

Item 25-0153: Resolution #2-R-25 Emissions Reduction Recommendation

Parks and Recreation Committee

Mon, Mar 10, 2025 6:15PM

Aldersperson Katie Van Zeeland (District 5) 12:15

All right, I'll go ahead then and move on to item number 25-0153, resolution 2-R-25 emissions reduction recommendation. Do we have a motion?

Aldersperson Martyn Smith (District 4) 12:30

Motion to approve.

Aldersperson Alex Schultz (District 9) 12:32

Second.

Aldersperson Katie Van Zeeland (District 5) 12:32

We have a motion to approve and a second. The author of the resolution is here. Alder Hayden, would you like to go ahead first?

Aldersperson Patrick Hayden (District 7) 12:40

Thank you. Thank you, Chair. First of all, I'd like to comment on the amazing work that the panel did in putting together this report. Anybody that's seen the work that they've done, it's quite frankly amazing, and I appreciate that they were able to find a way to understand that we can't completely control emissions within the city. They're state issues. There's federal issues, and issues with the utility—utilities that will prevent us from getting completely emission free. But I think this is the first in many of a number of steps for the city of Appleton to reduce our emissions and eventually find a path to zero someday. And I think by passing this, this helps us keep pace with cities like Sun Prairie that just a couple days ago became the first city to be completely self-sustaining. And I would hate to see Appleton fall further behind cities like that that are being more aggressive on things like climate change and emissions. So, I would ask the committee to please approve the—or recommend approval of this resolution.

Aldersperson Katie Van Zeeland (District 5) 13:48

Thank you. And we do have some members of the public here. Is there anyone who wants to speak on this item? If you would like to just step forward to the podium, state your name and address for the record, and I ask that you keep your comments under five minutes, please.

Charlie Goff (Appleton Sustainability Advisory Panel) 14:03

No problem there. Charlie Goff [XXXXX]. So, I've been involved with the committee here, I think, since we formed a couple years ago, and we produced a report that we sent to the city council in December, and in that report there was three recommendations. One of them was to produce a inventory of the city's emissions, CO2 emissions, and the second one was to modify the goal of the city.

Charlie Goff (Appleton Sustainability Advisory Panel) 14:37

What I handed out here just before is the revised—it's not revised. It's an updated listing of 2024 plus 2023 so you can see in the what we handed out, we are actually making some progress. We're actually down about almost 6% in our total emissions year over year.

Charlie Goff (Appleton Sustainability Advisory Panel) 15:01

One of the challenges when you take a look at this and look at the initial recommendation that the 2021 report had to go to net zero by 2050 is taking what we have here and reducing the 25,651 metric tons of CO2 in half, or if you want to go to net zero, down to zero. The listing that that we put together in terms of what are some of the steps is a goal that we have here for this for this fiscal year, for this calendar year. We're going to take a look at which ones we think are feasible and practical for the city to undertake in order to reduce the emissions. But it didn't make, in our mind, a whole lot of sense to have a goal, a conflicting goal. One of the goals was that it was to reduce it by 2050. The resolution that was recommended in the report was to go down to 2040. Kind of a conflicting goal. And one of the things we found was that there is ISO independent—or International Standards Organization, and I think they recognize that a lot of municipalities are struggling with the same problem. So, they said, well, let's, let's break this up into pieces. And instead of taking look at the end goal, let's, let's see if we can do something on a on a decade basis. And so, their recommendation—ISO's recommendation—is to set your baseline and then see if you can cut it in half in 10 years. And so that's the that's the impetus of the resolution to change that, and at the same time keeping a stretch goal of net zero by 20—2050. So that's what we have in front of you.

Alderson Katie Van Zeeland (District 5) 17:07

Thank you very much. I see there are some other folks who would like to speak, possibly. If you could just step forward and state your name and address for the record, please.

