

LOYOLA UNIVERSITY CHICAGO

SUSTAINABLE CHICAGO 2015:

A POLITICAL ANALYSIS

A THESIS SUBMITTED TO

THE FACULTY OF THE GRADUATE SCHOOL

IN CANDIDACY FOR THE DEGREE OF

MASTER OF ARTS

PROGRAM IN POLITICAL SCIENCE

BY

ZACHARY A. BROWN

CHICAGO, IL

MAY 2015

UMI Number: 1593811

All rights reserved

INFORMATION TO ALL USERS

The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.



UMI 1593811

Published by ProQuest LLC (2015). Copyright in the Dissertation held by the Author.

Microform Edition © ProQuest LLC.

All rights reserved. This work is protected against unauthorized copying under Title 17, United States Code



ProQuest LLC.  
789 East Eisenhower Parkway  
P.O. Box 1346  
Ann Arbor, MI 48106 - 1346

Copyright by Zachary A. Brown, 2015  
All rights reserved.

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This project was a big undertaking, but just like “Sustainable Chicago 2015” it was built through a network. I want to give special praise to Dr. Blackmond Larnell. She took a masters student under her wing and put in an amazing amount of work to help me make this project a reality. I am eternally grateful for her help throughout the process and I know she will do some amazing work in the field.

I also want to thank Aaron Durnbaugh, Philip Hale and everyone else at Loyola University Chicago who helped me get contacts and connections to make this research happen. I would not have had the opportunity to interview these distinguished subjects if it was not for their willingness to connect me.

To my subjects, thank you for finding the time to meet with me and give honest answers. Your dedication to the City of Chicago is greatly appreciated.

However, none of the following would have sounded so good and clear if it were not for my good friend and copy editor extraordinaire, Sean Hickey. Thanks for helping to turn 100 pages of however, prospective and typos into a thesis.

Lastly I want to acknowledge those closest to me. You helped me believe I could do it and understood when I was unable to get dinner or even come on spring break because of this project. To my roommates, friends and family, this project is just as much yours as it is mine. I hope you enjoy reading it as much as I enjoyed writing it.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

|   |     |
|---|-----|
| ACKNOWLEDGMENTS                                       | iii |
| LIST OF TABLES  | vi  |
| CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION                             | 1   |
| CHAPTER TWO: GOVERNANCE, REGIMES, AND NETWORKS        | 6   |
| Governance Theory                                     | 7   |
| Regime Theory   | 11  |
| Network Theory  | 14  |
| Significance  | 19  |
| CHAPTER THREE: SUSTAINABILITY                         | 21  |
| Sustainability: Comprehensive View                    | 22  |
| Equity: The Foundation of Sustainability              | 31  |
| Cities and Sustainability                             | 36  |
| Governance Networks and Sustainability                | 39  |
| CHAPTER FOUR: CHICAGO: A CASE STUDY                   | 42  |
| The Daley Legacy                                      | 42  |
| Emanuel's Turn  | 44  |
| CHAPTER FIVE: THE RESEARCH: PURPOSE AND METHODS       | 46  |
| Purpose Statement and Research Question               | 46  |
| Research Methods and Design                           | 47  |
| CHAPTER SIX: ANALYSIS: THE PLAN                       | 55  |
| 7 Themes. 24 Goals. 100 Key Actions                   | 56  |
| Theme 1: Economic Development and Job Creation        | 62  |
| Theme 2: Energy Efficiency and Clean Energy           | 65  |
| Theme 3: Transportation Options                       | 67  |
| Theme 4: Water and Wastewater                         | 70  |
| Theme 5: Parks, Open Space, and Healthy Food          | 72  |
| Theme 6: Waste and Recycling                          | 74  |
| Theme 7: Climate Change                               | 75  |
| Conclusion  | 77  |
| CHAPTER SEVEN: ANALYSIS: THE NETWORK                  | 79  |
| The Decision Making Coalition: On Paper               | 80  |
| The Decision Making Coalition: Subjects' Perspectives | 84  |
| The Interests of Stakeholders                         | 90  |
| Conclusion  | 100 |

|   |     |
|---|-----|
| CHAPTER EIGHT: DISCUSSION   | 103 |
| The Plan and the Network: A Comparison  | 104 |
| The Decision Making Process   | 107 |
| Social and Economic Equity  | 113 |
| Conclusion  | 115 |
| CHAPTER NINE: CONCLUSION  | 117 |
| Implications  | 119 |
| APPENDIX A: 24 GOALS AND 100 KEY ACTIONS CODED FOR THE THREE<br>PILLARS AND JUST SUSTAINABILITY | 122 |
| APPENDIX B: ACTORS' PERSPECTIVES ON THE PLAN AND ITS DEVELOPMENT                                | 135 |
| APPENDIX C: ACTORS' PERSPECTIVES ON THE OUTCOME   | 140 |
| REFERENCE LIST  | 145 |
| VITA  | 152 |

