**Captioning Transcript of Parks and Sustainability Committee Meeting –
October 20, 2022**

"Chair Fowler"
Good afternoon, and this is the regularly scheduled meeting of the Parks
and Sustainability committee and I am Councilwoman
Cindi Fowler the chair I am joined today by Council Woman Holton Stewart
and Councilman Jecorey Arthur and Council Woman Nicole George
Um, uh, Rick BLACKWELL, Councilman BLACKWELL has an excuse to absence. I
don't see anyone else on.
The meeting virtually, um.
So, I guess since we don't have a quorum, we'll need to go ahead and take
up. Um, Adam, number, 1, the special discussion. Um, this is the parks
for all study.
It's dash 1340 and Brooke Pardue with the Parks alliance and Jayne Miller
for the Parks Alliance Is here virtually to guide us through this
presentation?
through this presentation

"Brooke Pardue"
Thank you so much Chair Fowler
Like she said, my name is, I've presented to you guys before I'm the
president and CEO of the parks alliance of vulnerable, and we presented
to you all, uh,
last December my time flies on the parks for all equitable investment
initiative.
Um, and we wanted to come back and give you an update on what has
happened since then. So.
We have completed a, uh, well, the, the team with whom I've contracted
Jayne Miller
being the lead consultant on that she and her team have done an analysis
of all of the parks department budgets, capital budgets, since merger
operating budgets for the last 10 years.
They've also done a thorough, um.
Analysis along with the parks department on every 1 of our 120 parks, and
the condition of those parks, and the amenities in the parks. Um.
They have done a full community needs assessment, assessment, identifying
by census track. Our highest needs communities.
Um, the parks alliance did extensive community engagement this past
summer at.
Scores of events across the city, um, the parks for all has conducted a
27,000 dollars city wide poll of more than 900 residents to ask them what
is important to them.
Um, in our parks, what, uh, what needs they have that are being met are
not being met and and what it is that they would like to see in our
public parks,
the consultant team is finalizing those recommendations.
Um, and we would love to come back once those are final and and present
those, uh, for the feedback of the parks and sustainability committee.
Jane, I'm gonna pass it to her in just a minute. I just want you all to
know that this is an extraordinarily data, rich presentation.
You all have copies of it, and it's something that you're probably gonna
want to spend some time with, because we're going to be giving you a lot
of information in a reasonably short time,

but just please let or know reach out directly to me.
If you have any questions about anything, once you've had an opportunity
to do a deeper dive, and certainly today in the during the presentation,
if you have any questions feel free to chime in. So, with that.
I will pass it to Jayne Miller.

"Chair Fowler"
Can I say Councilman Peden has joined us and, um, President James has
joined us um, and just a reminder. We have a hard stop in 20-25 minutes.
If that works for you, I hope Thank you.

"Brooke Pardue"
Thank you so much.

"Jayne Miller"
Thank you, Chair Fowler and Committee Members, am pleased to give you an
update on the parks for all project.
And as just as a reminder, this project is about developing an equitable
and transparent investment action plan for the entire part system.
And so, just to ground you in our work, remember, our mission is to
collect new data, listen to new voices, sharing information and create a
roadmap for that transparent and equitable investment for a little bit of
public parks.
The work that we've been doing has been guided by a local project team.
These are the members of the local project team, very diverse
representation to ensure that the work we're doing really is fits logo.
And the voices on this local project team have been invaluable to make
sure that that work that we're doing. And as we move things forward, what
recommendations come forward are for local.
Also, I just want to remind you our work is is really based on what we
call a 3 legged stool that and Brooke mentioned really deep dive into the
parks and recreation sites. What you have.
The proximity and access to those parks and amenities by residents, the
value of recreation in those, the needs and conditions of those.
The 2nd, leg of the stool, the community contacts who we are meaning who
are the people in Louisville.
Uh, what's the built environment? What are the health implications across
global not looking at mobile as a monolith but looking at within the
nuances from neighborhood to neighborhood and then the 3rd piece, as as
Brooke mentioned was public input.
Really, really critical that the public priorities for investment drive
the recommendations that will be bringing forward.
So, let me share with you the 1st, leg of that stool. What we have been
able to document relative to parks and the parks and recreation sites.
So there are 160 parks and recreation sites across Louisville
6,000 over the 6,000 acres our park sites are parks parkways and green
race.
Plus the Jefferson Memorial, which is almost, uh, 60,600 acres.
1 of the things that we did that's really important is grounding our
work, uh, with benchmarking work. So the National Recreation and park
Association, uh, looks at all park systems across the country.
And so we've done some comparisons with there. The other thing I want to
point out is the trust republic land identified as up on the right? Upper

right. Hand evaluates the 100 most populous cities every year across the United States.