Terry Dawson (Taskforce on Resiliency, Climate Mitigation and Adaptation) 17:21

Terry Dawson, [XXXXX]. When the council established—adopted Resolution 13-R-19 years ago, you set a goal of achieving net zero emissions by 2050 or sooner, and you set up the task force on resiliency, climate mitigation and adaptation. And Mayor Hanna had asked me to chair that task force, which Mayor Woodford concurred with, and I did that until July of 2021. Following the final report of that task force which advised adopting clear timelines for energy transition, the council established the sustainability advisory panel, which has now recommended these emission targets and timelines.

Terry Dawson (Taskforce on Resiliency, Climate Mitigation and Adaptation) 18:05

The World Economic Forum notes that most of the carbon emissions around the world come from cities, but cities have the opportunity to improve their local air and noise pollution, public health, as well as lower their municipal operating costs relatively lower. The resolution before you helps us move toward becoming a healthier, more economical city and a healthier planet. It refines and fulfills the intention that the council expressed back in 2019. I appreciate all the great work that's already been done by the city staff as well as the sustainability panel, and I think this is the next logical step, and I urge you to adopt it. Thank you.

Alderson Katie Van Zeeland (District 5) 18:48

Thank you very much. Is there anyone else would like to speak on the item? Just come forward. State your name and address for the record, please.

Ron Jones (Appleton Sustainability Advisory Panel) 18:55

My name is Ron Jones. I live at [XXXXX], and I am also on a member of the Appleton Sustainability Advisory Panel, and I'm just here to speak in support of that and of the fine work that Charlie has done in putting together a lot of good information of the carb—the greenhouse gas emissions in the City of Appleton and the work that we are currently doing in Appleton and projected to do. But I see that this resolution will help us fine tune our goals that we have set, that lofty goal being net zero by 2050, and it gives us an achievable goal that I think is very doable for the City of Appleton. So, I urge support for this resolution. Thank you.

Aldersperson Katie Van Zeeland (District 5) 19:48

Thank you very much. I should say that we're always very thankful for our citizens who step forward and serve on our boards and commissions. Before we get into this discussion, you should know that. I—we do have our—now, forgive me, our project and resiliency manager Steve Schrage here today. Did you want to give us some feedback from staff on this item?

Steven Schrage (Projects Manager) 20:19

Yeah, so when we when we started the panel and started some of our initiatives, the Clean Energy Initiative was one of the, one of the big ones we wanted to hone in on and with that and that the goal of 2050, and once we started digging into that, we found that we have a lot of constraints, and especially constraints with the utilities. And it seems like other communities and stuff, they're just put in that goal and then just kind of say, "Yeah, we'll just wait till technology improves," and then just kind of kicking the can down the road, just per se. And I like this resolution because it puts it puts a goal, and it gives us a time frame for that goal. So, I think that's really going to help move through some changes on to get emissions reductions within the city.

Steven Schrage (Projects Manager) 21:15

So, I think that this is a very—this is an achievable goal in an achievable timeline, and reducing that by 50 cent—or 50% is about 13,000 met—CO tons of CO2 E. And I think that's, that's a huge number. And I think we can, once we get closer to that 2035 time frame, then we could do maybe another resolution for 50% again of what's remaining in the next 10 years, and kind of do that as a basis like that so we have achievable goals that we can work towards.

Aldersperson Katie Van Zeeland (District 5) 21:58

If I could just ask, do you see any way that this new resolution would constrain the work of staff, or what kind of costs—are there any costs with moving this goal a little bit? I mean, it seems like the goal was actually larger. We're breaking it down a little bit. Can you just talk a little bit about what you foresee as far as costs or work does this change in any way?

Steven Schrage (Projects Manager) 22:30

I don't foresee it changing too much. A lot of the stuff we could do could be incorporated into projects that are future projects that we have in the five-year plan and beyond, and I think we can get a lot of it through projects that we need to do within the city already. So, I don't foresee a ton of changes with our capital planning or anything like that to meet our goal. So, we have a couple ideas, and hopefully we can work through them this year and give some good recommendations of how we get there over the next 10 years.

