
  - We don't want to go against any goals but making more ambitious goals in this plan makes sense
  - Need to reassess whether we can work towards this more quickly
  - Continuously update with new information
  - Put these questions on a special list, if we want to work towards a new goal, work on that together, have the best data points possible, there's some fluidity before adoption
  - Our goal should be what we HAVE to do because of what the science says; every year we don't do it the goal has to be more ambitious
  - Share out as is but make sure we update the number before final policies are adopted for any specific numbers
- When we say the "Durham Community" are we talking only about the Durham community or different communities, like the Black and brown community?
  - Talking about people in Durham County when, for example, the greenhouse gas plans talks about "Community" emissions.
- Have to point to how we got where and why, yes the plan just adopted was around City operations, yes we need to be more aggressive and update previously adopted plan, however the City needs to lead not follow so if we put it in the plan, we need to base it on something we can do
- In our renewable energy plan (and we can do in actions) recognize what is out of our control, we will lobby Duke Energy for these things to get to this policy
- We can include things that are working towards changes at federal state or corporate level to change to be in line with our goals and objectives

- Two big picture things that I don't see, unless they are included as action items: Encourage sustainable consumption. And, encouraging and supporting systems for reusing building materials.
- line 6 - do we not currently allow homes to connect to public water when it's available?
- Write out ROS in policy 115
- The only trail goal is related to developer-provided trails. Can there also be a goal about city-provided trails? Functionally the city ones will likely basically come from implementing the master trails plan - but it doesn't hurt to just say that
- It could be implied, and it may not be an 'environmental' policy, but with farmland protection comes an element of protecting the rural communities (e.g. Bahama and Rougemont) in Durham. I searched all the policies and didn't really see anything here about wanting to maintain some rural element (yes, farming and forestry) in Durham. Line 62 - add 'natural resource' as a sector? (also green industry, landscaping, etc – what better language can we include?)
- Line 52 - I think the word 'strains' seems a bit subjective and conditional. . . can't think of another word for this now. . .when a new development would require extensive and costly infrastructure extension, it's a little subjective
- Line 100 - I think we want to 'prioritize' parks, etc., in this areas, right?
- Line 132 - May want to think about using conservation and protection in specific ways. Conservation doesn't necessarily mean permanently protected. (Kind of in the weeds, but in the land protection work, it kind of matters.) Maybe use protected vs. Conservation; for the county, conservation land is permanently protected; could be helpful to assess language and maybe help folks understand what types of property we include in different terms
- Line 134 - would be way cool to start thinking about permanent recorded protection of these development's required open space lands
- Might want to include the environment tag to a lot of the Transportation policies - 21, 23, 24, 25, 33,
- Line 29 references the Sustainability Roadmap. Check with General Services if they still want that referenced. Sounded like they are already moving away from that.

### **Close Out**

- Staff will send follow-up notes to this group for review before posting publicly to the EngageDurham site.