And what we did is we took the 18 U s cities that have a population between 60,999,000 of which Louisville sits right in the middle. So, how Louisville compares to these other 7.

middle so how Louisville compares to these other seven

And a court relative to those comparisons, little parks and rec 33.

Compared to these peer average cities, though, little spends on average, 40 dollars per resident and these other 17 cities spend 107 dollars on their part system and we're just talking public dollars when you add the private dollars to the table. Um. the table um

Louisville is at 36% as compared to these other 17 cities or 43 dollars as compared to 118.

Full time staffing is also below the national average at 58% for full time employees and when you add seasonal or part time employees that actually drops the 53%.

A comparison of 308 employees are full time equivalents as compared to 720 for these other 17 cities. to seven hundred and twenty for these other seventeen cities

There's a lot of data here. I'm not going to go through at all, but I'm just going to cut to the bottom, which we also looked at the 5 year average of spending both for operations and capital and Louisville average over that.

5 year period was 45% of the pure city average. city average

Uh, 30.6Million, it's compared to.

The pure city's at 68Million. So obviously you spending considerably less on the public part system.

The flipside of that coin, however, is that the system in Louisville is larger than the average of the 17, the average.

Um, all parks across the country, not just the 17.

And for every 1000 residents.

There is 13% more part. Public parkland in Louisville.

Uh, then the national average, um, so not only are spending less.

But you're also spending less per acre, you're spending 47% as compared to all parks systems.

In the country per acre so you're spending just under 2000 dollars per acre.

Whereas all park systems across the United States are spending over 4,000 per acre. So.

The dilemma here is that Louisville is spending considerably less on its part system and has actually a larger perk system to care for.

Uh, relative to the size of the city of.

So now, let me share with you, the capital investment.

So, over time, the chart here on the left shows, capital investments over the last 20 years. Really? Since the merger.

And the distribution of that.

30 parks in your entire system, have received 0 capital dollars.

50% of the parks in the last 20 years, have only received a total of 100,000 dollars and 67% of the parts that were less than 500,000 dollars over this last 20 year period of time.

And it reflects and shows in the condition of the parks. shows in the condition of the parks

The chart here on the right shows the overall condition, uh, overall score of the, the condition of the parks that our team, the consulting team.
Went through in great detail with every single park, and every amenity with the staff that manages the capital projects for a little.
27% of the parks or 50 received an f.
And 87 received a score of data f. so it's really reflective of the.
Lack of resources that have been invested in the system over time.
This map itself is obviously a map of Louisville and

"Vice Chair Peden"
what I can ask a question.

"Chair Fowler"
Yes, yes, I'm sorry Councilman Peden has a question on something.

"Vice Chair Peden"
Go back to that last slide just a quick question and we talked about this when I got a preview presentation, but have you done.
The lack of resources take a toll you mentioned how X number of parks that have this have had this much money invested, et cetera.
Did you ever go back and take out actual council dollars?

"Jayne Miller"
Yep, and that's actually in the very next slide.

"Vice Chair Peden"
Okay, cool because without Council dollars many, many, many more parks would be 0.

"Jayne Miller"
You're probably correct, but let me I actually have done that in the next slide.
So, this slide shows, all of the capital investments over the last 20 years, and where they've been spent.
The parks and orange are the Olmstead parks and the larger the circle.
The more dollars that have been spent the green, the parks in green are the non homestead parks and as you can see.
There are a handful of homestead parks that have overwhelmingly received the largest.
Investments in the system overwhelmingly more.
Then the majority of the parks in the system, which are not parks.
The circles in purple are the non onset golf courses and then.
But circles in red that are red on the exterior, but clear on the middle are the ones that have received no funding and then, in terms of the capital funding over the last 20 years, there's been a total of 108.8Million dollars invested capital.
point eight million dollars invested capital
In the system of those 108 dollars 8Million dollars 61% is from metro government capital budgets.
19% is from philanthropic partners.
13% is from other public sources, such as the federal government state, or.
6% of that total comes from metro council allocations of or.

