

## Facility and Support Services

600 West 4<sup>th</sup> Street

Davenport, Iowa 52801-1003

fss @ scottcountyiowa.com

(563) 326-8738 Voice (563) 328-3245 Fax

---



May 3, 2011

To: Dee F. Bruemmer  
County Administrator

From: Dave Donovan, Director  
Facility and Support Services

Subj: Sustainability Plan and Public Comments

Attached are two documents related to the Scott County Sustainability Plan. The first document is a summary of revisions made to the plan since it was presented to the Board of Supervisors in March. All revisions are a result of either feedback from the Board or comments we received. Also included in that document is a very brief synopsis of the public comments we have received since the Board presentation and through today.

The second attached document is a summary of the comments received that indicates the residency of the commentor and includes a brief description of the comments provided including the main theme and if the comment is supportive or non-supportive of the plan.

I will attend the next Committee of the Whole meeting to discuss the plan further and to answer any questions you or the Board may have.

## **Scott County Sustainability Plan**

### **Summary of Final Revisions and Public Comments**

On March 29, 2011, Gena McCollough from the Bi-State Regional Planning Commission presented a summary of the draft Scott County Sustainability Plan (dated February 2011) at the Scott County Board of Supervisor's Committee of the Whole meeting. At that meeting, Supervisors recommended a minimum of a one month period for public comment. Beginning on Friday, April 1, the Plan was available on the Scott County website and comments were accepted via the website.

Based on subsequent feedback from the Board of Supervisors (and comments from stakeholders), the Project Team asked the Bi-State Regional Commission to make final revisions to the Scott County Sustainability Plan Draft Report. The Plan presented to the Board as the final plan and under consideration at the May 10, 2011 Committee of the Whole and the May 12, 2011 Regular Board meetings includes said revisions.

A recap of the revisions follows:

- 1) Throughout the document: the responsibility for the plan, moving forward, is changed. All references to creating a new group – the Sustainable Solutions Committee – are removed. Instead, the existing Scott County Green Team, an internal employee committee, is re-focused on any implementation activities included in the plan. Rather than including external partners on a new group, the Green Team, will work and communicate externally, as needed, to ensure our partners and stakeholders interests are known and represented as any implementation activities may move forward.
- 2) Under Section 2 (On Becoming Sustainable), in the heading “Goals for Sustainability and Strategies for Implementation”, page 9, paragraph 2: This paragraph identified and described the implementation of the Sustainable Solutions Committee and discussed membership of that new group. The revised document instead discusses that the existing Scott County Green Team, at the recommendation of the County Board is re-focused and tasked with any implementation activities that the Board chooses to pursue.
- 3) Similarly, in Table 2.1, under the heading “Making Sustainability the New Normal”, page 10: The creation of the Sustainable Solutions Committee is removed and the retasking of the Green Team is substituted. All references of the Sustainable Solutions Committee from here forward, throughout the document, are replaced with the Scott County Green Team.
- 4) In Table 2.1, under the heading “Preserve the County's Natural or Unique Resources – Public and Private”, page 12: the title reference to “public and private” is removed.
- 5) In Table 2.1, under the heading “Preserve the County's Natural or Unique Resources”, page 12: Identifying opportunities and threats, a reference to invasive species, is added.
- 6) In Table 2.1, under the heading “Preserve the County's Natural or Unique Resources”, page 12: the organization “The Friends of the Nahant Marsh” is added to the list of partnering organizations.

- 7) In Table 2.1, under the heading “Preserve the County’s Natural or Unique Resources”, the fourth strategy bullet is revised to include a reference that identifies wetland areas as one of our natural resources.
- 8) Under Section 2 (On Becoming Sustainable), in the heading “Action Plan for Scott County Government”, page 33: The first goal to create the Sustainable Solutions Committee is revised to instead reference the County Green Team, similar to items #2 and #3 above.
- 9) Under Section 3 (Measuring Success for Future Generations), page 41, paragraph 3: The third sentence which read, “Yet other activities will require significant time and funding investment from public and private interests”, is revised to read, “Yet other activities, if undertaken, may require significant time and funding investments from public and private interests”.

Between April 1 and May 3, staff received numerous public comments from the Scott County website regarding the proposed Community Sustainability Plan. Those comments are summarized as follows:

- As of May 3, 2011, a total of 31 comments were submitted via the Scott County website.
- 25 comments were positive or supportive of the effort; 4 were not supportive of the effort and the remaining 2 comments were unclear if they supported the plan or not.
- Of the 31 submissions, 17 indicated Scott County residency. The remainder either indicated out of county residency (Rock Island County) or did not provide the information.
- 28 of the submissions indicated their identity (name). Only 3 were submitted anonymously.
- All comments as of May 3 are summarized in a spreadsheet including the primary points made in their comment narrative.