## LIST OF TABLES

|  |    |
|--|----|
| Table 1. Final Interview Subjects  | 50 |
| Table 2. Sustainability in the 24 Goals  | 57 |
| Table 3. Sustainability in the 100 Key Actions                                   | 58 |
| Table 4. The Three Pillars in the 24 Goals                                       | 60 |
| Table 5. The Three Pillars in the 100 Key Actions                                | 60 |
| Table 6. Just Sustainability in the 24 Goals                                     | 61 |
| Table 7. Just Sustainability in the 100 Key Actions                              | 61 |
| Table 8. Theme 1: <i>Economic Development and Job Creation</i> and Related Goals | 62 |
| Table 9. Theme 2: <i>Energy Efficiency and Clean Energy</i> and Related Goals    | 65 |
| Table 10. Theme 3: <i>Transportation Options</i> and Related Goals               | 67 |
| Table 11. Theme 4: <i>Water and Wastewater</i> and Related Goals                 | 70 |
| Table 12. Theme 5: <i>Parks, Open Space, and Healthy Food</i> and Related Goals  | 72 |
| Table 13. Theme 6: <i>Waste and Recycling</i> and Related Goals                  | 74 |
| Table 14. Theme 7: <i>Climate Change</i> and Related Goals                       | 75 |
| Table 15. Organizations Listed in Acknowledgements                               | 81 |

## CHAPTER ONE

### INTRODUCTION

As the nation emerged from the recession of 2008 America's cities found themselves overburdened and underfunded. Chicago, one of America's largest cities endured not just financial strain, but also great political transition. In 2011 Chicago elected Rahm Emanuel, the former White House Chief of Staff for President Barack Obama, to replace Richard M. Daley as the city's mayor. Daley's retirement, the city's longest standing mayor and the son of Machine Boss Richard J. Daley (who also held office for 21 years) signaled the end of an era in Chicago, specifically the end of a political regime.

From his first press conference as mayor-elect, Emanuel made it clear that things would be different. He stated that "[the] election is about reform... I will reach out my hand to everybody to work for reform" (Davey and Graves Fitzsimmons 2011). The reforms would have to be steep as the city faced high rates of violent crime, municipal deficits, pension liabilities, an aging infrastructure and a need for jobs (Davey and Graves Fitzsimmons 2011). The administration also made it clear in their transition plan that the standards had to be high and inclusive. The transition plan states that "Chicago can only succeed as a city if every part of Chicago succeeds" (City of Chicago 2011). The administration's pursuit of policies that both address the city's problems and improve sustainability "[would] be measured by asking whether



all of [Chicago's] communities are thriving" (City of Chicago 2011). Along with these high standards of success for all Chicagoans came high expectations.

Cities around the country emerged from the Great Recession of 2008 with a new focus on sustainability and Chicago was no different. While Emanuel inherited a city facing many issues, Chicago was leading the nation in environmental policy and urban efforts to combat climate change. Under the Daley administration, the city had received many international awards for their environmental work and accomplishments (Ferkenhoff 2006). The shining star of the past administration's environmental efforts was the "Chicago Climate Action Plan". Released in 2008, this was a comprehensive plan focused on reducing the city's carbon footprint. The plan has been heralded as one of the most in-depth and forward thinking climate plans to come out of cities at the time (Bierbaum et. al. 2013, Plautz 2008)

The reforms that Emanuel addressed in his first press conference stretched into the pioneering environmental work of the city. In his first year in office, Emanuel consolidated the Department of the Environment, while simultaneously creating the position of the Chief Sustainability Officer within the Mayor's Office. This controversial move led many to question how the new administration would address the city's climate and sustainability concerns (Nemes 2011). In the fall of 2012, the administration released "Sustainable Chicago 2015", an action agenda with seven themes and twenty-four specific goals that would focus and guide the city's work in sustainable development (City of Chicago 2012).

For the first time in Chicago's history the city released a plan focused on sustainability. The plan not only set forward the administration's vision, but also

defined a complex term for the municipality. Sustainability is a broad concept concentrated around three elements: environmental, economic and social sustainability. City leaders are using a variety of policies to address the many issues associated with the three pillars of sustainability. One area that has not been fully addressed in the literature is the role of social justice and equity in municipal sustainability policy and planning. If the Emanuel administration truly believed that its success would be measured by the success of all of Chicago's neighborhoods, as stated in the transition plan, then "Sustainable Chicago 2015" should address issues of equity related to sustainability throughout the city of Chicago.