Aldersperson Katie Van Zeeland (District 5) 23:09

Would you foresee adding a goal like this would make the city eligible for more grants or funding in some way? You know, would you find it be advantageous than any other avenue?

Steven Schrage (Projects Manager) 23:23

I think with this goal, I think it will be great for showing other communities that this is a good, realistic way to lower emissions within a community. It's—like I said, it's peoples have that 2050, and they keep saying, "Well, we'll just wait 'til technology improves. Wait 'til technology improves." And you're not really doing stuff when you can do—little things you can do will add up over time.

Steven Schrage (Projects Manager) 24:05

So, when we, when we discuss this with WE Energies, they said that they basically said that we're just going to wait till technology improves, and that's how we're hoping to meet our 2050 goal while at simultaneously

recommending the approval of building two new natural gas power generation facilities in the southeast corner of the state. So, they don't—aren't showing really any kind of goals of meeting—any kind of way of meeting their goals. So, this way, we can actually have achievable goals that we can meet. We can show other communities and people within our community that we're making a difference.

Alderson Katie Van Zeeland (District 5) 24:53

So, this, if I understand you correctly, you're not saying we need to do this because they're not doing their job. We were going to do this regardless, but this is a more manageable goal for the city.

Steven Schrage (Projects Manager) 25:04

Yeah, correct, because we only can reduce our emissions so much with our Scope 1 emissions. When you get into the Scope 2, that's all the emissions that come from generating the power that the city's using and we do not have con—the only control we have over that is the amount we use, or if we add renewables into the mix. So, I—with our 2035 goal of our 50%, we will be doing a combination of trying to lower our usage, possibly adding renewables where it makes financial sense, and trying to work on our Scope 1 emissions also.

Alderson Katie Van Zeeland (District 5) 25:48

And can you talk about—when you say "this city" are you talking about residents within the city? Are you talking about this city and the work that we do specifically?

Steven Schrage (Projects Manager) 25:57

No. This resolution is strictly for city operations. So, this will be just city buildings, city cars, just whatever emissions come from keeping the city going. We are trying—we are working this year on a community-wide emissions inventory, so we'll have a little bit more data for the whole community. So, then we can and we can start talking that in the future, but for right now, we're just talking city operations.

Alderson Katie Van Zeeland (District 5) 26:28

Thank you. And one last question, what is the difference between Scope 1 and Scope 2 emissions?

Steven Schrage (Projects Manager) 26:34

So, Scope 2, just start with that, because that one's easy. So, Scope 2 is whatever emissions come from generating the electricity you're using within the city. And then Scope 1 is direct source emissions. So that's going to be the emissions coming out of your tail pipes, emissions coming from natural gas water heaters, natural gas boilers, furnaces, and then also the methane combustion at the wastewater treatment plant.

Alderson Katie Van Zeeland (District 5) 27:06

Okay, thank you. Any other questions? Alder Smith.

Alderson Martyn Smith (District 4) 27:12

Thank you, Chair. First, I just want to say, chair, that I think that was an important point about these are—this is not about all Appleton, but it's about the city specifically. And I would—I think that's an important thing, if anybody is watching or listening to this, understand we're talking about the City of Appleton reducing its emissions. From our discussion earlier, I just want to make sure I have a couple of points correct in my head. The—because of WE Energies being on its own pathway as far as energy generation generating, it's very difficult for us to predict how that will work, and this zero emissions by 2050 is really dependent on them. So, what we're doing, in my understanding, is moving towards a more realistic time frame. We're not move—booting forward the goal or making it more ambitious. We're moving it to a more realistic track where we as a city can say we're by the things that are in our control we think we can get to a 50% reduction by 2034, or—and so that's

what we're voting for. So, this is not a kind of, "Let's push this even harder," but actually a step towards realism. Is—would you say that is correct?

