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Preface

Through its Green Local Government Pilot Program, the California Sustainability Alliance observed that while most California local governments are actively engaged in trying to help meet the state’s aggressive clean energy, climate action and environmental goals, many are confused by the myriad of options and actions – some mandatory and some voluntary – that are being implemented by various state and federal agencies. In addition, while there are many different types of benchmarking and analytical tools, as one of the Alliance’s pilot participants noted: “None of them tell me how to get from a ‘D’ to a ‘B.’”

Recognizing the pivotal role that local governments play in helping to achieve California’s vision for a long-term sustainable future, the Alliance conferred with California cities and counties, the U.S. Department of Energy, California Department of Conservation, utilities and other key stakeholders to help cities and counties develop and implement actionable sustainability plans. In particular, the Alliance is exploring the development of a simple, easy-to-use, best-practices oriented sustainability benchmarking tool that can be self-administered and maintained by local governments. Since local governments are typically resource-stressed, the Alliance is also evaluating tools that could help local governments make cost-effective choices.

Through a grant issued by the U.S. Department of Energy to the Public Technology Institute (PTI), a non-profit organization based in Washington D.C. whose mission is to provide the benefits of technology to local governments, PTI and the Alliance entered into a partnership to identify and fill gaps in sustainability benchmarking and analytical tools needed by local governments to successfully implement, monitor, track and adjust their sustainability plans. The collaboration between PTI and the Alliance commenced with this survey of local governments’ needs that was jointly conducted by PTI, the Alliance technical team, and two of the Alliance’s non-profit partners, The Public Sustainability Partnership and Strategic Energy Innovations.

The survey was conducted for the express purpose of identifying the types of sustainability benchmarking and analytical tools that are being used by local governments, how well these tools are meeting local governments’ needs, and the types of additional tools and support needed by local governments to help them achieve their sustainability goals. This report contains the responses from California local governments. PTI will issue a separate national report summarizing responses from its members outside California. Information regarding PTI can be found at www.pti.org.

While this compilation of survey results is being made available to the public, readers should be aware this was not structured as a statistical sample – anyone was welcome to respond to the on-line survey. The on-line survey was supplemented with interviews of city planning managers.

This report communicates the survey results. We have not attempted to extrapolate the responses to the remainder of California cities; nor have we attempted in this report to interpret their responses, favoring instead a faithful reporting of the results from which interested stakeholders can glean insights about local governments’ sustainability planning needs.
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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The power of local government is substantial. Local governments have control over the “greening” of their own facilities, often a significant portion of the region’s energy load. In addition, simply by adopting a policy, goal, green building ordinance, code or standard, local governments significantly impact the energy and carbon footprints of their constituents and stakeholders.

While many local governments have signed onto climate action accords, relatively modest implementation has occurred. Through our Green Local Government pilot program, the California Sustainability Alliance (the Alliance) learned that although many of California’s local governments are dedicated to advancing environmental sustainability, they are confused by the maze of policies, rules, regulations and legislation that have been established over recent years. Inevitably, confusion leads to inefficiencies; and in the worst case, can lead to inaction.

As the lead implementer for the California Department of Conservation’s “Emerald California” Program, the Alliance is helping California’s local governments understand what they need to do to be in compliance with new rules and regulations. The Alliance is also working with Emerald California to help local governments adopt “reach goals” (i.e., goals that exceed the minimum statutory requirements). In addition, the Alliance is partnering with utilities, developers, non-profits, state agencies and a wide variety of stakeholders to develop templates, training, web-based tools, peer networks and other resources to help California’s local governments break the cycle of inaction.

This is a particularly critical time in California, where numerous environmental mandates are coinciding with serious budgetary challenges. The American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 (ARRA) is expected to provide some relief. In addition, utility programs help under-funded local governments conduct audits and assessments of municipal facilities, while also helping to deliver targeted outreach and education to their constituents.

The primary goal of this survey was to identify the types of benchmarking and analytical tools that are needed by California’s local governments to help get them to action as quickly as possible with comprehensive, feasible and cost-effective sustainability plans. However, respondents also took the opportunity to describe the wide variety of policies, programs, plans and strategies that they have already implemented or are planning to implement. Primary barriers were highlighted, along with proven strategies for overcoming them. In addition, respondents shared their ideas about the types of improvements that are needed to help them become more successful in their sustainability efforts. Recommendations ranged from improving communications (e.g., so that cities can understand just what they are expected to do) to implementing more robust programs, tools and partnerships.

It is particularly notable that despite significant budgetary challenges, sustainability – climate action; energy and water use efficiency; smart transportation, planning and growth; waste reduction; renewable energy – continues to rank very high from a policy standpoint. Many respondents noted, however, that significant recent stresses on financial and staff resources have accelerated the need to secure additional funding so as to not lose the momentum from existing sustainability efforts.
Given the comprehensiveness of feedback from the cities that participated in this survey and the importance of their perspectives and observations, the Alliance decided to report the results and comments in as pure a form as possible. As noted in the preface, this report has purposely avoided synthesizing the results of this survey, allowing instead the voices of 76 cities to be clearly “heard.” Results have been compiled separately by question and by population size. Interview notes have been provided by survey question in the appendices.

The comments contained in the appendices provide valuable feedback to California’s policymakers about the challenges being faced by its local governments as they struggle to advance the state’s sustainability goals. These comments also help the Alliance and other service providers to tailor our programs and services to better meet local governments’ needs.

It is difficult to draw broad conclusions from this survey. The diverse responses reinforce the perspective that local governments tend to have unique local priorities and resource challenges, such that “one size” does not necessarily fit “all.” However, there are several important common themes:

- California’s local governments face many competing priorities, many of which are mandatory, and do not have enough financial and staff resources to do them all.

- Confusion is high, with existing and evolving policy goals and regulatory and legislative mandates competing for attention, and lack of clarity as to exactly what actions local governments need to take.

- Despite these challenges, city leadership and community support for sustainability remain high and there is a lot of current activity in all of the sustainability priorities.

- On their own initiative, many local governments are proactively partnering with their utilities, state and federal agencies, private organizations, and other cities and counties.

- Nearly every one of the 76 cities that participated in this survey indicated they had some type of environmental sustainability program - whether it was recycling and/or composting, to fully integrated smart growth and climate action programs.

- Energy efficiency and water conservation are very high priorities for most local governments, followed closely by climate action/greenhouse gas reductions; smart transportation and smart planning and growth; and waste reduction.

Most of the respondents indicated interest in participating in the development of sustainability tools and techniques; and also in participating in peer networks to share information about what they need to do and successful strategies for overcoming barriers.

The Alliance program plans to launch a series of workshops in fall 2009 to engage survey respondents and other interested stakeholders in the collaborative development of sustainability tools and techniques that are tailored specifically to meet the challenging needs of California’s local governments. These workshops will be conducted in conjunction with the Emerald California program, the Public Technology Institute and other Alliance partners.
INTRODUCTION

In December 2008, the California Sustainability Alliance (Alliance), a market transformation program funded by utility customers under the auspices of the California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC), entered into a partnership with the Public Technology Institute (PTI) for the purpose of developing a “transparent, easy-to-use, best practices oriented sustainability benchmarking tool for local government.” This collaboration was supported by funding from the U.S. Department of Energy and Southern California Gas Company ratepayers.

The project commenced in spring 2009 with a survey of local governments in California for the purpose of determining their needs for sustainability benchmarking tools: what they are using now, how these are working for them, and what additional functionality they may need to support development and implementation of their sustainability plans and actions. Additional information about their level of sustainability adoption was collected to provide context for the replies. In addition, the survey responses were summarized by size of jurisdiction in order to determine whether any clear patterns emerged along the lines of local jurisdiction size, as defined by population.

Table 1 - Size of Surveyed Cities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Size</th>
<th>Population (2009)</th>
<th>Surveyed</th>
<th>Total in CA</th>
<th>% Surveyed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Small</td>
<td>&lt;35,000</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>35,000 to 100,000</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large</td>
<td>&gt; 100,000</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>480</td>
<td></td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This report summarizes the responses of 76 cities – 16% of the 480 cities in California. The percentages of city respondents by size of population are shown above.

SURVEY APPROACH AND METHODOLOGY

An on-line survey tool was created and placed on the websites of the California Sustainability Alliance and its partner, PTI. A copy of the survey questions is provided in Appendix A: Sample Survey.

Announcements about the survey instrument were emailed to 485 planning directors in California as well as local government associations, non-profit organizations and PTI’s member jurisdictions. Respondents included city planners, community development directors and environmental/sustainability coordinators.

In order to encourage frank and detailed responses, the Alliance committed to protect the identity of respondents. Quantitative data have been aggregated and qualitative responses do not identify the name of the respondent or the city government. A list of cities that participated in this study is

1 Department of Finance reported population as of January 1, 2009.
provided in Appendix B, Geographic Distribution and Population of Respondents. Responses are summarized by size of city.

Not all respondents answered all questions. The number of respondents by size of city is shown for each question.

**SURVEY RESULTS**

Survey questions relate to three (3) primary sustainability issues:

1 – Level of organizational commitment, capabilities and adoption (Question 1)
2 – Existing sustainability programs (Questions 2-4)
3 – Sustainability tools and strategies (Questions 5-11)

The first question was designed to ascertain the level of sustainability adoption within the responding jurisdiction. The second group of questions established the range of sustainability options that are being pursued by each respondent. The third group of questions delved into the specific tools that are being applied by the respondents to their sustainability initiatives with the objective of identifying what tools are being used now, how well they are working, and what additional tools organizations need. The responses are summarized below by jurisdiction size as defined by population size.

**LEVEL OF ORGANIZATIONAL COMMITMENT, CAPABILITIES & ADOPTION**

*Question 1a: There is strong community support in your jurisdiction for sustainability efforts.*

Fifty (50) respondents of 75 (67%) assigned a score of 4 or 5 to this question, indicating that their communities strongly support sustainability.

There was no clear difference in the responses when viewed by size of city.
**Question 1b:** There is strong leadership support in your jurisdiction for sustainability efforts.

Fifty five (55) of 75 respondents (73%) scored this question a 4 or 5, indicating there is very strong leadership support in their cities. There was no clear difference in the responses by size of city. In addition, the minimum score assigned by all respondents was a 2, indicating that everyone believes there is at least some leadership support for sustainability in their city.

**Question 1c:** Your government has the internal capacity to address sustainability efforts.

Twenty-nine (29) respondents (39%) scored this question a 4 or 5, indicating that their city has the internal capacity to address sustainability efforts.

Forty-five (45) respondents (60%) scored this question a 2 or 3, indicating that they believed their city has some capacity to address sustainability efforts.
EXISTING SUSTAINABILITY PROGRAMS

Questions 2-4 were designed to obtain information about the respondents’ existing programs, priorities and progress to provide context for their responses about the types of benchmarking and other tools and support that they need to help implement and manage their sustainability programs.

VINTAGE OF EXISTING SUSTAINABILITY EFFORTS

*Question 2 – Please select the appropriate timeframe for the sustainability programs that you currently have in place in your local government. If you do not currently have one of these programs in place, please select the answer “0 years.”*

The below figure illustrates the relative vintage of existing sustainability plans and programs being conducted by the survey respondents.

The responses by sustainability initiative follow.
Green Building Ordinance

**Question 2a: Green Building Ordinance (# Years)**
- Large Cities (n=17)
- Medium Cities (n=29)
- Small Cities (n=28)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years</th>
<th>Large Cities</th>
<th>Medium Cities</th>
<th>Small Cities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 years</td>
<td>48 (65%)</td>
<td>18 (24%)</td>
<td>7 (9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-2 years</td>
<td>13 (18%)</td>
<td>5 (7%)</td>
<td>4 (6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-5 years</td>
<td>5 (7%)</td>
<td>6 (9%)</td>
<td>1 (1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-10 years</td>
<td>1 (1%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Green Building Incentives

**Question 2b: Green Building Incentives (# Years)**
- Large Cities (n=17)
- Medium Cities (n=28)
- Small Cities (n=28)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years</th>
<th>Large Cities</th>
<th>Medium Cities</th>
<th>Small Cities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 years</td>
<td>49 (67%)</td>
<td>16 (22%)</td>
<td>4 (5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-2 years</td>
<td>14 (19%)</td>
<td>3 (4%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-5 years</td>
<td>2 (3%)</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-10 years</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Energy Action Plan

**Question 2c: Energy Action Plan (# Years)**
- Large Cities (n=17)
- Medium Cities (n=27)
- Small Cities (n=27)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years</th>
<th>Large Cities</th>
<th>Medium Cities</th>
<th>Small Cities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 years</td>
<td>48 (68%)</td>
<td>13 (18%)</td>
<td>5 (7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-2 years</td>
<td>13 (18%)</td>
<td>7 (10%)</td>
<td>4 (6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-5 years</td>
<td>5 (7%)</td>
<td>6 (9%)</td>
<td>1 (1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-10 years</td>
<td>1 (1%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Climate Change Action Plan

**Question 2d: Climate Change Action Plan (# Years)**
- Large Cities (n=17)
- Medium Cities (n=30)
- Small Cities (n=28)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years</th>
<th>Large Cities</th>
<th>Medium Cities</th>
<th>Small Cities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 years</td>
<td>56 (75%)</td>
<td>14 (19%)</td>
<td>2 (3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-2 years</td>
<td>14 (19%)</td>
<td>2 (3%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-5 years</td>
<td>11 (16%)</td>
<td>3 (4%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-10 years</td>
<td>6 (9%)</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Greenhouse Gas Inventory

**Question 2e: Greenhouse Gas Inventory (# Years)**
- Large Cities (n=16)
- Medium Cities (n=30)
- Small Cities (n=27)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years</th>
<th>Large Cities</th>
<th>Medium Cities</th>
<th>Small Cities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 years</td>
<td>46 (63%)</td>
<td>18 (25%)</td>
<td>6 (8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-2 years</td>
<td>18 (25%)</td>
<td>6 (8%)</td>
<td>2 (3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-5 years</td>
<td>6 (8%)</td>
<td>2 (3%)</td>
<td>1 (1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-10 years</td>
<td>2 (3%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Composting

**Question 2f: Composting Program (# Years)**
- Large Cities (n=16)
- Medium Cities (n=26)
- Small Cities (n=28)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years</th>
<th>Large Cities</th>
<th>Medium Cities</th>
<th>Small Cities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 years</td>
<td>37 (53%)</td>
<td>5 (7%)</td>
<td>11 (16%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-2 years</td>
<td>5 (7%)</td>
<td>11 (16%)</td>
<td>9 (16%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-5 years</td>
<td>11 (16%)</td>
<td>6 (9%)</td>
<td>11 (16%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-10 years</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;10 years</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SUSTAINABILITY PRIORITIES

Question 3. For the following categories, please rank in order (1-7) the order of importance for achieving community sustainability. You can only select one rank per category (for example, you can select the ranking one for energy efficiency; you cannot use the ranking one for any other category).