Count	Date Rec'd	Last Name	Scott County	Supportive / Non-supportive	Summary
1	4/2/2011	Hopper	Yes	S	Complimentary; need for more encompassing methodology for assessing and sharing performance.
2	4/2/2011	Sherman	Yes	S	Need to add language to address invasive species as a threat. Please discontinue; please don't offer to educate me about this issue; propoganda.
3	3/28/2011	Anderson	Yes	N	Well done; Concerned with local foods and Food Hub
4	4/6/2011	Staub	Yes	S	Complimentary.
5	4/14/2011	No Name Given	?	S	Complimentary; Scott County is a leader; mentions local foods, renewable enery, water/air quality.
6	4/15/2011	Griffiths	No	S	Sets the example for youth
7	4/15/2011	Griffith	Yes	S	concerned with lighting
8	4/18/2011	Collins	Yes	-	Necessary to compete for potential business and jobs; mentions Greensburg, KS as an example of a "green city" and the positive impact that has had.
9	4/17/2011	Kai	Yes	S	Wants more done concerning organic farming.
10	4/17/2011	Lyle	Yes	S	Proud to be a resident of Scott County; good to know that our governing bodies are taking the future into consideration.
11	4/17/2011	McDonnell	Yes	S	Will make Scott County a better place.
12	4/17/2011	Forth	Yes	S	Concerned with CAFO's; likes the short proposed timeline for some actions.
13	4/16/2011	Kasper	No	S	Concerned with air and water quality; commerce and profit at the expense of the community is not sustainable; commends Scott County.
14	4/16/2011	Zimmerman	Yes	S	Proud of the QC; wants a requirement that all new power facilities do studies to explore energy conservation instead.
15	4/16/2011	VanThournout	No	S	Don't let corporations influence this project.
16	4/15/2011	Unsicker	No	-	Likes the "new normal".
17	4/15/2011	Neff	Yes	S	Need to tighten up draft: charts aren't clear and key audiences (realtors, landlords, farmers not in Farm Bureau, Habitat ReStore, Living Lands and Waters, PACG and IDALS) are left out; ensure buy-in.
18	4/15/2011	Grove	Yes	S	Applauds.
19	4/15/2011	No Name Given	?	S	Has been concerned about how poorly Iowa counties are doing protecting air and water quality.
20	4/15/2011	Hendricks	Yes	S	

Count	Date Rec'd	Last Name	Scott County	Supportive / Non-supportive	Summary
21	4/17/2011	Bergren	No	S	Leading the way in the QC just as Davenport did when they became the first QC "Cool City" (a Sierra Club designation). Forward looking; all proposals are attainable; likes the three part model (people/community, planet/environment and profits/economy).
22	4/19/2011	Ford	No	S	Sees the plan as a way to be more intrusive into private lives and it worries them.
23	4/19/2011	No Name Given	?	N	100% behind the effort.
24	4/19/2011	Martin	?	S	
25	4/21/2011	Wells	Yes	S	The goal of sustainability seems so obvious and necessary. Well thought out plan, but at what cost? Seems that many of the goals will drain rather than sustain. Questions who reviews for progress and what administrative process occurs if progress is not made or actually creates hardship; urban migration puts pressure on scarce public resources; how does the plan ensure that both public and private property rights are protected; where do citizens fit into decision making?
26	4/20/2011	No Name Given	?	N	
27	4/20/2011	No Name Given	No	S	Local green economy is key to surviving economic crisis and are a trend across the country. We have great resources to grow food, so why are we "importing". Thanks for leadership; thinks that local foods, renewable energy, clean water/are are essential to every community; the sooner we implement the better; let us choose to be a model for others to follow.
28	4/21/2011	Vernon	?	S	
29	4/22/2011	Crowther	No	S	Excited and thinks this is a great start; hopes Illinois communities will follow Scott County's lead and develop plans.
30	4/25/2011	Anderson	Yes	N	Demands a public hearing on the plan. Plan seems comprehensive and plausible; areas for improvement: more detailed performance measures, strong efforts to educate, recurring scientific survey, use of data to target programs; offers thanks.
31	5/2/2011	Schiltz	Yes	S	
32					
33					