Steven Schrage (Projects Manager) 28:35

That is correct. Yes.

Alderson Martyn Smith (District 4) 28:36

Okay. I mean, to me that's an important point as we as we message this. And then the second point is that on the Scope 1 emissions that we now have before us, the prime value in passing this is really for its—it would set the kind of the city's imprimatur that we want to move in this direction, and as we make future decisions we could move in a direction of limiting our carbon, limiting our emissions, and so this would be a kind of goal that, as we make choices about busses or new systems in different places, that we could be pushing for. But you don't have a—it would set this up as a goal for us to reach, but you don't have a program necessarily about how we're going to put these pieces together?

Steven Schrage (Projects Manager) 29:26

Yeah, that's we—yeah, we're working on that year with the panel with Charlie and Ron and the rest of the members on the panel. We we're working towards—that's what our goal this year is, to put together a plan for this. And you brought up reducing the Scope 1 emission. So, I'd like to say that that that's 100% within our control. And why it's good to focus on the Scope 1 emissions is because not only is it putting CO2 out, it's also Scope 1 emissions also includes all the criteria pollutants, and those are all being emitted within our city, so particulate matter, carbon monoxide, nitrous dioxide, all these pollutants that are known to cause health hazards. So, by doing that, by reducing those we're directly impacting the people within the community by reducing this criteria pollutants also so.

Alderson Martyn Smith (District 4) 30:26

And you would vouch for the idea that 50% and not 35% or 40% but 50% is something realistic? I just—I feel like we often have goals that we don't live up to, and I think it's important at this stage to be realistic. 50% is something we could—it is a realistic goal for our for the city, you would say. It's maybe a stretch goal, but realistic.

Steven Schrage (Projects Manager) 30:26

I think with—I have some thoughts, and if we can implement some of these thoughts, I think that we should be able to do that. Yes.

Alderson Martyn Smith (District 4) 31:05

Thank you.

Alderson Katie Van Zeeland (District 5) 31:07

Any other questions or comments? Alder Doran.

Alderson Chad Doran (District 15) 31:12

Thank you. I think my first question just is about the "therefore, be it resolved" portion of the resolution, and I understand kind of the first part, but I guess what I'm wondering is, what this actually directs staff to do?

Alderson Katie Van Zeeland (District 5) 31:31

Can we—I guess, let me just take a look at it really quick. I—

Alderson Chad Doran (District 15) 31:39

What I'm wondering, I guess, is if it's more than just changing a target on paper, or if this is actually directing staff to do something—

Alderson Katie Van Zeeland (District 5) 31:46

Yeah.

Alderson Chad Doran (District 15) 31:47

—beyond that.

Alderson Katie Van Zeeland (District 5) 31:47

Perhaps this would be in Alder Behren's court. Does he—is this—is something like this in the "therefore, be it resolved," is this some kind of binding resolution for staff or is that something that's still managed through the administration?

Attorney Christopher Behrens 32:02

Just to clarify, you called me Alder Behrens.

Alderson Katie Van Zeeland (District 5) 32:05

I'm sorry. I'm sorry. Attorney Behrens. My apologies. You—okay, you have this—right?—the same microphone?

Attorney Christopher Behrens 32:13

Yeah, the first line indicates updating the emissions target. So, I—can interpret that how you want, but target implies a goal, so I guess the directive is to try to achieve the target.

Alderson Katie Van Zeeland (District 5) 32:35

And procedurally that would be done through the administration?

Attorney Christopher Behrens 32:39

Correct.

Alderson Katie Van Zeeland (District 5) 32:39

Okay. Does that answer the question well enough?