And then 1% or other sources, this shows investments on facilities again over the last 20 years.
And, uh, the facility that received the largest amount of capital investments is focus grove and that the majority of the funds. funds
For that facility have been philanthropic hours.
And then this map here chose the 30 parks that have received no capital and where they're located across logo in the last 20 years.
Now, let me share with you, the 2nd, leg of the stool, which is the community context.
So, what we've looked at throughout our work with the local project team, we probably looked at a 100 different data sets. Um.
And from the input that we received from the local project team, these are the data sets that we'll be looking for every.
The national standard is that everyone should live a 10 minute walk of a park in an urban community. So, for every park in the system.
We have mapped the 10 minute walk, shed for every park and so for every 10 minute walk.
We have the data sets and data information that cover all of these.
Different characteristics, population, density, race and ethnicity poverty, foreign, born population.
Air quality, pollution and heat risk proximity to green.
Crime physical health and mental health conditions as well.
We also have that data for the areas of the metro area.
Where people do not live within a 10 minute walk of a park, and we'll be making recommendations around those areas as well.
And so as we looked at.
For all of the variety of data sets here are the 4 main categories that are represented individually on the small maps on the right. Population density.
And where there is a greater concentration of density in the city.
Historic in equities, the darker the red.
The greater the inequities, environmental injustices and health and wellness where there is poor.
For mental and physical health, and when you combine all of those 4 points together, you get this larger map logo that shows where the needs are across the metro area.
Um, relative to each other, the 3rd leg of the stool is the community survey, and again, this survey is really important to drive priorities for investment where the community wants their dollars spent.
So, as Brooke mentioned, we received over 900 surveys. This is geographically where they, the survey respondents came from. from
And 1 of the things that we did is Brooke in particular, was really instrumental in us breaking the city up into these 9 regions to be reflective of the neighborhoods of the metro area.
So that we could not only look at the results city wide. But we can look at them within each of these 9 clusters to see where there are nuances or differences.
In people's priorities for investment in the system.
So 2 critical things that we thought were really important is that 95% of households across Logan who responded to the survey had visited.
Parks within the last year much greater than any of the other areas that we asked them about, where they visited really important statistic in terms of the impact of parks for the residents of local.

We also ask them to tell us what makes a community a great place to live. Parks was the 3rd, most important factor for again the survey respondents.
Crime was number 1 and safety quality, public schools with 2nd, with parks trails and recreation. It's a 3rd, most important factor in making Louisville a great place to live.
So, then what we're going to do is share with, you.
Uh, results from the survey on the 4 investment areas. Maintenance. Rehab capital and programming for maintenance.
Uh, what this shows you is the priority of rankings for maintenance activities this is a conglomeration of 2.
Questions we ask them of these maintenance activities to rank them.
In level of importance so, as you can see from an important standpoint, restroom maintenance was number 1.
Path sidewalk pave maintenance was number 2 and so on.
The 2nd, ranking, you'll see to the right is their satisfaction of how the maintenance practices currently are being done.
So they are prioritized by a combination of the ranking of importance and the level of dissatisfaction.
So because restroom maintenance was the number 1, most dissatisfied maintenance activity.
And it was also listed as number 1 importance. It is the number 1 ranking in terms of priority for.
Taken care of the system graffiti, removal of vandalism repair with 2nd, and then path sidewalk maintenance is 3rd and then so on down.
This crash this slide is is very complex. What it does is it takes the responses.
So this actually ranking, uh, this slide shows, the results by the entire metro area, what we did is took the results and broke them down by race ethnicity and age.
By income, and by geographic area so you can see the top 4 rankings in each of this, these areas. And again, this is an example of where.
There's probably it will require a lot more deep diving on your part. You can see when you look at the areas of the metro area, we have the map on the bottom.
So, you can understand where they are coming from, but you will also see, while there are some nuances, which make a lot of sense households with children and under 10, their number 1 priority.
With playground safety makes perfect sense and there are some other nuances there, but you will see a lot of commonality restroom care.
Paths and sidewalks mowing. Right you see a lot of consistency.
What where something falls, maybe it's 2 or 1 or 4 it might be slightly different, but there's great consistency in terms of the top 4 priorities for maintenance.
Now, what I'm going to do is show you.
The results for the public priorities for investments in the assets, and the facilities in the system.
Again, this is a combination of 2 factors 2nd of all is the unmet need to the public feel like their needs are being unmet by the assets in the community, and they rank those again.
So the number 1 unmet need is water fountains or bottle filling stations in the parks. parks
Yeah, the importance their number 1 of importance is hiking.

Uh, and biking paid and unpaved trail. So again, the results of prioritization is a result of the combination of those 2 rankings, such that.

Trails investing in them, or, uh, doing rehab on them was number 1 out to our restaurants was 2.

Water fountains, bottle, filling stations with 3rd and outdoor and indoor swimming pools was for.

And so, on down the list again, the next slide.

Takes that information and breaks it up into all of these categories race, ethnicity, age, income, geographic area.

Again, look at multi use paths and trails overwhelmingly.

It's the number 1 priority, no matter who you are, what your income level is, where you live in the metro area.

Open space and out to a restaurant very closely. 2nd and 3rd.

And bottle filling stations as number 4 very consistently with a few nuances across the metro area.

This area is around recreation programs and activities. Again we ask the public to tell us.

