

**Topic:** The Green City**Convener:** Janelle Sjue**Room:** I**Discussion Summary:**

Repurposing and using existing structures instead of building new – way of being green. Carbon footprint of teardowns and green building is less green than repurposing a building. How do we make it possible for all socioeconomic groups to repurpose buildings? Why are we abandoning old buildings all over the city?

Hate to see teardowns replaced with inferior quality new structures. Impacts the quality of neighborhood. Example of Power & Light District. Amenities attract people. Repurposing buildings for residential use. Have lots of underutilized buildings downtown. Incentives for greenfield development have helped lead to this. Not offer tax incentives for sprawl, use them instead to reinvest in urban areas. Culture places high value on the new and low value on the old. Easier to build on greenfield rather than infill sites for environmental, economic, neighbor issues.

Cultural war between individual versus collective rights and responsibilities. Maximizing own success doesn't add up to maximum community success. Individual not balanced with collective rights and responsibilities.

Development from previous decades now depleted, lowering in value. Having to go back and incent older parts of town. We could stop adding things that cause people to move further south. Shopping centers. The further out they are being built, the older interior centers die. KCMO working to make eco dev policy strong than in past.

Expectation that whatever is built, the state and local highway departments will serve those areas. Era of "free roads" will end, equity of transit mode funding will grow. If reuse existing areas, don't have to expand roadway infrastructure, easier to serve with transit. Policies continue to favor highway construction from federal level.

How do we keep cities more compact, save money? Tax incentives (only for historic buildings). Is it sustainable to incentivize development? Need to go farther than public policy; more cultural and education work. Green building does given incentives, but entirely voluntary, and focused on final structure. If more incentives to use LEED, more incentives to reuse buildings.

Some metro areas have identified growth boundary. No natural boundaries do that near Kansas City. Think about policy decision that prohibits state and federal funding beyond a certain boundary. Encourage citizens to challenge projects and growth that is too far out. [Discussion about how to make this happen. Explanation of MARC's long-range transportation plan and KDOT's long-range plan and how to participate.] Some federal money that comes to region can be flexed to other modes, like transit, if local money to match it. Need more local, regional, state resources. If KC stays sustainable in the future, do all these constraints make sense?

KCMO sewer issue very green focused, would've been unheard of several years ago. What about mandating porous driveways? Know who council members and commissioners are and communicate with them.

Cycloviva – close streets to cars and reclaim for festivals, etc. Impacts interaction between people, neighborhood.

Decreasing fuel usage all about economics and not conservation, sustainability.

Need to make cities more transit-friendly, walkable. Have demonized government and taxation. Government is mechanism by which we accomplish collectively what we can't do alone.

**Meeting time:** Session 3: 11:30 a.m.**Recorder:** Julie Wittman