The purpose of this question was to identify the relative ranking of sustainability priorities by respondent. Seventy-three (73) cities responded to this question, but not everyone ranked all seven (7) sustainability initiatives or actions. Four (4) cities selected only their single most important priority. Of these, two selected energy efficiency and two selected GHG reduction. Other cities selected their top two (2) or three (3) priorities. Some ranked all seven (7) sustainability initiatives.
### SUSTAINABILITY PRIORITIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Efficiency</td>
<td>Efficiency</td>
<td>Energy</td>
<td>Energy</td>
<td>Gas Reductions</td>
<td>Recycling</td>
<td>Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rank #1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rank #2</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rank #3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Relative Ranking by All Respondents (excluding non-respondents)

| #Respondents Ranked 1-3 | 40 | 39 | 18 | 28 | 27 | 27 |
| Avg. Score (Rank 1-3 only) | 1.95 | 1.77 | 2.56 | 1.82 | 2.25 | 1.67 | 2.30 |
| Avg. Score (all responses) | 2.92 | 2.82 | 4.58 | 3.80 | 3.95 | 3.53 | 4.19 |

Water (53%) and energy efficiency (55%) were included among the top three (3) sustainability priorities by more than half of the 73 respondents. Water efficiency was selected by 21 cities as their very top sustainability priority. Eleven (11) cities selected energy efficiency as their top priority. Twenty (20) cities selected energy efficiency as their second highest priority.

The above tabulation shows that there are substantial differences among respondents as to the third highest priority, although greenhouse gas reduction and smart growth and planning fall into the top four (4) priorities when only the top three (3) ranked priorities are considered. While renewable energy was ranked within the top three (3) by some cities, no one ranked it as number one.

The responses were also compiled for the top three (3) priorities by size of city (small, medium and large), to determine whether any clear trends emerged.

### SUSTAINABILITY PRIORITIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Efficiency</td>
<td>Efficiency</td>
<td>Energy</td>
<td>Energy</td>
<td>Gas Reductions</td>
<td>Recycling</td>
<td>Planning</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### A. Relative Ranking by Small Jurisdictions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. of Responses</th>
<th>n=23</th>
<th>n=19</th>
<th>n=18</th>
<th>n=19</th>
<th>n=22</th>
<th>n=16</th>
<th>n=19</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rank #1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rank #2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rank #3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### B. Relative Ranking by Medium Jurisdictions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. of Responses</th>
<th>n=24</th>
<th>n=22</th>
<th>n=20</th>
<th>n=21</th>
<th>n=25</th>
<th>n=23</th>
<th>n=24</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rank #1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rank #2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rank #3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### C. Relative Ranking by Large Jurisdictions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. of Responses</th>
<th>n=15</th>
<th>n=16</th>
<th>n=14</th>
<th>n=16</th>
<th>n=13</th>
<th>n=14</th>
<th>n=14</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rank #1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rank #2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rank #3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The same relative priorities emerge here: energy and water efficiency are very high priorities; GHG reduction, waste reduction, smart planning and growth, and smart transportation are also very important; renewable energy is not as important – with no clear differences observed by size of jurisdiction.

SUSTAINABILITY PROGRESS

Question 4: On a scale of 1 to 5 please indicate how much progress you are making towards improvement within each of the following categories in terms of not at all (1) to very much (5).

Survey participants were asked to indicate the level of progress that they are making towards the seven (7) sustainability goals identified in Question Three. The survey results are provided below.

Energy Efficiency

Water Efficiency

Renewable Energy

Greenhouse Gas Reductions
Waste Reduction & Recycling

Question 4e: Progress - Waste Reduction and Recycling

![Chart showing progress in waste reduction and recycling](chart1)

Smart Growth & Planning

Question 4f: Progress - Smart Growth & Planning

![Chart showing progress in smart growth and planning](chart2)

Smart Transportation

Question 4g: Progress - Smart Transportation

![Chart showing progress in smart transportation](chart3)

NEED FOR TOOLS AND SUPPORT

Questions 5 – 11: We are interested in hearing about the tools you are using and how well these are meeting your needs. Our goal is to use this information to create a more comprehensive and easily utilized tool that allows you to more effectively measure your progress and identify the steps you can take to move forward. For each of the following categories, please describe what tools (if any) you are using to track your progress and please tell us what improvements would make these tools more useful to you.

The goal of this survey was to identify the types of benchmarking, analytical and other tools California’s local governments are presently using to support their sustainability efforts; how well these are working for them; and local governments’ needs for additional tools and other types of support.
Survey participants’ responses are summarized on the following pages. A description of the tools, strategies and approaches cited by respondents is provided in Appendix D. Full narrative comments have been provided by question in Appendix G.

**Question 5: Energy Efficiency**

![Energy Efficiency Measurement Tool or Approach Chart]

**Question 6: Water Efficiency**

![Water Efficiency Measurement Tool or Approach Chart]
Question 7: Renewable Energy

![Renewable Energy Measurement Tool or Approach](image)

Question 8: GHG Reduction

![GHG Reduction Measurement Tool or Approach](image)
Question 9: Waste Reduction & Recycling

Waste Reduction and Recycling Measurement Tool or Approach

Number of Responses

- Recycling program
- Training & outreach education campaigns
- Audits of facilities
- Waste management plans
- Education and awareness programs
- Partnership with local businesses
- Staff checklists for curbside recycling
- No/Don't know
- No response

Question 10: Smart Growth and Planning

Smart Growth, Planning Tool or Approach

Number of Responses

- City Planning Code
- Transit-Oriented Development Strategy
- Affordable Housing
- Planning Department
- Network Connections
- Incorporation of CLD priorities
- No/Don't know
- No response
SUMMARY OF RESPONDENTS’ COMMENTS

To provide additional context for the results reported in the sections above, below is a summary of the comments by question. Please note that not every participant provided comments to these questions.

QUESTION 1 - LEVEL OF ORGANIZATIONAL COMMITMENT, CAPABILITIES & ADOPTION

Question 1a – Community Support

Respondents cited the following types of successful strategies:

- Acknowledgment from the city that community support and involvement is important and therefore it is imperative in order to make the city more environmentally sustainable;
- Strong support from the community to ensure that adaptive reuse/redevelopment projects are sustainable;
- Establishing a community led environmental taskforce, where community representatives work with city staff on key initiatives such as General Plan revisions;
- Facilitating opportunities for the community to review and comment on environmental sustainability initiatives and programs; and
- Provision of monetary grants and subsidies to the community for environmental related programs and installations (such as rebates for solar panel installations at residential properties).
Several cities expressed the lack of outreach and education efforts as a shortcoming in their cities that resulted in a less than desirable level of community support. These cities were interested in finding out what peer cities did to boost community support.

Another respondent stated that the lack of community support for environmental sustainability was exacerbated by competing priorities and interests, with sustainability scoring low in their annual city survey.

**Question 1b – Leadership Support**

Respondent comments included:

- The identification of sustainability priorities (such as transportation) that will have a positive impact for the community;
- Support from mayors who believe that sustainability is a good idea and a high priority to ensure the future success of the community;
- Proactive steps to innovate and serve as models for other cities, particularly in meeting state environmental targets (such as AB32); and
- Motivation to take action on sustainability efforts to promote cost efficiencies and expense reductions.

Several small cities (based on population) highlighted their small size as the reason for lack of city leadership on sustainability efforts.

Cities that have recently begun to adopt sustainability efforts into their policies and activities are looking to the models and approaches of established programs and developing partnerships to support their efforts.

**Question 1c – Internal Capacity**

Cities that noted challenges to internal capacity cited the following types of underlying causes:

- Limited resources and need for additional funding;
- The current economic challenges have resulted in competing priorities taking precedence over sustainability efforts (that have been placed on hold or been suspended); and
- Sustainability efforts have been proposed, but are contingent on the receipt of grants and funding sources.
EXISTING SUSTAINABILITY PROGRAMS

QUESTION 2 - VINTAGE OF EXISTING SUSTAINABILITY EFFORTS

General Comments

• Many city governments stated that they are currently developing and piloting programs for formal implementation.

• Recycling and composting programs tended to have a high adoption rate and have been around the longest, whereas energy efficiency and climate action programs were noticeably recent in their implementation by local governments.

• Some respondents cited a lack of understanding as to what exactly is required of them to achieve the emissions targets established by state legislation such as AB32.

• Others cited funding and resource constraint issues.

Full respondent comments to question 2 are provided in Appendix E: Narrative Responses to Question 2.

Question 2a - Green Building Ordinances

The following types of strategies were cited:

• Incorporation of green building principles into General Plan and zoning guidelines;

• Provision of green building guidelines to encourage developers to adopt these measures in their projects;

• Link green building ordinances with incentives to boost the adoption of green building design and development; and

• Learn from other cities and adopt successful elements into a respondent city’s own green building ordinance.

• Several cities have adopted ordinances on third party tools and approaches including Built-It-Green and LEED rating systems.

Several respondents base their green building ordinances on Title 24. One city respondent noted the shortcomings of city specific ordinances, instead preferring a California-wide green building code.

Question 2b - Green Building Incentives

Several cities stated that they do not provide direct rebates for sustainability, relying primarily on utility-based programs and incentives.

Question 2c - Climate Change Action Plan

Most respondents stated that they are currently planning and developing a strategy to address climate change in their city.
**Question 2d - Greenhouse Gas Inventory**

Cities that stated they are currently in the process of undertaking a greenhouse gas inventory cited partnering with peer cities, industry organizations and academic institutions to help develop greenhouse gas reduction strategies.

**Question 2e - Composting Programs**

Composting programs were typically described as curbside recycling for residents in which green and organic wastes are separated from other types of waste.

**Question 2f - Alternative Transportation Plan**

The most common plan focused on pedestrian and bicycle access paths, followed by car pooling and rideshare programs. Several cities in large urban centers highlighted the importance of public transit facilities.

**Question 2g - Smart Growth Incentives**

Several respondents stated that their city did not have incentives largely due to the geographical constraints that prevent smart growth from taking place (i.e. being built out).

Several respondents noted that their local government was in the process of updating their General Plan to reflect smart growth principles.

**Question 2h - Renewable Energy Program**

Cities with renewable energy programs cited programs that included the retrofit of city buildings and facilities with solar PV systems, and establishing solar PV pilot and demonstration projects for residential and commercial applications. These have been supported by utility and state-based funding.

**QUESTION 4 – SUSTAINABILITY PROGRESS**

Full respondent comments to question 4 are included in Appendix F, Narrative Responses to Question 4.

**Question 4a - Energy Efficiency**

Commonly cited energy efficiency measures included the retrofit of lighting in city facilities and installation of performance glazing to reduce reliance on the use of artificial heating/cooling. Some cities also cited achieving LEED certification for city buildings and/or requiring that new city facilities achieve minimum LEED standards.
Some cities have taken proactive measures that have resulted in cost savings and recognition for energy savings. Other cities are still learning how best to deal with requirements such as AB32 and acknowledge that their city is “playing catch-up”.

**Question 4b - Water Efficiency**

Respondents generally indicated the installation of water meters has been instrumental in driving water efficiencies for both city facilities and private sector uses.

Several city governments have taken proactive measures to promote water conservation – from installation of water efficient irrigation systems, to outreach and awareness programs.

**Question 4c - Renewable Energy**

Best practices included installing solar PV on city buildings and facilities, and utilization of hybrid and compressed natural gas vehicles for the city’s vehicle fleet.

One large city cited that it had committed to purchase 20% of its electricity from renewable sources, increasing its commitment to 23% in 10 years.

**Question 4d - Greenhouse Gas Reductions**

Measures range from the measurement of greenhouse gases through inventory software, to the implementation of city codes and policies that would reduce and limit greenhouse gas emissions within the city. The cost of undertaking the greenhouse gas inventory was cited as a key barrier by some respondents.

**Question 4e - Waste Reduction and Recycling**

Respondents across all population sizes cited residential curbside recycling and, to a lesser extent, composting programs. Beyond the focus on residential efforts, several cities with ambitious recycling targets are focusing on recycling and composting programs for specific industries and activities such as restaurants and rural industries. One small city cited the equine industry. Additional targeting of both residential and commercial sectors has boosted the waste diversion rates of the participating cities, ranging from 50% to 70% for small sized cities.

Several cities have also implemented policies in their cities banning the sale and use of styrofoam and plastic bags. Another city has adopted a zero waste resolution.

Many cities cited using outreach and awareness programs to boost the participation rate of recycling and composting programs. Several small and medium cities offer composting classes, distribute calendars with recycling dates, and provide subsidies for composting and worm bins for its residents.

**Question 4f - Smart Growth and Planning**

Some respondents stated that smart growth and planning was constrained by cities being built out.
Question 4g - Smart Transportation

A range of smart transportation measures are provided to city residents and local government staff, such as shuttles and rideshare programs. Some local governments promote other means of transportation including cycling and public transit.

QUESTIONS 5-11 – SUSTAINABILITY TOOLS AND STRATEGIES

Full respondent comments to these questions are included in Appendix G, Narrative Responses to Questions 5-11.

Question 5 - Energy Efficiency

- Most respondents commented that their city partners with the local utility or third-party consultant to measure, track and monitor energy efficiency measures.
- According to respondent comments, partnering with the local utility and leveraging their expertise is a common choice for city governments to measure and manage energy efficiency efforts, followed by establishing planning and building codes.
- Small cities generally partner with their utilities to measure and track energy efficiency.
- Some medium and large cities stated that they are undertaking in-house audits/assessments. Some cities stated they are partnering with utilities to measure energy efficiency efforts.
- No particular tool or approach is overwhelmingly favored.

Question 6: Water Efficiency

- Common strategies employed are the use of water meters and billing data to measure and compare water consumption over time.
- A variety of tools and approaches are being used to implement, measure and track water efficiency. The water meter was considered by several respondents as the most effective and accurate way to track water usage, and therefore program effectiveness, over time.
- City-wide landscape irrigation efficiency measures were also featured prominently in respondent comments, as well as using recycled water for irrigation purposes.
- In promoting water conservation and efficiency in the private sector, city government respondents stated that they have employed a variety of measures ranging from ensuring that new projects achieve a minimum level of water efficiency (e.g., through building codes), to water audits for major water users (generally commercial and industrial sites), and to the promotion of water conservation through education and outreach programs.

