





PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT

400 La Crosse Street | La Crosse, WI 54601 | P: (608) 789-7512 | F: (608) 789-7318

Memorandum

To: Mike Giese, Sustainable La Crosse Commission Chairperson

From: Lewis Kuhlman, AICP, Associate Planner

Date: July 20, 2017

Re: Sustainability Indicator 2016 Draft Report Suggestions

The Sustainability Indicators 2016 Draft Report has good data, but could make some adjustments to improve its message and usability. Staff suggestions include highlighting the goals of the *Strategic Plan for Sustainability*, adjusting graphs, correcting grammar and spelling, and going forward.

The report may be more impactful if it is framed or structured around the goals of the Plan, like making the goals headers for their section, or at least putting the goals in bold. Goals could also be illustrated in the graphs, either by a straight line across (like in Figure 5 and 6) or a linear slope showing a decline of 25% to 2025 (for example). Lastly, for the Paper Usage goal, the report could explain how many pounds or sheets are in a case of paper, to make it more tangible.

Figure 1 and Figure 3 show the number of Cooling Degree Days (CDD) and Heating Degree Days (HDD), but additional graphs could go a step further by normalizing for those variables. It would be interesting to see if there were a trend for the City's electric use if CDD and HDD where held constant. Also, for Figure 7, the 2007 data for the City is available in the 2009 Plan (134,720 gallons of gasoline and 262,371 gallons of diesel fuel).

There were a few minor grammatical and spelling mistakes. In the top header on page 11, "EIA" should be "EUI." The corporate entity "City" is capitalized (i.e. "City" departments instead of "city" departments on page. "Waste Treatment Utility" could be "Waste Treatment Plant" in the last line on page 17.

The Planning and Development Department had been short-staffed, requiring the help of contractors for this report. Unfortunately, the scope and budget of the contracts were limited, so these reports don't indicate whether action recommendations from the Plan were successful or give policy direction. City and County staff should now be capable again of taking on the indicators report and action analysis, so the SLC may want to reconsider contracting out next year. Also, Onalaska could start reporting since it is represented on the SLC.

With these suggestions, the Sustainability Indicator 2016 Draft Report will hopefully be a useful tool for the SLC to make sustainable policy recommendations to the City and County in the future.