Where do they, where does the programming stand in terms of the Annette made for an unmet need for their family?

And how important those programming areas are, and, as you can see, the combination of those 2 fell with adult fitness programs as number 1, special events and festivities festivals. And family program is 3rd. I do want to point out a couple of things.

Because this survey was done during covid, we believe, as professionals that special events probably ranked higher than it normally would, because most special events are in outdoor environments,

where you can gather and see people in a socially distant safe way. So, I suspect that this ranked much higher because of that.

I also the other thing I want to point out to you, and we didn't catch this until we got the results back was the number of youth activities in this.

pnr.

Was more than double than the number of adult activities and so you'll see that that most of the youth activities fell lower on the bottom of priorities.

We believe again from a professional standpoint that the prioritization of our youth activities got dispersed, because we had so many different activities.

Whereas if we had had the same number of youth activities, as we had adults, it would, we believe strongly that youth priorities would have risen hired to the top.

This next slide does the same thing that the other 2 dude shows, the cross tabs again,

by all of these factors special events again overwhelmingly number 2 fitness programs overwhelmingly number 2 2.

Family programs, recreation programs again, nuances here and there in different places.

And then the last piece that we want to share with you is the capital investment piece this is done slightly different and this is a complex slide. So I'm going to walk you through this. So we are going to be looking 1st at these 2 areas here.

Need and community context.

In places in the metro area, where people live within a 10 minute walk of a park.

We're going to assess the condition we have assess the condition of every park and it's amenities.

We've also assessed the investment capital investment in every park over the last 20 years.

From the scores in each of these categories you get a park needs score.

We then take those community characteristics that I talked about earlier.

Every neighborhood within the 10 minute, walk of a park gets scored in each of these and gets a total community context score.

That park needs score and the community context score.

Have equal waiting, they get added together and then there becomes a prioritized list based on all of this data for prioritize ranking for investments in the park system.

In the parks themselves and the recreation facilities.

The 2nd, piece of the puzzle is looking at those areas in the metro area where people do not live within a 10 minute, walk a park.

So, we take the information of those areas across the metro area where people live outside of a 10 minute walk of a park.

And then we also take the community context information.

For those neighborhoods, we combine those together and develop. We have a we're developing a priority.

List of areas for new parks or improved access to existing parks.

Based on the neighborhoods that have the greatest need, and also areas where there is more growth and development happening.

Across the metro area so now what I want to share with you is.

With all of this data, as Brooke mentioned, we're in the process of developing our recommendations and what I want to share with you is the overview of what that roadmap or action plan.

Will consist of, so the 4 key strategy areas are the investment areas, the equitable investment areas in maintenance across the entire park system.

Rehabilitation or caring for the existing assets to extend their life, extend their functionality and improve their safety.

3rd area is recreation, programming and services across the metro area, and the 4th area of being capital investment. So those are the 4 areas we're going to provide recommendations very specifically.

About equitable investments, then we have 3 supporting strategy areas. 1 is policies.

Metro government, and or parks and rec policies that will support the equitable investment initiative.

Its implementation reflect industry, best practices.

And protect against neighborhood displacement and provide for improved operational efficiencies.

Internal operations will be the 2nd supporting area. We'll be making a recommendation for.

Coordination or organizational structure.

For the parks and rec department for improved alignment and coordination of department activities improvement of operational efficiencies.

Also supporting the equitable investment initiative.

And reflective of industry, best practices.

And then the 3rd supporting error will be financing and fund raising. We will be making financial management policy and practices and recommendations.

Revenue generation strategies, partnership, recommendations with nonprofits and the philanthropic community.
All to support the strengthening of the park system overall uh.
And provide strategies for accountability and transparency.
So, with that, I will actually broke up and share a flower. Oh, actually, I'm sorry 1 last slide. So we have our local project team meeting next week.
Uh, where we will be putting together all of this data that's more detailed than what we've been sharing with them up to date.
With recommendations, uh, with a November public rollout and a January 25th event.
I don't know if you want to speak to any of these pieces of the puzzle before we open up for questions.

"Brooke Pardue"
No, I think that, um, you know, uh, I just want to let everybody know that I am certainly available to answer any questions.
I know this like I said on the outset, this is a lot of of information to kind of absorb and and analyze.
So, uh, I am certainly we can take questions now if there's time or, um, I just want to reiterate that I'm available. If anybody wants to.
Reach out and and I can.
Talk you through any of this thanks working with that commissioner for

"Jayne Miller"
I'll turn it back to you.