Question 7: Renewable Energy

- The most common approach cited was to measure and track energy use based on utility data. Several city respondents stated that their governments are looking to utility companies for guidance and support.
• Several cities stated that their planning ordinances (General Plan) incorporate renewable energy measures for new development, enhanced through incentive programs.

• Several respondents highlighted expansion efforts to incorporate renewable energy measures for existing city facilities (e.g., cogeneration at city landfills and waste treatment facilities).

Question 8: GHG Reduction
• Many respondents stated that they are using ICLEI’s Clean Air and Climate Change (CACP) software.
• Other tools and strategies include Climate Action Plans, fleet vehicle reductions and greenhouse gas emission studies.

Question 9: Waste Reduction & Recycling
The most commonly adopted strategies and techniques include recycling programs, third party tracking of waste and recycling rates, local government waste policies and audit reports. Outreach and awareness efforts are used to increase the level of adoption of waste reduction techniques such as recycling.

Question 10: Smart Growth and Planning
Many respondents noted the most appropriate tool or approach to implement smart growth and planning is through the incorporation of principles in building and planning ordinances, particularly in the city’s General Plan. Many cities indicated they have already updated their General Plans to incorporate smart growth principles.

Question 11: Smart Transportation
• Strategies cited by respondents included city-wide bicycle and transportation master plans, and tools that have been developed and implemented by third-party state and regional agencies.
APPENDIX A
Survey Form

California Sustainability Alliance

2009 Sustainability Indicators Survey

1. On a scale of 1 to 5 please rate the following statements for your jurisdiction in terms of not at all true (1) to very true (5)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>There is strong community support in your jurisdiction for sustainability efforts.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is strong leadership support in your jurisdiction for sustainability efforts.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Your government has the internal capacity to address sustainability efforts.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Please select the appropriate timeframe for the sustainability programs that you currently have in place in your local government. If you do not currently have one of these programs in place, please select the answer "0 years."

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>0 years</th>
<th>1 to 2 years</th>
<th>3 to 5 years</th>
<th>5 to 10 years</th>
<th>More than 10 years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Green Building Ordinance</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green Building Incentives</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Energy Action Plan</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Climate Action Plan</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenhouse Gas Inventory</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Composting Program</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative Transportation Plan</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smart Growth Incentives</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. For the following categories, please rank in order (1-7) the order of importance for achieving community sustainability. You can only select one rank per category (for example, you can select the ranking 1 for energy efficiency, you cannot use the ranking 1 for any other category).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Energy Efficiency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Efficiency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renewable Energy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenhouse Gas Reductions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waste Reduction and Recycling</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smart Growth and Planning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smart Transportation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. On a scale of 1 to 5 please indicate how much progress you are making towards improvement within each of the following categories in terms of not at all (1) to very much (5).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Energy Efficiency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Efficiency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renewable Energy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenhouse Gas Reductions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waste Reduction and Recycling</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smart Growth and Planning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smart Transportation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Currently, local governments are measuring or tracking environmental indicators in their communities using a wide range of tools. Some of these tools are well-suited to this task, some are not. For some indicators (e.g., energy efficiency), tools are well developed, while for some (e.g., land use planning), tools may be quite limited. Additionally, many tools are designed to track indicators but provide limited ability to facilitate planning and decision-making. Such an environment limits the ability of local governments to effectively manage sustainability efforts across their communities.

We are interested in hearing about the tools you are using and how all these are meeting your needs. Our goal is to use this information to create a more comprehensive and easily utilized tool that allows you to more effectively measure your progress and identify the steps you can take to move forward.

For each of the following categories (questions 5-11), please describe what tools (if any) you are using to track your progress and please tell us what improvements would make these tools more useful to you.

**ENERGY EFFICIENCY:**

**WATER EFFICIENCY:**

**RENEWABLE ENERGY:**

**GREENHOUSE GAS REDUCTIONS:**
9. For the category WASTE REDUCTION AND RECYCLING, please describe what tools (if any) you are using to track your progress and please tell us what improvements would make these tools more useful to you.

WASTE REDUCTION AND RECYCLING:

10. For the category SMART GROWTH AND PLANNING, please describe what tools (if any) you are using to track your progress and please tell us what improvements would make these tools more useful to you.

SMART GROWTH AND PLANNING:

11. For the category SMART TRANSPORTATION, please describe what tools (if any) you are using to track your progress and please tell us what improvements would make these tools more useful to you.

SMART TRANSPORTATION:

12. Would you like more information on how to participate in the sustainability indicators pilot program?

[YES] [NO]

13. Contact Information

Name
Title
Organization
Email address

Submit
APPENDIX B

Respondents by Region and Population

Figure B-1 - Geographic Distribution of Survey Respondents
## Table B-1 – List of Cities that Participated in the Survey

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alameda</td>
<td>72,259</td>
<td>Loomis</td>
<td>6,260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Canyon</td>
<td>9,774</td>
<td>Manhattan Beach</td>
<td>36,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anderson</td>
<td>9,022</td>
<td>Manteca</td>
<td>49,258</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Angels</td>
<td>3,500</td>
<td>Mission Viejo</td>
<td>93102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atascadero</td>
<td>26,411</td>
<td>Mountain View</td>
<td>70,708</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bakersfield</td>
<td>247,057</td>
<td>Oakland</td>
<td>399,484</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beaumont</td>
<td>11,384</td>
<td>Ontario</td>
<td>158,007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berkeley</td>
<td>102,743</td>
<td>Orland</td>
<td>6,281</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brea</td>
<td>35,410</td>
<td>Palm Desert</td>
<td>41,155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calabasas</td>
<td>20,033</td>
<td>Palmdale</td>
<td>116,670</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carlsbad</td>
<td>78,247</td>
<td>Paradise</td>
<td>26,408</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chico</td>
<td>59,954</td>
<td>Piedmont</td>
<td>109,52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citrus Heights</td>
<td>85,071</td>
<td>Port Hueneme</td>
<td>23,201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concord</td>
<td>121,780</td>
<td>Porterville</td>
<td>39,615</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Costa Mesa</td>
<td>108,724</td>
<td>Redlands</td>
<td>63,591</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cupertino</td>
<td>50,546</td>
<td>Redwood City</td>
<td>75,402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delano</td>
<td>38,824</td>
<td>Rolling Hills Estates</td>
<td>7,676</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dixon</td>
<td>17,531</td>
<td>San Gabriel</td>
<td>39,804</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dublin</td>
<td>29,973</td>
<td>San Jose</td>
<td>894,943</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Centro</td>
<td>133,559</td>
<td>San Juan Capistrano</td>
<td>34,621</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Escondido</td>
<td>37,835</td>
<td>San Leandro</td>
<td>79,452</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eureka</td>
<td>26,128</td>
<td>San Luis Obispo</td>
<td>44,174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Folsom</td>
<td>65,611</td>
<td>San Mateo</td>
<td>92,482</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fort Bragg</td>
<td>7,026</td>
<td>Santa Barbara</td>
<td>92,325</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fullerton</td>
<td>126,003</td>
<td>Santa Maria</td>
<td>77,423</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glendora</td>
<td>194,973</td>
<td>Santa Monica</td>
<td>84,084</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glendora</td>
<td>49,415</td>
<td>Santa Rosa</td>
<td>147,595</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Terrace</td>
<td>11,626</td>
<td>Sausalito</td>
<td>7,330</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grass Valley</td>
<td>10,922</td>
<td>Seal Beach</td>
<td>24,157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hermosa Beach</td>
<td>18,566</td>
<td>Simi Valley</td>
<td>111,351</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hesperia</td>
<td>62,582</td>
<td>South Gate</td>
<td>96,375</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hillsborough</td>
<td>10,615</td>
<td>South Lake Tahoe</td>
<td>23,609</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hollister</td>
<td>34,413</td>
<td>Sunnyvale</td>
<td>131,760</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huntington Beach</td>
<td>189,594</td>
<td>Tiburon</td>
<td>8,666</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imperial Beach</td>
<td>26,411</td>
<td>Vacaville</td>
<td>88,625</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irvine</td>
<td>143,072</td>
<td>Ventura</td>
<td>100,916</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lancaster</td>
<td>118,718</td>
<td>Vista</td>
<td>89,857</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larkspur</td>
<td>12,014</td>
<td>Woodland</td>
<td>49,151</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## APPENDIX C

### Types of Barriers Cited by Survey Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Barrier</th>
<th># Responses</th>
<th>Sample Statements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Financial Funding        | 25          | • “The lack of funding to create the framework that is necessary is the city’s biggest program. Also, the decline in revenue is causing employee reduction.”  
                             |             | • “Cost barriers- they need to come up with programs to help pay for the costs.”  
                             |             | • “Initial costs of installing systems and lack of funding.”  
                             |             | • “Costs to business and property owners.”  
                             |             | • “There is no funding mechanism to encourage people to upgrade.”  
                             |             | • “All cities have guiding documents (zoning code, General Plan, parking ordinances, housing elements) and whenever cities are updating, it’s a huge task and cities are trying to survive rather than optimize. It would be good for cities to be able to apply for grants during this updating process. That money would be specifically used for greening. This could result in strong model language.” |
| Education/Information    | 15          | • “It is difficult to get the message out to the people. There are not a lot of outlets for mass messages.”  
                             |             | • “Need more education for staff.”  
                             |             | • “Improve the learning process (i.e. when things become available and when they can be used). We are a small city, so it is difficult to find solutions.”  
                             |             | • “Having access to appropriate tools that would move [renewable energy] projects forward. Also, there is a lack of understanding regarding available tools.”  
                             |             | • “The city hasn’t studied this aspect [transit]. We don’t understand how it would benefit the city.” |
| Program Assistance       | 14          | • “The city needs tools.”  
                             |             | • “There is currently no program.”  
                             |             | • “[Need tools] that are more location specific and it is not easy to capture the community’s attention.”  
                             |             | • “The city does not have the same skill set for the process (as ICLEI) and it is a very rigorous process.”  
                             |             | • “ICLEI does not apply to every local government and is not something that can be replicated.”  
                             |             | • “What are the modeling tools at the community level- related to a General Plan rather than just a project?” |
| City Conditions          | 11          | • “Limited options because they are built out.”  
                             |             | • “All ideals of smart growth and planning are high priorities of the city, but the city experiences very little growth.”  
                             |             | • “Small town and limited resources.”  
<pre><code>                         |             | • “Most of the city’s system was put in during the 30’s and 40’s. We need...” |
</code></pre>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Barrier</th>
<th># Responses</th>
<th>Sample Statements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Staff &amp; Time</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>“Staff capacity limitations (for developing plans) and time (for technical analysis), how to take advantage of staff experience, and how to build technical support in the community.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaboration</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>“It is difficult to get transportation services within the city to be on the same page. Need to conduct collaborative, long range, progressive collaboration between the cities and regional agencies that is supplemented with funding.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>“Meeting regional goals will require cooperation with adjacent regional cities and counties.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>“The city currently does not have much control over private property.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>“The development company always wants to do things that benefit them. The city doesn’t want to lose the development income.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legislature</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>“Not knowing state requirements is delaying the progress of work. What are the targets they are shooting for? What effect will these targets have on planning?”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>“Clarify SB 375 and then we will know what we need to do.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>“Lack of information on AB 32. We don’t know what cities are required to do (undetermined thresholds and requirements).”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>“Not ready for mandates of AB 32, only ready for voluntary ideas.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Track and Report</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>“The city needs to do a better job of tracking and reporting.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Priorities</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>“Sustainability is not a priority.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>“There are competing priorities.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Attitude</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>“Not very well received in the city [high density, compact development].”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>“We can’t change the behavior that people will and want to hop in a car.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>“There is no fiscal incentive for people to make upgrades [energy efficiency].”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX D

Description of Tools and Strategies Cited by Respondents

AB32, see Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006 (AB32)

Alternative transportation plans generally involve adopting strategies and actions to encourage residents and workers to adopt public transit.

American Public Works Association Tools. The American Public Works Association (APWA) is an international educational and professional association of public agencies, private sector companies, and individuals dedicated to providing high quality public works goods and services. With a membership of 29,000, the APWA has developed tools and resources on a range of issues including facility and grounds management, utilities and water issues. More information can be obtained from the APWA website: www.apwa.net

Building codes/ordinances generally specify and enforce the minimum building standard codes (incorporating local and state standards) for commercial (office, industrial, retail) and residential projects within the city or county’s jurisdiction. Recently, green building ordinances, usually applied via city resolution, have been enacted to address resource efficiency and sustainable development/construction practices. These green building ordinances must also incorporate state-based building codes pertaining to energy-efficiency (such as Title 24, California State Energy Regulations).

“Carbon Calculator” is a carbon footprint calculator, developed by CoolCalifornia.org (a partnership of California based Government Agencies, Universities, and Next10, a nonprofit organization) and aimed at providing the tools to help reduce carbon emissions. More information can be obtained from the website at: www.coolcalifornia.org/article/calculator

California Climate Action Registry Tools. The California Climate Action Registry is a private non-profit organization originally formed by the State of California. The California Registry serves as a voluntary greenhouse gas (GHG) registry to protect and promote early actions to reduce GHG emissions by organizations. The California Registry has developed GHG reporting standards and tools for organizations to measure, monitor, and third-party verify and reduce their GHG emissions consistently across industry sectors and geographical borders. A range of these tools include:

- Protocols - guides to measure GHG emissions accurately and consistently. There is a General Reporting Protocol that most organizations use, but the California Registry has also developed industry specific protocols including cement, forest, local government operations and power/utilities companies.

- Climate Action Registry Reporting Online Tool (CARROT) is the California Registry’s greenhouse gas emission calculation and reporting software. CARROT uses built-in emission factors and conversion factors to automate calculation of GHG inventories and improve consistency and comparability. Users input annual energy usage data (i.e. kWh of electricity, or MMBTUs of natural gas) and CARROT calculates the associated GHG emissions.
• Verification Protocols through the utilization of a standardized approach for the verification process to promote completeness, consistency, accuracy, relevancy and transparency of emissions data.

More information can be obtained from the California Registry’s website: www.climateregistry.org

Commute/Traffic software include a range of tools and approaches designed to capture levels of pedestrian, commuter and vehicle activities within a designated route.

“Dial-a-Ride” program refers to transit assistance programs that provide a range of services such as curb-to-curb and demand response services aimed generally at elderly persons or persons with disabilities.

