Process update

Topic-focused Working Groups

Meeting #1, May
- Review existing conditions, issues, and opportunities
- Set preliminary goals

Meeting #2, June
- Refine goals
- Review existing City policies
- Develop strategies and actions

Meeting #3, July
- Refine strategies and actions
- Identify indicators and targets

Prioritization Survey

Advisory Committee

September
- Review synergies and conflicts
- Feedback on proposed and prioritized actions

December
- Identify a final list of actions to include as plan recommendations (both near-term and aspirational).
- Identify a final list of indicators that are most effective and feasible to track progress along goals.

Topic-focused Working Groups

February
- Review citywide development scenarios and impacts.
- Set targets based on the desired level of performance across indicators.

Community feedback

Fall, ‘17
- Public engagement on goals

Spring ‘18
- Public workshop on scenarios
Today’s agenda

Meeting objective: Gain consensus on actions that will be written into the plan as recommendations, and select indicators that the City will measure on an ongoing basis after the plan has been released.

• Session overview
• Actions: Discuss Working Group feedback on the Priority Matrix developed by City and consultant teams. Identify a final list of actions to include as plan recommendations. *(Facilitated exercise)*
• Indicators: Present indicators recommended by the planning team that are most effective and feasible to track progress along goals. Discuss indicators and identify a final list to be included in the plan.
• Next steps
Essential Definitions

**GOAL**

- Broad, aspirational statement of what we want to achieve

**Strategy**

- Approach or approaches that we take to achieve a goal

**Action**

- Specific policy, program, or tool we take to achieve a strategy

**Indicator**

- Quantitative measure(s) used to assess performance against goal

**Target**

- Desired level of performance
Session overview: Determining plan priorities

Sorting: Working with the City, the actions generated at the end of meeting #3 have been sorted into 4 categories based on expected impact and difficulty.

Streamlining: To bring the actions into a parallel style across all working groups, some of them have been rephrased or combined. We intended to make the actions more specific, and to sharpen them by replacing verbs such as “explore” or “encourage” with concrete actions that the City can pursue.
Facilitated Exercise
Action categorization

Do you agree with the current placement of each action along the four quadrants?

### No-brainers
(high impact + low difficulty)
Actions that are easy to accomplish and of a high impact. Should be completed first.

### Major projects
(high impact / high difficulty)
Actions that are difficult to accomplish but of a high impact. May be worth doing, but only considered after top recommendations are completed.

### Fill Ins
(low impact + low difficulty)
Actions that are easy to accomplish but of a low impact. Low priority but could be worthwhile.

### Low impact – High difficulty actions
(low impact + high difficulty)
Actions that are hard to accomplish and of a low impact. Not worth the time nor effort and should not be considered.

### Major Projects
(High impact / High difficulty)
Actions that are difficult to accomplish but of a high impact. May be worth doing, but only considered after top recommendations are completed.

- Establish an eco-roof requirement for new construction
- Require electric vehicle charging in new buildings
- Create incentives or requirements for adaptive retrofits for existing buildings (utility placement, floodable ground floors, etc.)
Indicators
Characteristics of a Good Indicator

An indicator is a quantitative measure used to assess performance against a goal. To guide the Working Group’s development of indicators, the following general characteristics of good indicators have been identified.

- Simple to understand and communicate
- Historic data is available and readily accessible
- Indicator is a true reflection of performance

Indicators That Do Not Meet These Criteria

- Citywide noise pollution (Lden)
- Native plantings as % of groundcover
- Total number of parks
Recommended climate & environment indicators (1 of 2)

Which of these indicators seem most compelling in measuring progress against the goals?

Are there any other indicators that should be considered as a better way to measure progress against goal(s)?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Goal assessed</th>
<th>Potential Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vulnerable populations at risk of displacement due to flooding (% of households)</td>
<td>A. Preparedness and Resilience</td>
<td>City of Cambridge Community Development Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heat-related hospitalizations (annual hospitalizations per 100,000 people)</td>
<td>A. Preparedness and Resilience</td>
<td>City of Cambridge Public Health Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Climate change and sustainability curriculum taught in Cambridge Public Schools (hours of instruction)</td>
<td>B. Engagement and Benefits Sharing</td>
<td>Cambridge Public Schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tree canopy coverage (% by neighborhood)</td>
<td>C. Natural Environment</td>
<td>City of Cambridge Department of Public Works</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population living within walking distance of a park (%)</td>
<td>C. Natural Environment</td>
<td>City of Cambridge Department of Public Works</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Which of these indicators seem most compelling in measuring progress against the goals?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Goal assessed</th>
<th>Potential Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community-wide greenhouse gas emissions (mt CO2e)</td>
<td>D. Carbon Neutrality</td>
<td>City of Cambridge Community Development Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potable water use (gallons/resident)</td>
<td>E. Sustainable Water Resources</td>
<td>Cambridge Water Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bacterial water quality report card for local water bodies (%)</td>
<td>E. Sustainable Water Resources</td>
<td>U.S. Environmental Protection Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waste to landfill (tons)</td>
<td>F. Zero Waste</td>
<td>City of Cambridge Department of Public Works</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Are there any other indicators that should be considered as a better way to measure progress against goal(s)?
## Alternative climate & environment indicators

Which of these indicators seem most compelling in measuring progress against the goals?

Are there any other indicators that should be considered as a better way to measure progress against goal(s)?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Goal assessed</th>
<th>Potential Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Minority and low income household representation on citywide committees (%)</td>
<td>B. Engagement and Benefits Sharing</td>
<td>City of Cambridge Community Development Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Air, noise, light and soil pollution (PM2.5, Lden, NSB, # of sites)</td>
<td>C. Natural Environment</td>
<td>Various</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Separated Sewer System (%)</td>
<td>E. Sustainable Water Resources</td>
<td>City of Cambridge Department of Public Works</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drinking water quality (Index)</td>
<td>E. Sustainable Water Resources</td>
<td>Cambridge Water Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waste generation (tons)</td>
<td>F. Zero Waste</td>
<td>City of Cambridge Department of Public Works</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Next steps
Upcoming citywide scenario analysis

- Envision Cambridge will be testing land use mixes and densities to determine the level of development under existing zoning compared to three alternative scenarios.

- The alternative scenarios will focus on the corridors and selected areas likely to have a higher propensity for change.

- The scenarios will be compared based on performance on citywide metrics such as:
  - Housing Units
  - Affordable Units
  - Jobs
  - Traffic volumes and mode share
  - GHG Emissions (MT CO2e)
  - Net Revenue ($)
Study areas for citywide scenarios