"Chair Fowler"
Thank you Jayne, so I don't have anybody in the queue. I don't know if I'm misreading something. Is there anybody that has any questions?
I know Brooke is accessible for anything that you may have a question about, and also want to say that we've been joined by Council Member Mulvihill and Council Woman Parker and Councilman Triplett
Parker and councilman triplet. I appreciate all of.
The work that you all have done on this project. I, I really am excited, um, about the outcomes and and the future. Um, and what we can expect going forward, uh, with this data.
So, a great job. Thank you. Um, thank you. Yeah, thank you. So, without any further questions, I don't think I've got any, uh, we can move on to our next item. Thank you.
Both for.
Be in here.
Thank you and, um, this slide will be available to all of us that email.

Um, so our next item is, um.
Ordinance 0103dash2 an ordinance amending chapter 42 of the local metro code of ordinances regarding use of Metro on parks. I believe this needs to be unstable. Can I get a motion?
be unstable can i get a motion
2nd, anybody.
That came from Councilman Mulvihill thank you.
Um, so, uh, President James, I believe that, uh, you're the primary on this? Yes.
Um, so I know that we have a new, um, um.

Piece that is uploaded and, um, just to clarify that is the 1st 1 listed.
Is that correct?

"Council President James"
Yes.

"Chair Fowler"
Yes. 1 day at 1020 yes. Dated today. So, um.
Take it away Thank you, man.

"Council President James"
Thank you. Um, I guess if we could if we could.
If we could, if someone could introduce a motion to.
Introduce this most current version of it please so that we could discuss it.

"Committee Member Holton Stewart"
Madam Chair, I'll make a motion to, um, look at this, this new, uh, amended ordinance.

"Chair Fowler"
Thank you. I have a 2nd, please. 2nd.
Thank you from Councilman Mulvihill Oh, wait, I think yeah, we'd probably discuss it. Right?

"Council President James"
Well, I think we have to vote to say that we are gonna discuss this 1.
no. Okay. Thank you. Okay.
All right, so thank you Madam chair Thank you. Ma'am. Clerk.
The, uh, this ordinance, we've got a new amendment by substitution, um, that we're discussing now, uh, this came about, uh, with a lot of discussions with a lot of people, and especially.
Think, uh, chair valor for taking a lot of time to talk with me about this and other council members that have also and also the county Attorney's office Holly Hopkins from the county Attorney's office. So we, I think we listened to everybody.
And when tried to craft this newest version into something that addresses everybody's concerns.
Um, and, uh, I think, as you look through it, basically, we're just trying to say that, um, that neither.
The mayor's office, or any of the subdivisions of metro government, including Metro Council, or the police department,
or anybody else should have to pay a fee for a metro government sponsored event in a metro government park. Um, and that we're just trying to.
Uh, try to even that out and so a, a standard answer, any questions that anybody may have.
Anyone yeah,

"Chair Fowler"
Councilman Mulvihill

"Committee Member Mulvihill"
Thank you Madam chair. Thank you, David for.

I know you, and I have had some conversations. I I don't know that I've seen the latest version, but 1 of the concerns that we both discussed is and I still have and maybe.
You've addressed it and if you have it, maybe we still can, but I'm okay with the new fees and the things. But the thing that I'm most concerned about, whether.
Folks get paid or not paid is, I mean, I'm always concerned about that, but the availability and so if we do have new events.
That we consider in parks that are going to be, they spring up, and there's no limitation on what they can be.
Does do we allow an out for availability of available resources and officers not financial the people that can actually police and do the work otherwise.
I think we have to prioritize where folks need to be in should be so, just because we have an event and we say, well, it has to be free.
If they can't produce the folks, or there's more important things, is there an app for those folks to say? Sorry but thanks, but no thanks.

"Council President James"
Madam Chair can if I could respond.

"Chair Fowler"
 Yes, sir.

"Council President James"
 So, yes, there's an out so.
If you're gonna have an event, say, I'm gonna have an event at victory park and, uh, we need X number of officers to, uh, participate to have security.
And the police department says, well, we just don't have the people whether on duty or off duty.
Then we don't have the event, it's pretty simple, or we have to go find, um, and hire, uh, you know, the council person will need to hire security somewhere else, uh, in order to carry on that event. That's.
That's not an issue.

"Committee Member Mulvihill"
So, when you say, it's not an issue, is there something given or tangible that they check a box? You know, they have a box with stuff that people need if they're going to put on an event.
You have a long laundry list of agencies and things that they may be required for an event is 1 of the, we can't.
We can't have public. We don't have enough public. Uh, uh.
Garbage case, I'm using that 1 as an example, but we don't have enough place to do this event. Is that going to be informed that they fill out and and could uncheck the box and say, I'm sorry we're just we're too short and we can't manage this.