Energy Star and Energy Star Portfolio Manager. Energy Star is a joint program of the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA) and the U.S. Department of Energy (USDOE). USEPA developed and manages an energy performance rating system that is used throughout the U.S. Energy Star, through its Portfolio Manager Software, applies a national energy performance rating, or benchmark on a scale of 1-100, to help energy managers assess how efficiently their buildings use energy, relative to similar buildings nationwide. Buildings that receive a rating of 75 or more are recognized with an Energy Star plaque, indicating they are among the top 25% of facilities in the country with respect to energy performance. Energy Star includes consideration of both energy and water in its rating. More information can be obtained from the EnergyStar website: www.energystar.gov.

SmartWaySM is a stakeholder based program that represents environmentally cleaner, more fuel efficient transportation options, through the promotion of products and services that reduce transportation-related emissions. Launched in 2004 by the US Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA), SmartWaySM partnership efforts have helped participants develop optimal transport-related solutions, cost savings and efficiencies, and emission reductions. More information can be obtained from the SmartWaySM website: www.epa.gov/smartway.

ESCO (Energy Service Company) software provided by third-party companies that measure the level of energy consumption for a given use.

Fare box counting program involves the counting of ticketed fares on installed transit modes (such as buses, street and cable cars, light rail).

Geographic Information System (GIS) refers to the capture, measurement, analysis and presentation of data and information based on geographic location.

Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006 (AB32) is a California based target requiring that the state take measures to reduce its carbon emissions to 1990 levels by 2020.
**Green Building Incentives** encourage developers to exceed the minimum mandatory provisions and voluntarily adopt green measures for their projects. These can take the form of non-financial incentives such as expedited approval processes to financial incentives such as fee waivers and city based rebates. Other planning related incentives can take the form bonus floor ratio and height increase bonuses.²

**Green Task Force or Sustainability/Energy Committee**, usually within the city or county government.

**Greenhouse Gas Inventory** is the accounting of the amount of greenhouse gases discharged by the jurisdiction into the atmosphere. Local governments may undertake an assessment of their city/county related activities or adopt a more comprehensive approach, accounting citywide residential and commercial greenhouse gas discharges.

**ICLEI Membership.** ICLEI-Local Government for Sustainability (formerly known as the International Council for Local Government Environmental Initiatives) is a global association of approximately 1,100 city and county jurisdictions that have made a commitment to sustainable development. Founded in 1990, ICLEI works with members through international performance-based, results-oriented campaigns and programs. More information can be obtained from ICLEI’s website: [www.iclei.org](http://www.iclei.org)

**ICLEI Software (Clean Air and Climate Protection – CACP)** is an emissions management tool that calculates and tracks emissions and reductions of greenhouse gases (carbon dioxide, methane, nitrous oxide) and criteria air pollutants (NOx, SOx, carbon monoxide, volatile organic compounds, PM10) associated with electricity, fuel use, and waste disposal. More information can be obtained from the CACP website: [www.icleiusa.org/cacp](http://www.icleiusa.org/cacp)

**Keep America Beautiful tools** including Waste in Place, Toolbox for Community Change, and Clean Sweep USA aim to promote awareness and outreach efforts based on litter prevention, waste reduction, reuse, recycling and community beautification. These tools and approaches have been developed by Keep America Beautiful, a non-profit organization with the overall mission to combine education with hands-on stewardship to make communities across the United States cleaner, greener, and more livable. More information can be obtained from the Keep America Beautiful website: [www.kab.org](http://www.kab.org)

**LEED Certification.** The U.S. Green Building Council’s Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design (LEED®) Green Building Rating System™ was established to encourage and accelerate global adoption of sustainable green building and development practices through the creation and implementation of universally understood and accepted tools and performance criteria.³ There are four types of LEED® ratings that could be applied to various types and aspects of commercial office buildings:

---

- **LEED® for New Construction and Major Renovations** is designed to guide and distinguish high-performance commercial and institutional new construction projects.

- **LEED® for Existing Buildings: Operations & Maintenance** provides a benchmark for building owners and operators to measure operations, improvements and maintenance. The majority of green leasing activities will fall under this designation as it applies to the existing building stock.

- **LEED® for Commercial Interiors** is a benchmark for the tenant improvement market that allows tenants to control the certification process, realizing that they will not always have full control of other building programs and operations.

- **LEED® for Core & Shell** aids designers, builders, developers and new building owners in implementing sustainable design for new core and shell construction. This rating is complementary to the Commercial Interiors program and acknowledges that speculative developers will not have full control of the entire facility build out.

Within each of these ratings, there are increasing scores – Certified, Silver, Gold and Platinum - based on the degree of sustainability measures that are implemented. More information can be obtained from the USGBC website: [www.usgbc.org](http://www.usgbc.org).

**National Recycling Coalition tools** such as the *Recycling Calculator* help to provide participants with a measurable quantity of waste recycled and reduced that facilitate target setting and strategies that promote further waste recycling/reduction. The National Recycling Coalition (NRC) is a national non-profit advocacy group with members that span all aspects of waste reduction, reuse and recycling in North America. Established in 1978, the NRC represents advocates from every region of the country, in every sector of the waste reduction field. Local recycling coordinators, state and federal regulators, corporate environmental managers, environmental educators and advocates, consumers and waste management professionals are all members of NRC. More information can be obtained from the NRC website: [www.nrc-recycle.org](http://www.nrc-recycle.org).

**Planning Documents (including General, Master, Smart Growth)** are city and county planning policies and plans that define the type, extent and location of permissible uses of growth and development with the jurisdiction.

**Reports** can be any of a broad array of reports, such as solid waste and recycling reports from collector sources (city/county or contractor collectors) to ascertain the level of adoption from residential, commercial and industrial users.

**Tracking rebates, incentives, or permits** through records and databases to ascertain the level of adoption.

**Tracking distribution of efficient equipment** (e.g. low-flow shower heads, compact fluorescent lighting, etc.) usually through databases of equipment and fittings that are distributed to residential and commercial customers.
Transit-Orient Development (TOD) Strategy is aimed at the development and creation of mixed-use spaces (incorporating commercial and residential uses) that maximize the use of public transit. It encourages the use of public transit through close proximity to transit facilities, pedestrian and bicycle links, and reduced car parking opportunities (often incorporated in planning ordinances) that facilitate greater utilization for pedestrian accessibility to transit facilities.

Transit ridership programs offered by state and regional transportation boards such as the California Department of Transportation, MPO, and other County and Regional Boards

Utility/third-party/In-house energy and water audits generally involve the detailed accounting of all energy or water use at a given site, consisting of both internal and external uses, and details about where efficiencies can be achieved.

Utility bill energy/ water consumption metering/ internal records measure and track usage over a defined period of time.

Waste audit reports from state and municipal waste agencies such as the California Integrated Waste Management Board (CIWMB) and other regional/district waste agencies address the extent of waste produced and collected from a local government/county jurisdiction and reduction/landfill diversion strategies aimed at reducing the proportion of landfill waste.

‘Way-To-Go’ and ‘Safe Roads to School’ outreach program are school targeted programs aimed at encouraging school traffic reduction through the promotion of active transportation strategies with the goal of reducing vehicle trips and create safer traffic environments around schools.
APPENDIX E

Narrative Responses to Question 2

Question 2a: Green Building Ordinances

Small Jurisdictions:

- Our city has a civic green building (GB) ordinance. The city council will review and discuss a potential residential GB ordinance in their next meeting. The city adopted a voluntary GB guideline based on Alameda County Waste Management. Currently, the city has self-certification program (voluntary) for all city wide developments.

- Our city is in the process of developing a green building(GB) ordinance or equivalent. We just formed a green team and are looking at ways for the city to update zoning and building codes to make it easier for developers to adhere to the current GB standards that the city now has in place. Current GB standards are based on LEED. In our new GB ordinance/effort, we will include some or all LEED standards. They will also definitely include GB incentives.

- Although our city does not have a GB ordinance, it does provide voluntary GB guidelines for commercial and residential sectors. Our program has been around for about 2 years.

- Our city is a member of Build It Green and Energy Coalition.

- We adopted Build It Green standards.

- Our city is hoping to have a green building ordinance in place by 2010; working off of California Green Building Codes.

- We think it is difficult for each city to develop individual green building ordinances as these ordinances become inconsistent and complex. We support a statewide approach to GB. The city collects its building permit fee and passes it onto the state for use to refine the state GB code.

- Our city adopted a GB ordinance 2 years ago; based on the Build It Green guideline and the City of Irvine’s GB guidelines. Our city is also working with our chamber of commerce to establish a green business program..

Medium Jurisdictions:

- The city is looking at GB principles; whether this effort will result in a program or ordinance will remain to be seen.

- Will go into effect August 1, 2009.

- Our city is in the mist of drafting a GB ordinance. We have examined what other cities have done. Our city has a building code for energy and water conservation. The GB ordinance will probably be adopted by this year. Our city also focuses on how to get residents to adopt GB measures in their homes and businesses. Soon, we will have LEED Gold required for city facilities and LEED Silver
equivalent required for all big commercial facilities. Our city council approved this and our city is in the process of developing the ordinance.

- Our city hall and library are pretty close to being LEED certified.
- We have GB language in our General Plan; only required for 5,000 sq ft+ of municipal new construction (which there has been none since implementation).
- We implemented state building codes, Title 24.

**Large Jurisdictions:**

- We are updating our zoning ordinance in the next year or two.
- Recommendation for LEED silver for city buildings.
- We have existing GB ordinances for city buildings- debating GB ordinances for private development.
- Voluntary Green Building Ordinances are expected to be made mandatory within the year. All buildings are to comply with LEED or Build it Green.

**Question 2b: Green Building Incentives**

**Small Jurisdictions:**

- The city lowered its building permit fees for solar installations (2 years ago), and the city is part of the Solar City Program.
- The city has a fee waiver for solar PV installations. It also provides free technical assistance for solar PV. It is also about to pass an ordinance that allows for small wind turbines. The city does a lot to raise awareness of renewable energy in the community through workshops.
- The city adopted Build It Green standards.
- The city provides flat fees for solar PV as opposed to having different prices based on system grades.
- The city does not have any green building incentives especially because of the state of the economy, but we refer people to utilities that have incentive programs.
- The city does not have any official incentives, but the green building developers do get recognition at city council meetings. The city also has a solar energy incentive program that offers reduced permit fees for solar projects.

**Medium Jurisdictions:**

- All cities within the county worked with the local utility to offer fee waiver for installations of insulation and solar PV. We offer priority processing for developments planning LEED certification.
- The city has a waiver for solar permit fees for its residents. Aside from that, the city does not really have other GB incentives.
- Expedited reviews for green building applications.
• New construction needs to provide a checklist of LEED elements when applying for permit, but are not required to be certified or to comply. However, the checklist is considered in permit processing. Also, our planning department has open counseling for free technical assistance.

Large Jurisdictions:
• The city is considering it.

Question 2c: Climate Change Action Plan

Small Jurisdictions:
• The city will be forming an energy committee, and they are soliciting nominations for that right now. This formation came about because of AB32 requirements that were released late last year. A Climate Action Plan will be developed by the energy committee.
• The city expects completion of an action plan by summer 2009.
• We just completed our first milestone - inventory emissions - and now we are setting targets.
• We are receiving assistance from ICLEI and the South Bay Cities Council of Governments. Work will begin soon with an estimated completion by 2009.
• Work is ongoing currently- expected to be done in the next 6 months.
• Going through ICLEI, work to be done by end of 2009.

Medium Jurisdictions:
• In process now.
• Currently drafting- modeling after ICLEI.
• Updating General Plan next year and also the city is annexing 3600 acres which requires an EIR- this document discusses Energy Action Plan.
• The city is considering a GHG inventory.
• The city’s energy subcommittee is working to develop a Climate Action Plan based on the GHG emissions inventory that was completed in 2007. The Public Works Department put out an RFP for an energy audit of its facilities in order to see what types of energy conservation/efficiency measures they can adopt.
• The city expects to complete its Climate Action Plan by the end of 2009.
• EEGBG grant is in planning stage for Climate Action Plan.
• Referred to as the Sustainability Initiatives Plan; in 2008 the Sustainable Initiative Plan was approved by council. This is the city’s version of a Climate Action Plan. It establishes GHG, goals, what needs to be targeted, energy audits, water and energy efficiency and steps that need to be taken..
**Large Jurisdictions:**
- The Climate Action Plan is currently being updated.
- General Plan update includes a Climate Action Plan with sustainability policies.
- Slated to be completed by end of 2009.
- The city’s Climate Action Plan applies to municipal facilities only.

**Question 2d: Greenhouse Gas Inventory**

**Small Jurisdictions:**
- Just started a partnership with PMC and received support from the council to join ICLEI.
- The city recently completed its greenhouse gas inventory.
- Working with PMC for completion by the end of 2009.
- The greenhouse gas inventory applied to municipal facilities only.

**Medium Jurisdictions:**
- The city’s greenhouse gas inventory will be completed in a couple of months.
- We are working with our local council of governments to develop a greenhouse gas inventory.
- A greenhouse gas inventory will be part of the city’s General Plan update.
- A greenhouse gas inventory will be included in the EIR of our General Plan.
- It will be complete within a year.
- It will be done in a couple of weeks.
- A Masters student from a local university recently completed a greenhouse gas inventory for the city as part of his thesis.
- We have completed a 2008 baseline inventory.

**Large Jurisdictions:**
- The city is a member of the Climate Action Registry.
- The city conducted a greenhouse gas inventory in 1997.

**Question 2e: Composting Program**

**Small Jurisdictions:**
- Our city is about to roll out a pilot composting program in fall 2009.
• Our city has subsidized a residential curbside composting/green waste bin program. Our city also has a green waste diversion pile at a transfer station where residents pay half of the fee for disposing of regular garbage.

• Our city just submitted a grant to develop a composting program. We have held workshops to promote composting in the community.

Medium Jurisdictions:
• Our city is about to roll out a pilot composting program in fall 2009.
• There is a pilot for local businesses but not residents.
• Large projects must mitigate.
• A portion of green waste goes to composting.

Large Jurisdictions:
• Composting programs have been very successful over the years.
• Our city has curbside composting/trash separation.
• All residents have curbside green waste collection.

Question 2f: Alternative Transportation Plan

Small Jurisdictions:
• Our city is not really close to any rail systems; it does contract with a vendor to have a bus system for its resident. The city also has a bike plan.