Alderson Chad Doran (District 15) 32:44

I guess, for that part. The—I have a couple other questions, I guess. We talked about the sort of difference between the Scope 1 and Scope 2 emissions, and if I'm reading this correctly by trying to reduce this the city's CO2 emissions by approximately 13,600 metric tons. In I think one of the one of the documents from the committee noted that the wastewater treatment plant alone emits 12,000 tons a year. So essentially, we either have to cut, try to cut, every—all the other emissions the city does, or reduce the, or eliminate, I guess, the emissions from the wastewater treatment plant, unless there's some sort of combination of both, I guess. But I mean, that's the—we're talking about pretty big sums, correct?

Alderson Katie Van Zeeland (District 5) 33:45

Is that—is that the correct understanding that we would have to get rid of all emissions from the wastewater plant in order to meet this goal?

Steven Schrage (Projects Manager) 33:57

Yep, that is, and we're looking at options, and we feel that there's a feasible option that we are investigating, and that would that would take it down to zero.

Alderson Katie Van Zeeland (District 5) 34:15

Okay. Alder Doran.

Alderson Chad Doran (District 15) 34:17

Great. Thank you. And then just a couple questions maybe around that because I think one of the one of the possible solutions that was noted was a was a pipeline, I guess, to connect to the RNG facility out—that's connected at the landfill. Is that what you're referencing to do?

Alderson Katie Van Zeeland (District 5) 34:37

I'm not sure, because that is not—that isn't included in the resolution. I'm not sure that really we can go into that into specifics. Those things would need to be approved by Council and committee anyway, but so if we can just try to keep it to the resolution. I understand where you're going, but that's not something we would be here tonight.

Alderson Chad Doran (District 15) 35:01

So, I guess, with respect to that, what I'm sort of wondering is what the what the staff knows about sort of overall, I guess, an overall plan and cost at this point. If this is something that council is being asked to approve, I think it's important for us to know sort of specifically what the plan to achieve that goal is and what it would cost. So, I'm just curious if there's been any discussion about that, because it just wasn't included in the resolution at all. So.

Alderson Katie Van Zeeland (District 5) 35:30

Yeah, so we did talk briefly about that. If we can talk just maybe reiterate what we talked about, just in regard to cost.

Steven Schrage (Projects Manager) 35:46

As I as I stated before, we're not looking at any major projects that are going to cost this city significant amount of money. So, I don't know how—

Alderson Katie Van Zeeland (District 5) 36:03

When you say "the city," are you also including rate payers in that?

Steven Schrage (Projects Manager) 36:09

Correct.

Alderson Katie Van Zeeland (District 5) 36:09

Okay.

Steven Schrage (Projects Manager) 36:11

Correct. So that would....

Alderson Katie Van Zeeland (District 5) 36:17

Okay. Alder Doran, did you want to follow up?

Alderman Chad Doran (District 15) 36:22

Well, I guess I was just—I'm just wondering, what if there's even a ballpark of what the, you know, the city's costs would be, and what the actual plan is to sort of get us to that target of the reduced target of 50%, I guess?

Steven Schrage (Projects Manager) 36:39

We have not got that far in the planning. That's what we'll be working on this year. And we'll be working on putting together initiatives or projects, however you want to say it, as recommendations on how to get there. And then we would bring that back to council, and then go from there. So, we don't really know enough at this moment to give cost opinions on what it's going to take to get there. Especially because at how volatile costs for stuff are right now, it's too hard to judge what could be in five to 10 years down the road.

Alderman Katie Van Zeeland (District 5) 37:29

Any other questions or comments, Alder Doran?

Alderman Chad Doran (District 15) 37:32

Just one last one, I guess. With regards to the resolution itself, just wondering if—so, passing the resolution sort of directs the administration to put the city on the path to reach this goal? Is this something that sort of staff is already undertaking? Is the resolution necessary to get us to that goal?

Alderman Katie Van Zeeland (District 5) 37:54

I'm actually going to ask Attorney Behrens if he could weigh in on this.

Attorney Christopher Behrens 38:03

I think that's a decision for the council to make if they want to adopt the resolution. As I read the resolution, it's essentially taking a goal that was in place but just making some measurable targets on the way to the final goal. Whether the council wants to adopt those or not and leave the old one in place is a decision then for the council to make.