"Council President James"
Sure, that currently happens. A prime example is the St James art show this year, we said, we can't staff that event on duty or off duty and so they didn't sign off on it. And so, um, Saint James aren't show hired other security forms.
"Committee Member Mulvihill"

Great. So, then counsel people will have to go through that same process

"Council President James"
absolutely.

"Committee Member Mulvihill"
For their events. And if they can't do it, they can't do it.

"Council President James"
Absolutely.

"Committee Member Mulvihill"
Okay. Thank you. Matt.

"Chair Fowler"
So, um, I, I wanted to point out I did a little research and, um, the mayor special event.
Um, I, I, I guess.
Workforce, um, there are 5 salaries.
And those total 309,000 dollars annually for his special events.
And so I just want to put that out there that, um, you know, when you look at the grand scheme of things, and what we're spending on our events compared.
Touch it, so I know a lot of his events are sponsored, but we are still paying salaries for 5 individuals at the tune of 309,000 dollars annually. Um, so I found that interesting.
Um, I don't see anyone else in the queue. Are there any other questions concerning this legislation? questions concerning this legislation Anybody virtually, um.
I guess we have a quorum we plan on voting this out today.
Oh, okay. We can Councilman Mulvihill. We've lost your screen.
Oh, okay. Yeah, we don't have a quorum without you Councilman Mulvihill

"Committee Member Mulvihill"
I'm back. Sorry. Thanks.

"Chair Fowler"
Thank you. Sir. Well, and now Councilman Peden and is out of the room. We still have 4. okay. Yes.
Yes, um, so we need to do a voice vote to accept this amendment best substitution, all those in favor say, aye.
Knows about like sun. Okay. So, um, now it's before us to, um, to vote on overall. Um, and so will that be on.
Our screen, right? Okay.

"Cheryl Woods"
Committee Member Mulvihill

"Committee Member Mulvihill"
Yes.

"Cheryl Woods"
Committee Member Parker

"Committee Member Parker"
Yes,

"Chair Fowler"
okay so we have 4 yes votes and 2 not here. So this passes and we'll go to the old business, right?
And our next council meeting, thank you for that Council President James.

Um, we have just a few moments that we can introduce I had planned on holding it, but since we have a few minutes, I think that we can go ahead and introduce number 4.
And that is a resolution Dash, 107 dash 22 a resolution to support of establishing a science based target of net 0, greenhouse gas emissions community wide by 2040 in local Jefferson County.
And the primary sponsor is Council Woman George. And do I hear a motion. do i hear a motion
2nd, anybody 2nd, thank you. Councilman Mulvihill.
Okay, now we, we only have like.
About 14 minutes so Council Woman George, if you would like to introduce.

"Council Member George"
Certainly, thank you Chair Fowler and thank you for running an efficient meeting and giving us some time going to speak really quickly and then turn this over to our sustainability coordinator.
This resolution, uh, firms for things sections 1, and 2 are really about goal setting as it relates to net 0, greenhouse gas emissions.
So it simply says that the council supports achieving net 0, greenhouse gas emission reductions, community wide about 2040 and then it sets an interim target a 50% by 2030. fifty percent by two thousand and thirty
Sections 3, and 4 simply clarify expectations of the administration.
So, section 3 urges the office of advanced planning and sustainability to adjust timelines and strategies for achieving our existing goals.
And then it also asked the advanced planning and sustainability coordinate with all metro departments to incorporate emissions reduction targets into our capital projects and operations.
As the metro budget allows, and that's really important as we as we have this discussion.
And we think about this is that it specifies as Metro budget, allows it asks that if it's not practical, that agencies then be able to justify and to also explain what would be needed to reach that target.
On the front end of this, I just want to say that I'm supporting this resolution because we have a responsibility to adjust and to plan when confronted with new information.
And I would remind everyone on the front end, nothing in this resolution is radical as a legislative body. We passed a clean renewable energy resolution in 2019.
thanks to the efforts of former Councilman Coan and working with Council Woman Fowler, which translated into tremendous savings and energy efficiencies. and energy efficiencies
We've already seen.
Metro is also doing this work and, of course, we have our sustainability coordinator here to share. Uh, we signed a cities race to 0, pledge along with many of our peer cities, which we'll hear about today.

And so all that to be said, I'd like to turn it over to director Mike
King and to share a little bit about why we should be invested in this
way.
Thank you

"Chair Fowler"
thank you.

"Sumedha Rao"
Thanks Councilwoman George um, I'm going to just provide a quick
overview. Is there a way to share my screen?

"Chair Fowler"
Please.
Can you please identify yourself? Thank you.