Medium Jurisdictions:
• The city has a bicycle master plan.
• The city incorporated an alternative transportation plan into its last updated General Plan.
• Our city is currently revisiting this issue.
• The city has a Park and Ride program.
• Funding bus rapid transit, single priority and dedicated lanes.
• There is a specific plan within the city’s main commercial corridor.
• Various policies and incentives encourage public transport/carpooling including parking waivers etc.
• The city has access to a regional multi-use trail system, with bike racks at bus stops.
Large Jurisdictions:
• The city has a trails master plan; mass transit with two stations in town; in-city bus routes.
• Part of the update to the General Plan is a bicycle master plan.
• We have a Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan but no mass transit plan.

Question 2g: Smart Growth Incentives

Small Jurisdictions:
• The city does not have any formal programs for smart growth incentives but it is developing agreements with developers where they can negotiate certain conditions such as smart growth.
• The city has incorporated incentives into the Housing element.

Medium Jurisdictions:
• The city offers a density bonus.
• The city incorporated smart growth into its last updated General Plan.
• Eight smart growth areas have been identified and will be incorporated into the General Plan update – this is a regional effort.
• "Tons" in redevelopment, promoting infill, doing mixed use, lots of dollars into connectivity and walkability, huge revitalization project, open space.
• The city has a Downtown Smart Growth Plan.
• The city has incorporated award winning Transit Oriented Development.
• There is not much growth within the city.

Large Jurisdictions:
• Currently there are some specific plans and some big development projects with impact fees.

Question 2h: Renewable Energy Program

Small Jurisdictions:
• Our city worked with utility energy management and retrofitted city buildings.
• The city developed a solar ordinance.
• Reduced fees for renewable energy permits.
• The city is looking into promoting the installation of solar PV systems in the community. The city is looking at AB811 and what another city has done for this effort.
Medium Jurisdictions:
- The city sources 30% renewable energy from hydro project where the energy is captured through the aqueduct.
- We will be looking into it.
- We are exploring opportunities for cogeneration.
- Looking at AB 393 goals.
- We dealt with this through the utility companies waiving fees for solar installation 2008.
- We are establishing solar goals.
- Voluntary implementation of solar within city and residential.
- Looking at solar in the upcoming energy/ climate plan.

Large Jurisdictions:
- The city is looking into this but is concerned about the lack of marketability.
- The city implemented a successful pilot program of solar for 40 houses.
- Adopting in mid-May a solar first incentive. We have solar on some city facilities.
- Currently applying for grants and applying for solar power plant (application at CPUC).
Appendix F

Narrative Responses to Question 4

Question 4a: Energy Efficiency

Small Jurisdictions:

- The city has been retrofitting city hall and street lights.
- Our city hall is LEED Certified.
- Our city retrofitted old windows to EE window film.
- A lot of the low hanging fruit has been taken care of in the city (e.g. lighting and plumbing fixture retrofits). Our city is investigating cost-benefit analysis to invest in more costly measures. This will probably be done jointly with the GHG emissions inventory and climate/energy action plan development.
- All city facilities have been energy audited, and city hall has had its lights retrofitted. The city is looking into conducting the lighting retrofits for other facilities. The city is waiting to get funds from the stimulus grant to conduct the audits. The city is also partnering with our utility to get funds for audits and retrofits also. The city also has fluorescent bulb exchange and Christmas exchanges (LED) for our community. The city is piloting a LED streetlights program.

Medium Jurisdictions:

- Because the city owns their own municipal buildings, energy efficiency has been a program they have long invested in.
- Major switch outs/ upgrades in municipal facilities; changed streetlights (resulting in 20% savings in energy costs of the city).
- The city established an energy committee that looked into GHG and energy action measures.

Large Jurisdictions:

- “We are just trying to understand the new legislation, playing catch up.”
- Three years ago they won 4th Best in State for Energy Efficiency; all new city buildings are LEED Silver.

Question 4b: Water Efficiency

Small Jurisdictions:

- They have currently developed a recycled water system.
- Right now the city is expanding recycling water lines and implementing smart irrigation controls.
• The city encourages water conservation measures to its residents. The billing system is based on usage so there is economic incentive for residents to conserve water.

• Parks have a bubbler and drip irrigation system.

• The city used to have only flat rate water systems for all its facilities and community. The city has been putting in a sophisticated water metering system that is almost complete. Using the new system, the city will be able to evaluate efficiency and proactively notify if they have a leak. The city has a grey water line that is being developed and will be used in parks and golf courses.

Medium Jurisdictions:
• The city is about to get an approved desalination plant that will be completed by 2011; 25% of water is from reclaimed water sources; the city is 100% water independent.

• Green Belt that was adopted in 1994 (annexed land for the purpose of wastewater plant).

• The city has its own water utility, lots of conservation, no formal program.

Large Jurisdictions:
• The city just adopted a strategic plan for 1% annual reduction; everything is metered, including all new apartments.

Question 4c: Renewable Energy

Small Jurisdictions:
• The city is looking into installing solar PV on some of its facilities.

• City Hall has solar PV.

Medium Jurisdictions:
• We are working on public facilities and getting hybrid cars in the city fleet.

• The city is researching possibilities.

• We are working on a plan as part of our proposal for reducing the city’s GHG inventory.

• Lots of solar panels are installed in the city (3 megawatts) and compressed natural gas for city vehicles.

Large Jurisdictions:
• 20% of all electricity sold will come from renewable wind, geothermal, sun, etc. by 2017- we are increasing our renewables goal to 23%.
Question 4d: Greenhouse Gas Reductions

Small Jurisdictions:

- The city did look into doing a GHG emissions inventory, but can’t afford right now.
- The city is keen on adopting a 5% reduction over three years just for city facilities. Baseline year not yet established, but will look into establishing a base year along with conducting a GHG emissions inventory and a Climate Action Plan/energy action plan within a year. As for conducting the inventory through ICLEI/CCAR/another party – the city is unsure. We will look into alternatives. The city has money to conduct a GHG emissions inventory but how we are going to conduct it (consultant, ICLEI, own staff, etc.), still remains to be investigated. (City budget will not get adopted until July, and inventory efforts will not really begin until fall/winter 2009).
- The city just obtained ICLEI’s CACP software. The city is not a member of ICLEI, but was able to obtain the software through EPA. EPA staff stated that as long as you are city, you are eligible to obtain the software. The city is trying to see how it will manage and use the software with such limited resources.

Medium Jurisdictions:

- We have adopted a 25% reduction goal and are far along on our Climate Action Plan; created a Sustainability Task Force.
- The city is awaiting state guidance.
- We are just getting started, other than education.

Large Jurisdictions:

- There is a current big issue with public works because they have a local landfill and are looking to extend its life.

Question 4e: Waste Reduction and Recycling

Small Jurisdictions:

- The city has banned Styrofoam and plastic bags.
- 75% of the waste stream is to be recycled by 2012. The city also distributes a recycling calendar to all residents. Lots of public outreach.
- The city has curbside recycling – free for both residential and commercial customers; also free oil and battery recycling and electronic waste recycling.
- The city in general has very little grass and green spaces so it does not generate a lot of green compost. Most compost comes from food. To increase the compost amount, the city is currently doing a pilot program with UCLA to capture food compost in restaurants. This pilot is still in its design stage. One of the main pushes for this pilot is to increase the city’s recycling rate to meet the county’s recycling target. Currently, the city’s recycling rate is only 30-35% mainly because city lacks grass
and green waste. It is fairly low compared to county’s target of 50%. That is why the city wants to conduct the restaurant composting pilot program. The city contracts with a company for recycling hauling.

- City facilities have recycling. A year and a half ago, the city started mandating curbside for residential sector.
- The city has far exceeded the state’s mandatory 50% recycling requirement (our city has curbside recycling).
- Our city adopted a zero waste resolution on 3/17/2009. The city is also supporting the state legislation that mandates producers to be responsible for their material. The city also has recycling programs for all is community sectors (plastic bags, horse shoes, horse manure, etc.). In 2008, the city diverted 70% of its solid waste.

**Medium Jurisdictions:**

- The city is trying to improve coordination with the county.
- The city offers composting classes (3 classes per year) for residents. The city also offers subsidies for composting and worm bins for its residents.
- The city has a strong recycling program through its waste management contractor; offers free recycling for residents and businesses.
- Curbside recycling program already exceeding 50% waste diversion.

**Large Jurisdictions:**

- Our city is only growing by about 100 people per year.

**Question 4f: Smart Growth and Planning**

**Small Jurisdictions:**

- The city is basically already built out because we are a very small city so everything is redevelopment and smart growth and infill and density. We have been doing this for the last 25 years.
- For city facilities: all of the city’s garbage trucks use CNG. The city is also expanding its hybrid and electric vehicles in its fleet. For our community, the city has a large network of multipurpose trails for pedestrians and bikes. Our city is also putting bike racks throughout the city.

**Medium Jurisdictions:**

- The city is fairly progressive in terms of sustainable land development, land use, but not really cutting edge on renewable energy and green building.
- There is concern of lack of development within the downtown region due to motivation and funding.
- Over the last two years, we have been working very hard with University students to develop a plan.
• We are reliant on the region and strongly support the Gold-Line. The transit authority does not want to provide funding to the east side.

• We are developing a program to better monitor the success of programs related to land use.

• The city really tries to encourage infill development. There is concern about where new homes will go as the region continues to grow.

• The city does not experience much growth.

**Large Jurisdictions:**

• The city has included some provisions since before the term “smart growth.”

• The General Plan mentions smart planning and growth.

• Smart growth is a priority, but our city has very little growth.

**Question 4g: Smart Transportation**

**Small Jurisdictions:**

• The city has free shuttles for its residents and all city fleet are either LNG or hybrid vehicles. These include city transit vehicles, buses, shuttles, and passenger vehicles. The city is very into pushing hard for alternative fuels. The city requires its contractors to use alternative fuels vehicles.

• The city provides on-call transportation services to residents (no bus stops, but rather “house to house” pick ups). The city is looking into expanding this program and also looking into expanding bike paths within the city and connecting to neighboring cities.

• The city has commute alternative program for city staff, where staff who use alternative transportation receive money.

• The city has limited transit services. The services that are provided are provided by the county. However, the city tries to promote cycling.

• The city has parking incentives for downtown to encourage more people to walk and not drive.

• The city does not have its own transportation service. Residents use the county’s bus system.

• The city is not close to any rail systems; it does contract with a vendor to have a bus system for its residents; the city also has a bike plan. The city is going to be expanding its bus routes. It is also looking into having a trolley connection with AMTRAK about 8 miles away in Oxnard. The city has had a bike plan for a long time. Also, the city has been buying hybrid vehicles, electric vehicles, basically modifying fleet to be energy efficient, but alternative fuel is difficult given the fleet mix they have.

**Medium Jurisdictions:**

• Funding is the overall barrier- the city does not know where to find the funds.
• The city has a ride sharing program and carpooling incentives for city staff. The city also uses CNG dial a ride vehicles for seniors.

**Large Jurisdictions:**
• Bike paths along the river, grey line bus.
APPENDIX G

Narrative Responses to Questions 5-11

QUESTION 5 - ENERGY EFFICIENCY

Small Jurisdictions:

- We are not using any tools to track this. CA Title 24 requires minimum levels of energy efficiency and all building permits comply. We could use a tracking tool if available.
- We have no energy programs.
- The city is working directly with our utility to reduce energy use in municipal buildings.
- We are in a partnership with our utility so that the city can measure community and municipal usage and obtain a baseline measurement. Improvements are needed, but the utility is the most quantifiable way right now and the city is unable to conduct this work.
- The city recently changed out all light fixtures in all city facilities and installed energy efficient lights. We coordinated with our utility and had a third party vendor come in and do the change outs. They should have records of the change outs.
- The city conducted an energy analysis for city hall window conversions. We should have tracking through that program.
- ICLEI software will help track a lot of energy efficiency efforts. The city has been a member of ICLEI for about 6-7 months. The city is in the midst of completing the inventory of GHG emissions (baseline year 2007).
- The city is monitoring progress before and after upgrades. Our GHG inventory measures energy efficiency (street lights, CFLs for city facilities). Our Climate Action Plan will include an implementation plan that will be used as a tool. Improvement: time (so many projects going on at once), local and/or regional workshops that bring people together and offer tools and share best practices and how to work together.
- The city is in the process of creating a General Plan update which includes a new sustainability element. This element will result in the development of new policies, goal and incentives for sustainability. Once the General Plan is updated, then more progress can be made. It is expected to be completed by the end of 2009. Improvement: funding and staff, ensuring compliance with Title 24.
- Building codes are used to ensure energy efficiency. Improvements: learning process - when things become available, they will be used. We are a small town with limited resources.
- The city gives away free Compact Fluorescent Lights (CFLs) to its residents. It tracks the number of CFLs that are given out and estimates the kWh saved. The city also reviews annual electricity and energy consumption. It uses ICLEI’s inventory to indirectly track energy efficiency.
- Green points questionnaire; electronic permitting program.
• We are exploring various programs including energy efficient street lights and traffic signals, solar panels with housing rehabilitation, solar city facilities, encourage solar with housing allocations, zoning ordinances.

• We support above-industry standards because they condition projects to be energy efficient, utility-based measures.

• The city facilities conducted energy benchmarking with the assistance of our utility (used Energy Star’s portfolio manager). This was conducted at the beginning of 2009 and was completed for three years of data. Additionally, the city worked with an outside contractor to have about 50% of its city facilities’ lighting retrofitted (done end of 2007). The contractor should have all the records.

• A third party tracks energy efficiency in city facilities by utility. Two to three years of energy consumption history are available.

• We are replacing traffic lights with LED lights throughout the city and looking at the amount of energy use being reduced. We are currently in the process of retrofitting city hall lighting and working with South Bay Cities Council of Governments to measure.

• We are working with a consultant to develop a database which will track this for our municipal operations. We are working with a separate consultant to develop a GIS-based tool to track community efforts. The municipal database will be an input to the community-wide tracking system.

• Our Building Department uses ordinances and Title 24 calculations.

Medium Jurisdictions:

• Our utility measures kWh.

• We are examining usage and then measuring year over year.

• GHG inventory and an energy audit have been conducted for municipal buildings. Improvement: programs where the city could partner with the utility because the city does not own its own utilities and so is limited in its options.

• The city is working on establishing a program to get everything going. We are working with various outside agencies. Improvements: funding these programs and getting these programs going.

• The city has initiated conversations with an energy auditing company (starting from 2005) to track our progress. The data is facility specific, rather than technology specific. The city is also working with an energy service company that is looking for possible energy technologies upgrades. Improvements: no tracking in the past - made it difficult to track improvements and see what needed to be improved. Our utility is now making these tools available, but staff needs to be trained on how to use these tools.