Alderman Katie Van Zeeland (District 5) 38:28

Thank you.

Alderman Chad Doran (District 15) 38:29

Good. Thank you.

Alderman Katie Van Zeeland (District 5) 38:31

Alder Schultz.

Alderman Alex Schultz (District 9) 38:32

Thank you, Chair. First off, I'd like to thank Alder Hayden for bringing this forward and introducing the resolution. I think some historical context is probably prudent. This resolution 13-R-19 was passed in April of 2019 when most of the Alderman in this room weren't even sitting on council, and that established the Climate Task Force, and after several years, that evolved into the Advisory Panel which was passed with resolution 9-R-22 which would have been about the middle of 2022. So, I say that to give some historical context, that it's been a long road to get to this point and these goals, and trying to establish a baseline and some benchmarks for net zero goals and carbon reduction has been a goal of that initial resolution six years ago. So, it's important to keep that in mind.

Alderman Alex Schultz (District 9) 38:40

I also want to recognize comments by my fellow alder about this pertaining strictly to city missions and city facilities. And there's a question of whether the resolution is—has merit or should be brought to full council for vote. And I think, given the fact that we've taken, I believe, six years before we're finally taking some actual, I guess what I would call, public action on recommendations from the advisory panel. And thank you, Charlie and Ron, for your work there. And also, Steve for moving us forward. But I think it's crucial that we pass this resolution, take it to council to get it passed, because it does show the community that we're taking some steps at long last, to try and wrap our heads around it.

Alderman Alex Schultz (District 9) 40:13

It's taken us this long primarily because it is so difficult to take those measurements and sort of wrap our heads around where all of these emissions are coming from, how we measure them, and how we get the numbers. And I would have one question for Director—or for Steve Schrage is—and maybe the panel is—where were these numbers collected, and how were we, you know, sort of gathering that information and distilling it so that what we're seeing as a as numbers for measuring these many different variables within the city. How do you measuring parking ramps, facilities, gas emissions, water plant input, all of those very disparate things that we're trying to wrap our heads around, how much their carbon footprint actually is? I guess I'd just like a little information about how these numbers were obtained and how we're going to, sort of—I think you mentioned it—gather some more information and put some more numbers on paper.

Steven Schrage (Projects Manager) 41:09

Yeah, thank you, Alder Schultz. Yeah, this was, this was a big undertaking to get all these numbers, and there was a lot of work to try and get every bill that the city pays, and every kilowatt hour accounted for. So, in that it took several times to get it to where we are, but that includes every single traffic light, even we—even in there is like when you press a little button to cross the street and the flashing light, we even accounted for that. It includes all the power used at all the facilities, all the emissions at the wastewater treatment plant. So, every, we—every gallon of gas that the city purchased was accounted for in there. All the fuel for the transit system was accounted for. So, it's very in-depth list there that includes all of that, all the natural gas at all our facilities. So, Charlie did a great job. I rounded up all the data for him, and he did a really good job putting it all together. So, it was a team effort on this, and I feel very confident in those numbers there.

Alderman Alex Schultz (District 9) 42:35

Could I ask a follow up, chair?

Alderman Katie Van Zeeland (District 5) 42:36

Yep, go ahead.

Alderman Alex Schultz (District 9) 42:37

Just digging a little deeper then. So, we have—did we have a lot of this information readily available—how much gas use—and you're making extrapolations based on stuff we were already measuring? Or is there a lot of new measurements that are—that you're trying to introduce into the system to say, "Okay, we need to have new metrics and new ways to measure our carbon footprint?" Or are we looking at we use this many kilowatt hours, we use this much gasoline, we use—you know, we have this street sweeper on the road for 12 hours a month, and that equates to this much. Is it a lot of extrapolation by equation, or are we taking new measurements to capture some of this?