"Sumedha Rao"
Thank you. Uh, I'm Sumedha Rao the sustainability coordinator at the
office of advanced planning and sustainability.
Um, I just want to provide a quick overview to set, uh, context for why
this goal is important.
So, currently we have a target of reducing greenhouse, gas emissions,
community, wide, 80 by 2050. and this is a goal that was said, based on
the greenhouse gas emissions reduction plan that you'll see on the right
that was produced in 2020.
And that plan itself was based on a 2016 greenhouse gas inventory that
our office commissioned. So, um, this is where we stand with our current
target.
So, uh, the, which is the international planet panel on climate change,
which is a U.
N, organization and is an international, uh, you know, body that
basically sets, uh, produces reports every year that help that do a vast
review of scientific literature and provide the foremost recommendations
on climate science.
Um, have said that we, in fact, need to read emissions by 2040. thousand
and forty
In order to keep global warming, uh, below 1.5 degrees Celsius.
And this is something that we learned almost as soon as our last
emissions in, uh, emissions reduction plan was released and we have been
kind of aware that we will need to update that plan.
Um, just a quick graph to show that the cost, uh, to taxpayers money, in
terms of spending on climate disaster. It has been rising steeply over
the last several years.
And Kentucky is 1 of the regions that is expected to see rising costs.
And, of course, we have the painful reminder from the recent flooding in
eastern Kentucky, and also from the data about rising urban heat and.
So this is just a helpful graph that shows where our current goals are,
and where they need to be based on the recommendation.
So, 80% greenhouse gas by 2050 is where we are, we just need to slightly
accelerate that plan to get to 100% reduction by 2040. one hundred
percent reduction by two thousand and forty
So, uh, we report to the global nonprofit that is the carbon disclosure
project every year on our, uh, climate action and climate goals and, uh,
we receive our feedback from them.

So, for 2 years in a row, now, we've been, uh, listed as a list city, and this is about 100 cities globally that are recognized for their performance on climate action.

So this last year we were listed as a CDP Ellis city again, but we received feedback that, even though a lot of our actions really uh, uh. uh

Fine with what we should be doing, our vision does not reflect that action and that is 1 of the main reasons we need to update this goal.

And it is imperative to maintaining that list designation.

We are also a signatory of the cities raised to 0, as of last year, which requires us to, uh, set that updated science based emissions reduction target. Uh, we have also signed out to the U. S.

Department of energy is better climate challenge under which we have, uh, committed to 50% reduction in greenhouse gas emissions by 2034, Metro operations, which is a part of our interim goal as well. our interim goal as well

So some of the main benefits of signing on to this, uh, updated emissions reduction goal is, of course, to make sure that our targets are aligned with science to also fulfill our commitments under cities race to 0 and the U. S.

Department of energy is better climate challenge, but also, of course, we've seen, uh, over the past several years that these programs save costs for citizens. They improve quality of life and they protect the environment in our community.

So, what the clean energy resolution was able to do for our energy programs.

In terms of providing support, uh, this ordinance will sorry, this resolution will basically provide that level of support for environmental programs across the board to beyond just energy.

And I'll just mention that the photo on the right is from, uh, recent solar grant install through our solar grant program. It was a free installed for a low income resident. Um, that is going to provide them energy cost savings.

A quick review of some progress that's already underway. We have several plans and policies to guide our efforts, like our emissions reduction plan, which I mentioned, and also prepare loophole. Our climate adaptation plan. We also have our 100% clean energy resolution. energy resolution

In addition, there are several projects underway through both our office as well as several other agencies that we work with, um, as well as partners outside of local metro government.

For example, our energy manager has already saved metro over a 1Million dollars in energy savings since he started, um, solo removal, which is a program that we just concluded the 1st,

year of has succeeded in installing solar panels on 94 homes. 7 of those are which of, which are. are

Free installed through a solar grant program. Um, we also have the vision 0 program for transfer, reduced road accidents. We also have a solid waste management gold.

Of 90% diversion by 2042, an arbitrary canopy goal of 45% by 2055. we've also been working with other government agencies through the partnership for green cities. Um, as well, as we have an internal green team that's working on improving sustainability at Metro.

So all of these efforts combined are already setting us on a path to achieve that goal. It's just a matter of codifying that. to achieve that goal it's just a matter of codifying that

I'll also mention that a couple of weeks ago, um, Fisher signed an executive order committing to the same resolution. And this is something that we would love to have console support on as well.

And also we are not alone in this, as I mentioned thousands of cities. Have signed on to the cities race to 0, and some of them have already updated their targets just as we are trying to do.

And some of the peer cities include the ones that have listed here in Indianapolis, South bend.

Europe Austin, et cetera.

Um, that's it from my presentation.

"Chair Fowler"
Wonderful, Thank you. Very much for that. Um, do you want to go ahead and vote on this today?