• The city has not been able to measure what it is doing because we are still in the policy formation stage and evaluating alternatives. The main tools will be the main subdivision and zoning ordinances. Improvement: the city wants to know “Where would we get the biggest bang for the buck?” Old development vs. new development- strategies, quantification of costs and benefits.
• We have a partnership with our utility to monitor energy use and conduct energy audits. The city has some large facilities that use a lot of energy. These facilities are being streamlined to be more efficient. Improvement: Funding, payback period investments (e.g., solar).

• Public Works just put out an RFP for conducting an energy audit, which requires the vendor to investigate potential energy efficiency/conservation measures for city facilities. The city also tracked energy efficiency using the ICLEI’s CACP software.

• We waive fees for energy efficiency improvements that require permits. The city is tracking progress through permits.

• Improvements: have a tool where you can enter all your completed energy efficiency projects and track their energy, GHG, and cost savings over time based on the ability to enter monthly or quarterly inputs, such as cost/kWh of electricity. For selecting the energy efficiency products/technologies to purchase, it would be great to have a database-driven online tool where you can select various types of technologies (e.g. thermal windows, solar hot water heaters, variable-speed drive motors, etc.) and see approximations for the relative cost, energy savings, GHG reductions, and payback of each.

• Rebates and incentives.

• We have an energy partnership agreement with our utility. Energy efficiency is measured through kWh reductions.

• We do not have a management tool. We are working with the utilities but it is not centralized. Improvement: Centralizing the system so we can upload our energy data into a software tool.

• The city is not utilizing any specific tools to measure progress in this area. We have, however, participated in energy audits for city facilities with our utility. The city has taken steps to implement some of utility’s recommendations for energy efficiency. The utility should have some records.

• Utilities measure energy. Improvements: if our utility used smart meters, this would allow residential and commercial customers to identify energy being used at any particular time.

• LEED certification. Improvements: continued effort to upgrade equipment with more energy efficient equipment.

• City facilities are tracked in-house by PG&E and we do energy audits together. We have replaced lighting with CFL’s in city buildings. There has been lots of outreach to conserve energy. We have doubled the number of alternative energy vehicles within the fleet.

• EnergyStar Portfolio Manager. We need easier access to utility data and data transfer tools. We also use Utility Manager by SMR.

• The city is partnering with investor owned utilities.

• We use a third party to conduct an audit every two years to assess our energy use.

• Utility data and CCAR reporting.
Large Jurisdictions:

- We encourage LEED certification for new buildings and strictly adhere to Title 24. We are also looking into doing an energy audit.
- Using the point of sale forces energy users to exceed Title 24. Improvements: funding to make it as easy as possible for people to implement energy efficiency (subsidies, rebates, outreach and education).
- Rely more on state building codes for energy efficiency.
- The city wants to do a local inventory so that they have a baseline (the city has not yet decided whether to do it in-house or not). Improvement: need tools and funding.
- The city has adopted aggressive goals to reduce energy. Three years ago, the city won fourth best for energy efficiency in the state. The city continues to win awards for our energy savings achievements. There is strong public knowledge due to outreach programs. Our goal is to reduce energy usage by 1% annually).
- Energy use intensity in buildings is an important benchmark. We are looking for suitable benchmarks for other uses such as parks and streetlights.
- We use the Energy Star Portfolio Manager. Improvements: it is difficult to coordinate with local utilities to get data (where energy is used, what energy, about buildings, etc). It would be beneficial to establish a protocol with the utilities to get the data that is specific to the city.
- Monitor utility bills.
- The city has adopted formal energy goals. We participate in the East Bay Energy Watch Program and so the city receives data on the energy performance of the city. GHG inventories provide data and allow the city to establish targets. Improvements: funding, staff capacity limitations (for planning), time (for technical analysis, how to take advantage of them, how to build support in the community).
- Tools include the EIR review process, efficiency equipment, roofing materials and landscaping. Improvements: tools are needed; also, there is a lack of information about AB 32—in this case we don’t know what cities are required to do (undetermined thresholds and requirements).
- Through building code updates, the city is currently partnering with the private sector and requiring them to incorporate energy efficiency into new construction. The city is working with energy providers to reduce energy consumption in public buildings.
- We are working with a consultant to develop a database that will track this for our municipal operations. We are working with a separate consultant to develop a GIS-based tool to track community efforts. The municipal database will be an input to the community-wide tracking system.
- By using baseline energy consumption in municipal operations and community-wide (obtained from power provider), we can track how effective our energy efficiency programs are.
- We have done reporting for and are a member of: Sustainable Silicon Valley, California Climate Registry, ICLEI.
• Monthly tracking of performance measures for energy efficiency objectives are called out in our General Plan.

**QUESTION 6 - WATER EFFICIENCY**

**Small Jurisdictions:**

• The water utility allows the city to track all building permits, and tankless water heaters can be tracked. New toilet installations are required to be low-flow, so are not tracked. Water bills and usage can be tracked through financial software and compared on a month-to-month, year-to-year basis.

• We track water usage through billing.

• The water company does free water audits and reviews water usage to target high water users. Annual garden tours are given as an educational tool for the community. Improvement: New landscape ordinance requiring drought-tolerant plants.

• The city is in contact with its water district. Upon request, the water district informs the city of the quantity (acre-feet) of water the city is using. The city monitors by checking with the water district, and does not really have its own tools.

• The city has a water system that tracks water usage.

• The city just installed digital water meters on all accounts in the city. These will help track water use a lot better.

• We are not required to have an Urban Water Management Plan; we measure progress through responses by the community and the measures they are taking, and the numbers of water efficiency programs. Improvement: create an Urban Water Management Plan. The city only has an interest during drought years; there are no fiscal incentives for people to make upgrades.

• Included in planning process, storm water management.

• Tools used are engineering and planning. The State Water Resources Control Board is the primary protection mechanism.

• The city uses reclaimed water at the city’s plant so it should have records of the amount of water that is reclaimed.

• Several measures - including Title 22 treated wastewater for re-use for irrigation for landscaping and for agriculture - require drought-tolerant landscaping, low flow toilets/fixtures, storm water detention and runoff practices to optimize recharge of groundwater (e.g. roof gutters to landscape swales). We partner with water agencies for education in-area about wise water use.

• Xeriscaping municipal areas.

• The city has reduced water usage in landscaped areas through Parks and Rec. and Water Works programs; however the City doesn’t really manage water. The City has adopted water quality standards (part of the countywide program- MMWD) and is involved in outreach and conservation
efforts. Also, there are building and code developments for all new buildings. Improvements: funding (high cost for services).

- SWWP Plan, best management practices and implementation that the town is working on with Department of Water Resources.
- Our county has a water advisory committee that monitors water constantly. The city uses those standards.
- Currently the city is not using any tools.
- Sophisticated water meters for all sectors, allows us to evaluate efficiency and proactively notify if there is a leak. 99% are almost installed, will be complete by August.
- We are working with our local water provider. We adopted a water conservation ordinance in February 2009 with different levels of water restrictions. The city recently completed audits of municipal buildings to determine where water use can be cut back.

Medium Jurisdictions:

- We look at city sales and the amount of water reclaimed every year. The city provides water audits. The city looks at how much the average house uses.
- Landscaping ordinances for native drought tolerant plants, sensitive irrigation technologies. Improvement: Currently looking into through the General Plan, AB 1881.
- The city has been working on a project to provide a water meter to each resident. This will take some time.
- The city works with two different water companies. Improvements: It has been difficult to obtain any information on water usage. There was no software program to manage data once it was accessed. There was no tracking of water costs over time. It has been a challenge to monitor conservation efforts (i.e., no tracking technologies, how to report leaks?). Public perception, goals and desires are more focused on aesthetics rather than on conservation. It is difficult to change the priorities of the residents.
- The city is developing a separate ordinance requiring that homes sold will be retrofitted with water efficient plumbing. Improvement: Most of the city’s system was installed during the 30’s and 40’s. They need to do studies to see if low flow works within the city’s infrastructure.
- The city has its own water agency. The city provides water to most of its residents. There are a lot of programs to minimize water use (outreach). The city has its own sewer treatment plant with about 9 mgd of used recycled water. Improvement: Regional Water Control Board and their denial of live stream discharge; also, finding sufficient customers to use recycled water.
- The city tracks water usage of all city facilities, its residents, and businesses through water meters. Based on water meter data, the city has developed water conservation measures for its residents (e.g. no watering in day, etc.).
- The city has a strong reclaimed water program.
• We compare potable water use between the current year and 2004, and between the current year and last year.

• We participate in, and publicize, the Santa Clara Valley Water District (SCVWD) conservation programs.

• We track water consumption for our biggest water users. Improvements: It would be helpful to get faster updates from the SCVWD regarding the participation levels of our water users in their programs. Even more important, though, is to be able to track more water users (or categories of water users). The software right now is not very user friendly (especially the “Business section”; the “new” billing system is better). Overall, more powerful and versatile software that helps analyze the data would be very helpful.

• Metered water at tiered rate, irrigation controllers. Improvement: Tools - Need a lot more work!

• Public works department reports.

• The city's water division measures efficiency through rates and usage. We also have a 6 mgd membrane recycled water plant. Improvements: Capital costs.

• We use recycled water from water treatment plant to water golf courses.

• Track per capita usage of water. Improvements: real time usage data would improve our tracking ability but it is extremely expensive to implement.

• Water conservation website is operated by the city. In prior years, the city has distributed to the public low flow shower devices and toilet tank kits (several hundred per year). We also have handheld water reader meters that measure the usage of water. Improvement: Some of this is paid for with grants, and the city is counting on these grants to continue. The website could also be improved.

• Utility data - need better data on consumption versus sewerage.

• Integration of waterless urinals; installation of new meters; ordinance for water conservation during droughts.

• The city has its own utility with an abundance of water. They have an over flow of 30% at over-capacity and the city is nowhere near over-capacity. The city does encourage water conservation and has set water limits- similar to Contra Costa.

• Reports from the irrigation district (annual basis) to determine water usage for municipal cities. Creating a landscaping ordinance to reduce water use on landscape. Improvement: Water barriers for private parties.

• Water metering will be used to identify how the city is doing. The city is installing the first phase of residential water meters. Commercial is already being metered. All water is groundwater so the city knows how much is being pumped. The city also looks at the amount of water going into wastewater and through pumps and the energy costs associated with water. Improvement: There are limited means to get the message out to people to conserve water. There are not a lot of outlets for mass messages.
Large Jurisdictions:

- Multiple water providers that encourage water meters. Almost all residential and commercial is on meters. We promote efficient irrigation and water-efficient landscaping. The city participates in a large water banking program. Improvements: The city has a lot of water and should do a better job about informing people about water waste. A lot of water conservation efforts have been voluntary.

- We included water conservation in our Point-of-Sale Ordinance. We need to couple programs with outreach and education. We partner with the East Bay Municipal Utility District. Improvements: Given the state of water resources, there will be more emphasis and a need for more funding and more staff.

- Through the development review process, zoning ordinance and other applications for new development. Improvements: Existing housing stock has not been yet been tackled.

- The water department measures usage through billing. The city will be revising its landscaping ordinance either through its own adaptation or through state model language. AB 1881, water conservation and landscaping act (January 1, 2010). Improvement: In terms of applying the ordinance, the city doesn’t have people on staff to review plans.

- All water is metered (except for apartments). All new apartments will be individually metered. The city is currently adopting a conservation plan to reduce 1% of water usage annually.

- Monitor water utility bills.

- Irrigation system, water heaters. Improvement: more guidance on AB32. There is a lack of information on AB 32- no established requirements.

- Our city has made lots of progress. We have introduced a new landscaping ordinance. The city also does a water audit for landscaping plans. We are also partnering with water agencies to create more groundwater storage and have been looking throughout the entire valley to find more basins and transportation methods. Improvements: The city is in lawsuits with water providers and farmers in the area.

- We are working with a consultant to develop a database that will track this for our municipal operations. We are working with a separate consultant to develop a GIS-based tool to track community efforts. The municipal database will be an input to the community-wide tracking system.

- BAWSCA data.

- The city uses a graphic to allow individual customers to gauge their water consumption, and is beginning to promote water conservation. The city can track consumption and determine effectiveness of programs and pricing tiers.

- Monthly tracking of performance measures for water efficiency objectives is specifically called out in the city’s General Plan.
QUESTION 7 – RENEWABLE ENERGY

Small Jurisdictions:

• Our utility allows us to track all building permits. Items such as solar panels can be tracked separately.

• Our Assistant City Manager is working with the utility for grant funding for solar installation. Improvement: Funding and any additional programs or assistance.

• There is not really much to measure currently. Improvement: The utility would probably help, similar to energy efficiency.

• The ICLEI software will help track a lot of the renewable energy measures.

• Through our Climate Action Plan and the implementation portion of it, and through projects that get grants or funding (i.e., biomass project). Improvement: More education for staff.

• Senior center carport solar panels.

• Title 24, building code. Solar water heaters are encouraged through government incentives. Improvement: Financial– too expensive and there are very limited incentives.

• Don’t have a specific tool besides tracking renewable energy through the permits that residents apply for to install renewable energy systems on their property.

• In the development phase.

• Currently the city is applying for solar energy grants. The city has adopted more liberal regulations for PV and solar, as well as reduced fees and minimized the review process for solar installations.

• Solar is required for new development.

• We are not currently tracking renewable energy.

• General Plan element and industry standards.

• The power doesn’t come from the city, it comes from the utility. So, whatever programs that come through are a result of the utility. The city cannot mandate renewable energy on private property, but it does facilitate implementation of state regulations.

• Promoting solar panel installation through reductions of permit and planning fees.

• We are looking at doing cogeneration at the water pollution treatment plant.

• Joint Powers Agreement with County Government.

Medium Jurisdictions:

• We are looking to other cities for guidance. Improvements: More information.

• We look at how much is generated. Improvement: The fit is terrible (need to make it more attractive-technology is not quite there).
Large solar array for water pollution control plant and a portion of the fleet is hybrid vehicles. We have conducted studies to determine other renewable energy opportunities for municipal operations. Improvement: More education and partnerships with utilities.

We are working on a program for expedited building permits for solar projects. Improvements: Initial costs of installing systems and lack of funding.

Some really good groups within the region have been collecting data and information. Improvement: A barrier is having access to the appropriate tools that would move renewable energy projects forward. Renewable energy is a very large investment and there is currently a lack of funding. There is also a lack of understanding.