Steven Schrage (Projects Manager) 43:16

No, we—there's—so this was done in CO2e, so we're converting everything to the to CO2e. So, each gallon of gas, each gallon of diesel has a certain number of CO2e that it emits when it's burned. So that's that's—and those numbers are agreed upon across the world. So, we have really good numbers there, and the—and we really dug into the energy grid and where Appleton is pulling from the grid, and how much emissions are with that. So that is a combination of natural gas, coal, nuclear, and renewables. So, we got a really good, really good number for CO2e from the power generation that Appleton actually uses. So real confident in that number too. So, there's—we have good numbers that way also. So.

Alderman Alex Schultz (District 9) 44:33

Thank you. I just—I want it sort of generally understood that these are, these are bona fide numbers based on a pretty solid system for trying to establish these measurements and metrics and move forward that we're that we're have a foundation for good numbers. Thank you.

Alderman Katie Van Zeeland (District 5) 44:46

Given that these—this information was found through bills and charges with the city, does that mean that we would be able to put a monetary savings on cutting emissions, you know, for it—like it—do we have an idea of how much it cost the city overall (all of the things that you used in this equation) that if we say, "Hey, we are going to cut it to this," how much is that saving the city?

Steven Schrage (Projects Manager) 45:19

Oh, yeah, we can we can put a—we can put a dollar a dollar value on emissions for electrical and for gas, diesel, natural gas. So that all can be—

Alderman Katie Van Zeeland (District 5) 45:34

Okay. I think that would be important information to bring to the Council also, and to prepare for any future decisions. I'm sorry. Alder Wolff, I think you were next.

Alderman Nate Wolff (District 12) 45:46

Thank you, Chair. My comments actually piggyback off that a little bit. I know cost has come up a few times in here, and you've—I've really liked sharing what you've had to say today. I just want to point out that as long as a suggestion that comes before us could lead to cost savings, I don't necessarily think you should be worried about bringing anything to us, if that makes sense. So sometimes people might be afraid to bring something to a body because it might cost too much, but I want to reassure you that when it comes to clean water, clean air, and the environment, there is no cost that's too high, especially when it can save us money. Just wanted to put that out there. Thank you.

Alderman Katie Van Zeeland (District 5) 45:49

Alder Smith.

Alderman Martyn Smith (District 4) 46:09

Thank you, Chair. I intend to vote for this to move it forward. And I see it as Attorney Behrens was saying, as our council, as our right as a Council, to adapt a goal and to vote for it and to hold that out for ourselves as the ideal. I think that if ideas come for any of these Scope 1 areas (Alder Doran brought up the wastewater treatment plant) we would have to look at it and say, "Does the extent to which this cuts our emissions, is that worth X amount of dollars?" And we would have to look at all those things on an individual basis. So, with my vote for this, I'm saying definitely, let's move forward. Let's adopt a strong goal that will guide us in our decision making, but that doesn't tie our hands as far as when we get these individual choices about updating, be it busses or

wastewater treatment plant. We'll look at those as they come, and this will be maybe a goad for us to be more ambitious than we would have otherwise. So, thank you for taking the time and the people who came to talk to us who have done the work for this. Appreciate that a lot.

Aldersperson Katie Van Zeeland (District 5) 47:46

Any other questions or comments from alders present? Alder Doran.

Aldersperson Chad Doran (District 15) 47:50

Thank you. I would just like to say thank you for the information so far. I think this has been helpful, but I would appreciate some knowledge about scope and costs. I think saying that you know that that clean air and water, you know ,cost doesn't matter is just a luxury that the city doesn't have. Everything we do has a cost to it, and we have to be mindful of that as we make comparisons and trade offs. So it sounds great in principle, but we have to have that information. So, I would just like to make sure that we could get that for the council meeting.

Aldersperson Katie Van Zeeland (District 5) 48:27

Anyone else? All right, hearing none, we'll go ahead and vote. All those in favor say aye. Aye. Any opposed? That motion passes five zero.