"Council Member George"
Whatever you feel comfortable?

"Chair Fowler"
Well, I mean.
Okay, so this is the resolution and I think that we can do the voice.
Vote on this, so all in favor of this resolution say.
I I'm sorry, I believe Councilman Mulvihill has a question. Is that right?

"Committee Member Mulvihill"
Yes, I do. Thank you. Yes. Sorry. I'm not sure how I will, uh, be voting on this.
Not because I don't support it, but due to my wife's employment with so I did see some of the, uh, whereas clauses and it talks about a community wide emissions.
Can you talk about how that may or may not or how it does apply to the major supplier of gas and electricity here in global Kentucky.

"Sumedha Rao"
Absolutely so, uh, their parent company already has their own net 0, um, emission goal and I believe it is net 0 by 2050. and, uh, they are working on that.
And a lot of what is, um, expected, or, you know, that they will have to respond to was already covered under the 100% clean energy resolution, because that covered emissions from energy sources.
So this will not have any additional impact in it. any additional impact in it
Top of what that resolution already um.
Requires of them, or hopes from them.

"Committee Member Mulvihill"
I'm more specific if, if you, if we have desirable goes it, does you've already upped it by 10 years? It does have an impact.
Potentially on their operations and how you expect them to operate correct?

"Sumedha Rao"
Yes, so we will approach it in a very similar way that we're approaching the 100 clean energy resolution. We can consider that a subset of this plan in some ways.
Um, and, uh, part of how we're approaching that is we have a good relationship with a need for in communication with them about our goals and what we hope to how we hope to achieve them.
And, uh, we provide, you know, comments during the PSC hearings based on what we think that they, you know, they could improve. improve
1 of things that we appreciate about their plan, um, and I think that we'll just continue.

"Committee Member Mulvihill"
Sorry, I appreciate the explanation. I'm trying to figure out how to vote on a resolution that impacts.
Or potentially impacts their operations due to my wife's employment there and given that there is at least in my mind. Uh.
Some relationship and some, um, either, uh.
Goal oriented, not because I don't think it can ever be mandated by this body. I, I won't likely have to abstain Madam chair. So they'll probably ask for a real call hub and I apologize but I need more information to understand it.

"Chair Fowler"
Okay, thank you. Council Mulvihill. Anyone else.
Um, um. Councilman Peden

"Vice Chair Peden"
I guess my bigger broader question is how it affects.
Everything, I mean, from housing to the automobiles to.
It just seems like I know it's a nice.
Feel good resolution. No pollution. That's great.
But that's not the world we live in. I mean, right down to the, you know, the amount of generators that they needed in Florida after the hurricanes. I mean, they put out emissions, that's just all there is to it.
So, I, I guess I need a bigger picture some more detail. How does that affect the trucking industry? Um, because there's a difference between diesel and.
And gasoline powered, how does it affect.
Uh, cars and trucks and stuff that come from other staff out of state.
Or out of the city limits, if you live in bullet County, and you drive to ups every morning, it's only a 10 minute drive closer than driving down here. But.
None of that seems to be in this and I know again very broad resolution.
It's a goal. It's not a there are no mandates, but.
But somebody needs to give me an idea of where we're going with that.
And I, it's obviously not something we can cover in.
2 minutes in 8 seconds. So, I mean, you can.
Discuss it now, but my preference will be at some point to table this before we journey.
"Chair Fowler"
Okay, so is that a motion to table if anybody

"Vice Chair Peden"
I don't want to do it now if somebody else is in the queue, if no. 1 else wants to talk, then? Yes, it's a motion to table.

"Chair Fowler"
Okay. I didn't see anyone else in the queue.

"Vice Chair Peden"
Okay. Then motion to table

"Chair Fowler"
do it do we have a 2nd.
2nd, okay. Um, all those in favor I believe

"Vice Chair Peden"
Do not need to do a roll call so Pat can abstain on this.

"Chair Fowler"
Not for time not voting on it.

"Vice Chair Peden"
Okay.

"Chair Fowleer"
Um, so all those in favor of tabling this Adam, um, to future, um, meeting, say, Ah, Ah, I.
Knows my like sad. Okay so this will be tabled.
I wanted to mention to you all before we go that.
Um, W, W, we are going to need to do a special meeting to address the camping ordinance that is before us,
and we were unable to get to today and I've got a lot on our agendas going forward through the end of the year. So, I have proposed a 3 o'clock meeting on October 31st. first
Um, it's a committee week, Monday.
Um, so if, if everybody could look at their calendar, see, if that's going to work for them, let me know by email if there's a conflict with, um, with that meeting. Um.
I'd appreciate it and no other business before us uh, we stand adjourned. Thank you. Yeah. Okay.