Most projects will be City initiated projects. Improvements: Grants for installments, funding. How do they establish requirements/ incentives? Unknown effect for cost of housing. Larger incentives for solar.

This area is still evolving at a policy level.

Improvements: Have a tool where you can enter all your completed renewable energy projects and track their energy, GHG reductions and cost savings over time based on the ability to enter monthly or quarterly inputs, such as cost/kWh of electricity. For selecting the renewable energy products/technologies to purchase, it would be great to have a database-driven online tool where you can select various types of technologies (e.g. solar hot water, solar PV, wind turbines, etc.) and see approximations for the relative cost, energy savings, GHG reductions, and payback of each.

A cogeneration facility for landfill gas (500-600 kW per day).

Through building permits, the city tracks how many kW are being applied for and how many are being installed. Improvements: Model after another city’s successful program to promote solar projects.

Purchased alternative vehicles for city fleet. Working with utility to do solar hot water heating for the city’s Olympic sized pools.

We need better tracking from our permits department. Presently, solar is not easily charted or tracked, as it can be part of a combination permit.

The city has installed photovoltaic facilities and is pursuing funding for additional projects.

The city has voluntarily installed solar PV on City Hall and the Park and Ride facility. Many of the City’s fleet vehicles are compressed natural gas.

The City doesn’t control or have a way of gauging progress. The City is supporting businesses that operate or generate renewable energy.

Large Jurisdictions:

There are no ordinance restrictions to renewable energy. There have been some inquiries about wind generation but there may not be enough consistent wind resource in our area. Improvements: People may not have the structural capability to hold panels. There are a lot of older buildings in our city. For new buildings, this is not a problem. Solar is expensive.
We have just launched a program called “Smart Solar” where local energy service providers educate the community and couple with incentives. Improvements: Couple energy efficiency outreach with solar outreach.

Improvement: There is no funding mechanism to encourage people to do so.

The city is looking into the following issues: “How do we get solar on a project? How do we show that it is cost effective? How does the city encourage businesses to place solar on large roofs (e.g. part of a large grid?”? Improvements: need more data.

The city provides about $1.5 million annually in incentives to residences for solar installation. We have adopted a goal that 20% of all electricity sold will come from renewable sources. The city already has geothermal, solar and wind energy resources.

Percentage of energy that is renewable by energy type.

Agreements with solar generating facility developers and operators.

The City has an application pending to obtain a permit to build a solar and a gas hybrid power plant. So far, the City has paid for the application processing and purchased the property (cost $11 million).

Utility data, permitting information, state information.

We are working with a consultant to develop a database to track this for our municipal operations. We are working with a separate consultant to develop a GIS-based tool to track community efforts. The municipal database will be an input to the community-wide tracking system.

Monthly tracking of performance measures for renewable energy objectives is called out in our General Plan.

**QUESTION 8 - GREENHOUSE GAS REDUCTIONS**

**Small Jurisdictions:**

ICLEI is helping the city conduct our Community and Municipal GHG Inventories. However a new tool to assess different uses by individual items included or not in plans would be highly useful. For example, a proposed new industrial building for wine storage and distribution: how do we assess energy use based on HVAC needs (standard is to maintain 58 degrees constant temp) if assisted by "night air cooling" vs. traditional system, plus cool roof, plus solar panels (broken down by square footage amounts), plus lighting (per square foot) differentiated by motion lighting, choices of lighting technologies, etc, plus numbers of distribution trucks arriving and leaving site per day, plus amount of trees and landscaping onsite, plus other individual factors that would play into estimating what the GHG impacts of a project would be and how to achieve "carbon neutrality" or at least an "x" percent reduction from "business as usual". This would be highly useful - if we could input project features and it would add and subtract GHGs to get a net indicator for any particular site.

The city joined ICLEI. The local air board is very active in GHG emissions and they review all of the environmental documents. The air board has very strict regulations. The city inventory is expected to be completed by the end of summer 2009. Improvement: Funding - there has been some grant funding through the air pollution control district. We need more staff.
• Measure through fleet vehicles being reduced. Improvements: A program in which to plug numbers and calculate benefits (on-line would be great).

• ICLEI will help track of a lot of the city’s GHG emissions efforts.

• We recently audited our GHGs and are developing a Climate Action Plan that is estimated to be completed in 2009.

• New hybrids and replacing old gas engines; also changed the work week from five days to four days. Improvement: Create a more walkable community, get more funding.

• Smart growth and planning are used to obtain GHG reductions. The city adopted the Smart Growth Code in 2009. Improvement: Being a small city makes it difficult to find solutions (i.e., is public transportation practical?)

• The city is an ICLEI member and is therefore using ICLEI’s software to track and monitor GHG emissions. They are currently doing an inventory for municipal operations (2003 baseline yr). We have been a member since November 2006.

• Greenhouse gas emission studies.

• Zoning requirements for pedestrian/bike connections between properties. Need: A bike pedestrian master plan is being prepared by the Council of Governments. Issues to date: Fill existing gaps for sidewalks where unincorporated development islands are in City planning area, at hazardous railroad crossings on a drill track, money to expand off-street parking to facilitate re-use of upper floors for housing. Revise double standard with state mandates - must reduce greenhouse gases but state mandates a regional housing need in the General Plan housing element that will increase the percentage of workforce that commutes out of this county (about 50% today commute out). The regional planning agency is unwilling to explore a blueprint (SB32) scenario with increased local employment because it would not be consistent with their employment forecast. What is the point of the blueprint?

• In the development phase.

• Working with the Marin Climate and Energy Partnership (MCEP) to develop a Climate Action Plan. Working with other cities and municipalities to coordinate strategies.

• Improvements: SB 375 is an open book; we will wait and see.

• Nothing set out yet but there will be new policies within SB 375. These will include mitigation measures. Improvement: OPR draft guidelines.

• The Climate Action Plan is currently being developed.

• Although we are not an ICLEI member, we were able to obtain ICLEIs CACP software through the EPA. Depending on the availability of time and resources, the city will look into using this software to conduct its GHG emissions inventory.

• Inventory from the ICLEI model.
Medium Jurisdictions:

- ICLEI Model, quarterly reports, public-private partnerships. Improvements: Funding because the city can only sustain so much.

- The City Council adopted a goal of reducing emissions 25% by 2020. We have a Sustainability Task Force and are looking at developing a Climate Action Plan.

- The city is hoping to incorporate this into the General Plan. This is expected to happen within the next 12-18 months. Improvement: Cost, putting together a plan.

- Cupertino is currently working with ICLEI to create a framework to achieve GHG emissions. Programs implemented in the future will have the ability to be tracked. Improvement: The city does not have the same skill set for the process (as ICLEI) and it is a very rigorous process.

- Improvement: Not knowing state requirements is delaying the progress of work. What are the targets they are shooting for? What effect will these targets have on planning?

- The city used grants to modify public works vehicles (put extra filters on them). The city placed cool roofs on city buildings and revamped City Hall. The city has saved $200,000 dollars per year on energy costs.

- This is currently in process through the EIR process. This will result in a Climate Action Plan for the city within one or two years.

- Improvements: (1) Have a tool where you can enter all your completed energy efficiency projects and track their energy, GHG, and cost savings over time based on the ability to enter monthly or quarterly inputs, such as cost/kWh of electricity.

- We are currently creating a sustainability plan.

- The city has endorsed a Climate Action Plan and a climate action task force.

- Transit-oriented development strategy, changed parking requirements, working on the Climate Action Plan, public outreach, measurement and planning initiatives.

- Pilot program for residential neighborhoods to improve energy efficiency of existing buildings (40% of GHGs), transportation, energy efficiency. Improvement: energy audits of all homes, reduce issues of single car drivers, increase pedestrian roadways.

- In December, we adopted a downtown specific plan that promotes mixed-use development and complies with AB 32 and SB 375. We made changes with set-backs and parking requirements. We also have a regional landfill. As of two years ago, the City ran a pipeline that uses methane to power the regional hospital (2nd hospital in the world). Improvements: state and federal money. We are not ready for AB32 mandates but are interested in voluntary ideas.

- We have used ICLEI and the California Climate Action Registry - but there is a big disconnect with their report and reality as we know it from other efforts.

- A greenhouse gas emission inventory is now in process.

- Improvement: The city is waiting for better direction from the legislature before making any decisions. The city would like to know more specifically what they are supposed to do.
• The city is just starting the inventory and Climate Action Plan drafting.

• California Climate Action Registry inventory. Improvement: Money and staff time (all of the effort would have to be supported by the general fund).

**Large Jurisdictions:**

• Reduce waste to decrease trip lengths, promote walkability, etc. The city has a permit process for obtaining a discounted bus pass or reimbursement for bike riding. New developments are being designed with more bike racks, bus services, and more walkability. We are also providing roadways and pedestrian links into stores and services.

• An updated Climate Action Plan is being delivered to the City Council this month. Improvements: do a better job of tracking and reporting.

• Improvements: Understanding the state’s expectations; more policies at the state level.

• Improvements: What are the modeling tools at the community level (related to a General Plan rather than just a project)?

• Improvements: Major barriers are funding, staff members, and time. There is a strong community and leadership will to continue to implement sustainability within the city.

• Cost-effective, standardized, reliable local government protocols are needed now that the California Climate Registry is more expensive and The Climate Registry has overly complex protocols.

• Improvements: More location specific, not easy to capture the community (there is nothing for the community protocol).

• Alternative fuel vehicles in fleet.

• The city is currently drafting an Energy and Climate Action Plan. It is expected to be completed by 2009.

• Once the General Plan gets adopted, there will be requirements for a Climate Action Plan.

• The city hasn’t made any progress at all. There will be some mandatory reductions coming from SB 375 and the city is actively participating in those discussions with SCAG. They are waiting to understand what the region has to do. The city requires GHG emissions reductions in all EIRs. Improvements: Not knowing what the regional share will be and what the regional goal will be. Meeting regional goals will require cooperation with adjacent regional cities and counties.

• Utility data.

• We are working with a consultant to develop a database to track this for our municipal operations. This database will become an input for aggregate tracking at the community level. We are working with The Climate Registry to track municipal and eventually community emissions information.

• ICLEI greenhouse gas inventory software - make inventory process less complicated and easily replicable for future inventories.
• The city is updating its General Plan which will include strategies for GHG reductions (per state law). We need to conduct an inventory, probably using ARB protocols. We have no idea what tools are available to track progress.
• The city received a grant from BAAQMD. About half of the projects have been completed and the other half are underway.

QUESTION 9 - WASTE REDUCTION AND RECYCLING

Small Jurisdictions:
• We ask our waste contractor to run waste reduction and recycling reports for us.
• Solid waste franchise and cooperation with sister agencies in the County.
• There is currently not a large focus on recycling. The city still allows backyard burning. We are currently developing a recycling ordinance.
• Work with waste management; they provide a measurement report.
• The city has a contract with a waste management firm. As part of contract, the vendor tracks solid waste generation and recyclables tonnage.
• The city develops reports for waste hauling. We have also conducted waste audits through Alameda’s stopwaste.org; conducted informal surveys for food scrap participation; and monitored waste generation and collection through a report that is sent to the state.
• The city develops annual reports to the CIWMB. The city has its own Waste Management Authority that tracks all disposals. The city also contracts with a local recycling processor that tracks tonnages of recyclables generated in the community on an annual basis. The city also weighs tonnages of green waste before they are sent out to composting facilities.
• Grants for waste reduction are critical for GHG reductions and should be included in Climate Action Plans. Improvement: from a regional perspective, need to collaborate to get people to reduce waste; also need grants to buy compost bins or give compost bins to people.
• We are negotiating a waste management contract with a recycler and recycle at apartments, achieving a 60% waste reduction through recycling.
• The Waste Management District monitors waste reduction. The city has incorporated recycling bins around downtown and near commercial centers.
• The city has to submit a quarterly waste report to the Los Angeles Regional Agency, which includes total tonnage and % recycling by the city. We hired a consultant to do this.
• Measures include: 1. Local ordinance requiring recycling of construction waste - just approved. 2. City contract with waste hauler has green water, recycle and just trash. 3. Encourage businesses that recycle (e.g., tires).
• Education program that targets residents and commercial businesses.
• Some programs are already in place for recycling. Trash is measured at landfill gates.
• We are working with the Marin County Refuge Program and recently appointed a green committee that will coordinate energy savings measures with waste reduction measures.

• Regional solid waste and garbage department; “blue bag” programs.

• We fund curbside recycling.

• Measurements are conducted at the landfill level; the sewer treatment operator takes care of this. Improvement: The county is promoting a mandatory waste ordinance; depends on money.

• We have achieved a 75% waste diversion rate. This is measured through state reporting and by the hauling company.

• We track waste reduction. Unlike other cities, we do our own hauling.

• We established a “Pay-as-You-Go” program with a new state-of-the-art system.

• The city develops an annual state report that details solid waste tonnage generated and recycled. The city also receives monthly reports from its contractor.

• We adopted an ordinance.

• We will address this later in our Climate Action Plan.

Medium Jurisdictions:

• We have just started work on a zero waste management plan.

• The city looks at its diversion rate and tonnage. Improvement: Switching to new technology, managing vendors.

• Yard waste, curbside recycling and yard waste. Improvement: A facility that can handle food waste and construction materials recycling.

• The city works closely with various service providers and hopes to make it more efficient. Improvement: The city wants to take part in sustainability efforts.

• Regulatory requirements have helped to increase waste and recycling programs throughout the city. The city has an environmental program that exclusively manages waste contracts. Improvements: garbage companies are struggling with the capacity to deal with composting and recycling. Services need to be expanded.

• The city has an ordinance that requires recycling. This will be expanded to require recycling at apartments and commercial buildings. Improvements: Space requirements- retrofit to accommodate future bins.

• All of this is handled through the local waste contractor. They have set up separate bins for recycling. The city has a green waste program and is working to comply with state mandates.

• The city submits a quarterly waste report to the Los Angeles Regional Agency that includes total tonnage and percentage of recycling by the city.

• The city has a very strong program. Currently, we are trying to increase recycling at commercial centers and multi-family housing projects. Improvement: Costs to business and property owners.
• Several measures including 1) monthly reports from our recycling processor (Smart Station), hauler (Foothill Disposal), and county composting and household hazardous waste programs. (2) Diversion rate calculator provided by the California Integrated Waste Management Board (Electronic Annual Report). (3) Monthly diversion and performance measurements prepared by City Solid Waste & Recycling staff in Excel. Improvements: For item (2), the ability to choose calendar year or fiscal year for all of their reports.

• Somehow we measure what each community recycles.

• Public works reports.

• A wide array of programs and goals. Improvements: Capital (we need to raise rates to pay for projects).

• Collaborative work with stopwaste.org and others to achieve targets (we have exceeded our target).

• There are currently existing incentives and heavy fees for failure to meet recycling goals. Improvement: Raising % of recycling. An actual program for private entities that targets waste and recycling would be really good.

• To comply with AB 939 there have been recycling programs for many years. The city tracks these through monthly measures. The city has instituted a pilot project for 6 months (in different zones) to monitor compliance.

• Volumes are tracked, but separation efforts and efficiency are at best estimated.

• Reports are generated noting materials that are recycled.

• Our city has surpassed California’s 50% waste reduction goals. Programs include curbside recycling.

• The city provides a report to the solid waste association on the progress of waste reduction.

• The city does pretty well because it is state mandated and there are fees that are returned to the program that promote waste reduction. The city conducts an annual report on the amount of waste that goes to the landfill so the per capita rate can be studied. Improvement: It is difficult to get the message out to people.

Large Jurisdictions:

• The city has a voluntary recycling program. The Council has voted to make it easier for billing folks through quarterly taxes. The city provides bins for curbside recycling and participates with other groups to provide drop-off locations. The waste department has a program with the commercial folks as far as cardboard recycling and other recycling to reduce waste stream through economic incentives.

• Recycling services available to everyone in the community for free. C&D debris diverted from landfill. Improvement: Staff capacity (# of staff to number of programs).

• There is a lot of outreach to the community to encourage residential and commercial. The city knows they have to comply with AB 939.

• Continued market development to make it worth their while. Food waste and how to deal with that?
• The city has a local landfill and the extension of its life is always a priority. The city has a high diversion rate. There is substantial recycling.

• CIWMB diversion tracking.

• We are already at a high rate; there is not much room for improvement. We are educating businesses on packaging.

• Monthly diversion reports from franchise hauler.

• We track data on different types of materials entering the waste stream. The city has developed a zero-waste strategic plan.

• Improvements: tools needed, lack of information AB 32- don’t know what cities are required to do (undetermined thresholds and requirements).

• The city provides three separate bins (recyclable, green waste, trash). Improvements: Educating the public on source separation at the curbside. The extent to which the City will get cooperation from the public is uncertain.

• We are working with a consultant to develop a database that will track this for our municipal operations. We currently conduct periodic audits of municipal waste diversion. Our residential integrated waste management teams track their diversion rates using monthly reports from the haulers and landfills. I am not sure about commercial efforts. Our commercial collection system is undergoing a redesign.

• The city uses data from landfill operations to determine diversion rates – it works well.

QUESTION 10 - SMART GROWTH AND PLANNING

Small Jurisdictions:

• We are a small town (16,000 population) that has in the past 2 years re-zoned our commercial area along Hwy 29 to mixed use to enhance smart growth. No developer has yet taken advantage of the change in use and increases in density.

• General Plan monitoring and update.

• The 2002 General Plan is much more focused on smart growth and planning principles. It adopted a mixed-use ordinance and is focusing a critical mass towards the downtown. There is a lot of open space within the City for larger projects.

• It is hard to measure.

• The General Plan creates incentives for smart growth including bike paths, extended downtown to make walkable and bikeable, and low-impact and compact development. Improvement: More staff to help work on the plan.

• Several measures including: 1. New 2005-2023 General Plan reduced that planning area with higher density compacter growth. Added three mixed use areas to former commercial only areas and one area transitions heavy industry from near the downtown core to mixed use. 2. Meeting with school
district to try to identify school sites that will be walkable and establish nodes of community in residential areas. 3. Meeting with school districts to problem-solve traffic problems around elementary and junior high schools that are on collectors. 4. Zoning ordinance requires a circulation plan submittal for new development that demonstrates connections through development and adjoins properties for pedestrians, transit facilities and requires dedicated corridors for pedestrians (e.g. through parking lots) that is vibration free and ADA accessible. 5. City is partnering with local council of governments and county for development of a bicycle/pedestrian master plan.

- The city is already completely developed out. All planning is focused on smart redevelopment.
- The city’s boundaries greatly limit growth. The city is already doing high density development near transit (TOD). Improvements: Maintaining a small town character is difficult to do with high density development. Traffic levels along major arterials are a problem resulting from high density (CEQA is a barrier).
- We are doing an infill project that will provide affordable and mixed use housing downtown. There is no policy or implementation plan.
- The industry standards, all principles, are applied where they can.
- Nothing exists and the City is built out.
- We adopted a Build it Green ordinance and LEED certification for mixed-use and commercial development.
- GIS is a tool.
- We adopted an ordinance.
- We will address this later in the Climate Action Plan.

Medium Jurisdictions

- We use ARC GIS, the census, Google and projections done by SCAG.
- Percentage of affordable housing, average density per acre, and the compliance with the RENA numbers. Improvement: The people that already live in the City hate the idea of it. They don’t want to see the intensification of development.
- General Plan designation for mixed-used and a zone for traditional urban development (smart growth). The Council has selected a compact growth development. Improvement: statewide and regional cooperation for transit.
- The General Plan has policies that encourage smart growth. The city is hoping to have programs that help encourage or provide for that sort of incentives. Improvement: We hope the Block Grant will help in attaining goals.
- The General Plan. There is not much more developable land. Improvement: How to implement the General Plan over time (strategically).
• The city is retrofitting ordinances to include mixed-use, TOD, and compact development. Improvement: Funding.

• This will be a major focus of the General Plan update. Population growth projections will be used to figure out where new growth will be accommodated.

• MTA doesn’t want to provide funding.

• The city has conducted bike and transportation study focused on bike lanes to see if they can implement more bike friendly lanes into the city. The city is small and is pretty much built out.

• Improvement: need to educate the Council, developers and the community.

• The city is a master planned community so the city has been initiating smart growth since the 1960’s. The city is still learning about mixed-use within the master plans.

• Zoning codes and General Plan.

• Planning Department, committees and commissions.

• Progress is being made but we are not tracking it.

• The city is struggling to redo its General Plan update (expected to be $1 million dollars). Improvement: Capital issues.

• Plan and mission district area, both encourage higher density and mixed use around transit lines. It is intended to focus growth where people can take advantage of transit systems.

• Award winning TOD strategy, changed parking requirements, working on the Climate Action Plan, public outreach, measurement, planning initiatives, applied for grants ($24 million).

• We do smart growth and planning pretty well. The city is already an infill city. The CalTrain railroad goes through and City has three stops; most of the development occurs around there. TOD zoning exists and is measured through applications. We encourage Build it Green and LEED Certification.

• Tracking affordable housing units, square footage of non-residential growth (existing growth management charter amendment- reported annually). Allocations of certain types of development (i.e.; community benefit, small additions, economic development. We are putting together an adaptive management program that includes a community indicator monitoring process.

• We are a member of ICLEI and are in the final phase of preparing a comprehensive General Plan update that includes a Green City Element, Healthy Community Element, and Community Design Element, all featuring smart growth provisions, a climate change strategy and transit oriented land planning ideals.

• The city is growing slowly. There is no real opportunity to capture smart growth principles.

• Through our regional association of governments, we have adopted a smart growth map that locates all the smart growth opportunity areas. This map is updated every two years. The regional association of governments also provides incentives and financing for smart growth development.
• The city has planners that are trained and enthusiastic about smart planning. Improvement: Barriers come down to funding. The development company always wants to do things that benefit them; the city doesn’t want to lose the development income. The political aspect is the barrier.

Large Jurisdictions:
• There have been two mixed used zones since the 1990’s. The city recently added items in the ordinance for pedestrian connectively. There have been parking requirement breaks for commercial developments that are near or at a transit facility. The city has added landscaping requirements to provide shaded areas. The city is also exploring the idea of no landscaping requirements in parking lots, but rather carports with solar.
• General Plan and TOD, Climate Action Plan, major employers in downtown that encourage employees to commute by public transit. Improvement: As population grows, how to keep GHG reduction goals in check?
• There is one vacant area open for development- growth has been slowing down. There is not much room left for infill.
• The city is looking into using sustainable development guidelines.
• All of the ideals of smart growth planning are high priorities of the city, but the city experiences very little growth.
• We are waiting on more robust traffic models (per SB 375) to measure the variables associated with jurisdictional GHG emissions.
• The city is trying to incorporate green ordinances into guiding documents. All cities have guiding documents (zoning code, General Plan, parking ordinances, housing elements) and whenever cities are updating them, it is a huge task and cities are trying to survive rather than optimize. It would be good for cities to be able to apply for grants that would be used specifically for greening these guiding documents. This could result in really strong model language.
• The city is actively looking for funding sources and applying for grants. Improvement: Lack of policies to promote smart growth, and there is no funding or staff to do that.
• Our General Plan is currently undergoing an update. Sustainability markers will be incorporated. Smart growth objectives have been integrated into the current General Plan. We track progress based on conformance with General Plan requirements.
QUESTION 11 - SMART TRANSPORTATION

Small Jurisdictions:

- The Napa County Transportation and Planning Agency (NCTPA) is our local transportation coordinator. They track improvements to transit and planning for such items.
- We continue to work on pedestrian and bicycle improvements. Transit continues to be a problem because of low demand and extreme cost.
- There are 2 or 3 bus lines that run throughout the City. The buses do not meet the critical mass of larger cities. There is a bicycle and alternative transportation master plan. There are lots of hilly roads. Improvements: Funding to build bike lanes.
- They have added a couple of other bus routes, farebox program with the county to see how many people are using the buses.
- It is easy to bike and walk but we need behavior change and this will not happen overnight. Tools are the bike and pedestrian master plan. Specific Alternative Transportation Plan, Climate Action Plan and survey. Improvement: Regional collaboration for better transit to increase routes and times. We need more people involved.
- Unlike cities in the nearby Monterey Peninsula and Silicon Valley, our city is somewhat isolated. There are transit facilities here but they are somewhat limited. The closest access to a commuter train is in Gilroy - about 14 miles to the north. Departure times are limited for commuters. There is a SPRR track that connects to Hollister but the track bed is substandard so speed is limited. Some people have asked about the use of rubber tires as an alternative. Nearly 50% of our workforce commutes out of county with the majority to the Bay Area. The smartest growth here would be to increase local employment, thereby reducing commute trips.
- Implementing or planning numerous bike transportation projects and streetscape improvement projects. The City is using Redevelopment Agency funds and Smart Growth Incentive grant.
- Some vans run up and down the measure the valley. Ridership is reported to the Eastern Sierra Transit Authority Board.
- The City is involved with Safe Roads to School and the Transportation Authority of Marin. Already implemented are pedestrian-oriented and bicycle-oriented facilities. The City is also participating in the “Way to Go” program that is intended to do outreach within the community on public transit options and alternatives to driving.
- Bicycle master plan.
- Currently track through LTC. Improvements: Grant funds for tracking.
- We are always upgrading transportation plans and adding bike lanes and bus stops. Our city is only 2.5 square miles so everything in the city is within walking distance. Two main arterials are owned by Cal Trans. We are currently developing a master transportation plan.
- Nothing exists except a bus system. There are plans to construct a new bike path. Improvement: Funding.
Medium Jurisdictions:

- We need better access to public transit.
- “Nexus” tracks road development and developers’ fees.
- The city doesn’t run the transportation system. Improvement: The city doesn’t have control over the system; it is subject to the “whims of Caltrans.”
- The sustainability section in the General Plan addresses bicycle corridors. The city is working to create a bicycle foot-train to create regional transportation. However, the city relies heavily on automobiles. There are already 26 miles of bike lane. Improvement: Motivating citizens to utilize alternative modes of transportation.
- The city hasn’t looked into smart transportation, as they do not know how it would be beneficial to the city.
- The city has a local transportation district. There is a major transit train-stop within town. The rapid transit bus line is being installed and should be up and running by August this year.
- A bike and transportation study was conducted to make the city more bike-friendly.
- The city is working on this, trying to work on a shuttle or bus service program to help move people around. Improvement: Cost barriers - need programs that help pay for the costs.
- Light Rail and Caltrans data reports. Improvements: Mandate companies that have shuttles to pick up from Light Rail and Caltrans stations.
- City Engineering Department monitors traffic levels.
- Part of the General Plan update.
- The city doesn’t have its own transportation network. But in the last 6 months, we added the first hybrid vehicles to the city fleet.
- Link shuttle, AC transit and pedestrian improvements; monitor commute and conduct polls of BART usage.
- Local dial-a-ride program; local fixed route system in development stage.
- The city has increased the ridership of city buses through decreased prices. They have also converted many of the buses from diesel to natural gas. Some of the alternative fueled vehicles are powered by solar installations on the City Hall and the Park and Ride Facility. There is very strong support for electric vehicles within the city.
- We are updating the circulation element but there is no tool to track the progress.

Large Jurisdictions:

- There are bike and pedestrian trails to provide linkages to destinations. Improvement: It is difficult to get people to use public transit but the city is trying to show that there are multiple options.
- Bicycle, pedestrian, public transit. Improvement: Shift mode to alternative transportation.
• Money comes from sales tax. There is a regional transit. Improvements: Funding to get projects done.
• Improvements: Tools that can accommodate modes other than vehicles or alternative methods for short trips. We can’t change the behavior that people will hop in a car, but they could rely on cleaner energy for cars.
• The city is continuously increasing the amount of bike paths and ensuring connectivity and linkage to destinations. There is an LA bus line as well as the B-line, which is a bus service within the city.
• None currently, but we should be tracking the percentage of synchronized signals, length of trip, relative efficiency of trip, etc.
• Not much we can do because we are built out. Improvements: Funding for internal shuttles, what type of fuel? Innovative electric vehicles to promote multi-modal transportation.
• This item is similar to Smart Growth and Planning. Improvements: it is difficult to get different transportation services within the City to be on the same page. Progressive long-term collaboration among the cities and regional agencies supplemented with funding is key.
• The city has made some progress through the construction of a metro-link station. There is a station in Palmdale that accommodates about 500-600 vehicles. The city also has a park and ride located adjacent to the recently constructed freeway. Improvements: there are a large number of people that are still using the freeways to travel. In order to reduce that kind of outflow to the Los Angeles area, the city must be able to provide a sufficient job flow within the area. Attracting businesses is a challenge. SB 375 might help to provide the transit system that could result in an increase in businesses within the city. 60% of the population is commuting to LA and San Fernando for jobs.