The Office of the Mayor did not create "Sustainable Chicago 2015" alone. Many actors both inside of government and from the private sector were involved in the development of the plan. The stakeholders that helped to develop the plan shaped its contents. This fits the trends seen throughout America's political institutions, especially at the local level. Government bureaucracies are restricted both fiscally and otherwise and private sector actors can contribute resources to strengthen policies.

The purpose of this thesis is to examine the literature related to local policy development, the contents of the plan itself and the stakeholders involved in the development of the plan in order to then evaluate the relationship between the network and the resulting policy. A qualitative analysis of the plan itself and interviews with individuals who were involved creating the plan will help to understand the role of social justice and equity in the development of "Sustainable Chicago 2015". The eight interviews conducted with stakeholders and policy makers

will allow for the research to look deeper than the plan itself. The conversations will give an understanding of what interests were represented in the creation of the plan and how those interests present themselves in the plan itself.

The paper begins with a review of literature on governance, network and regime theory to give the reader a better understanding of how power and involvement in the decision making process shape policy. That exploration is followed by a look at how scholars have addressed sustainability and specifically how it has been applied in the urban political arena. A sound understanding of these two sets of literature establishes the foundation for the conceptual focus of the research, the role of social justice and economic equity in the creation of “Sustainable Chicago 2015”. A description of the political, economic and environmental context that the Emanuel administration inherited in Chicago will lead into a description of the research methods that were utilized in the collection of data as well as the research questions and purpose. The following two chapters will contain descriptive analysis of the plan itself and the governance network that developed it. The paper will conclude with a discussion of how the network and the plan’s goals coincide and the implications the actors had on social justice and equity in “Sustainable Chicago 2015”.

With over 70% of Americans already living in urban areas, and the Census Bureau predicting that the American population will surpass 419 million by 2050, how urban areas address issues of sustainability will have dramatic effects on people and the ways they interact with the natural environment for years to come (United Nations 2005, U.S. Bureau of the Census 2004). This research is not looking

for broad findings that can be applied across municipalities. Instead it is a descriptive, case study analysis of the role of social and economic equity in how Chicago, one of America's largest, most diverse cities, is approaching sustainability.

## CHAPTER TWO

### GOVERNANCE, REGIMES, AND NETWORKS

It is not logical or feasible for a government to develop and carry out policy independently at any level of government. It is equally not feasible for a government's actions to be analyzed or understood without looking at the influence and role of non-governmental actors in developing and carrying out those actions. In order for the City of Chicago to fully capitalize on its own resources they had to engage with actors outside of government whose unique assets could help to increase potential impacts of "Sustainable Chicago 2015". While all actors share similar broad interests they also come to the table with unique narrow interests.

In the modern day when resources are scarce and budgets are tight, governments at all levels encounter this balancing act between providing the most reasonable policy for the electorate while catering to the needs of those actors whose resources help to make the policies a reality. Many scholars and practitioners have looked to understand this phenomenon in government through both empirical and case study analysis. Scholars have developed governance, network and regime theory in order to analyze the role of public private partnerships in modern governing. This chapter examines these theories and their implications for policy analysis in general and ultimately on "Sustainable Chicago 2015".

## Governance Theory

The influence of non-governmental actors on policy first came to light in Great Britain. Historically, Great Britain has been a nation with a powerful constitutional monarchy in which the state had complete control for governing society. When the conservatives came into power at the end of the 20<sup>th</sup> century, they began to diversify, relinquish power to actors outside of the central government. The government was not the only entity responsible for policy making. This “hollowing out of the state” forced scholars to reconsider their traditional understanding for the act of governing (Rhodes 1996; Stoker 1998; Peters and Pierre 1998).

Governance can simply be understood as the systems, manners and methods in which those people with power rule or govern a society (Rhodes 1996). In Britain that system and order was changing and becoming more complicated given that the central government was not in complete control. Instead of pure hierarchical rule, there was a network of actors, markets and hierarchies that all played into the ordered rule (Rhodes 1996). The outputs of governance can be the same as of government, but the process is very different (Stoker 1998). This dramatic, paradigm altering, change transforms the central government from controlling policy outcomes to influencing policy outcomes (Peters and Pierre 1998).

This shift away from centralized power towards an “oligopoly of the political marketplace” has many benefits for both those in power and the general public (Rhodes 2007, 1250). The most significant benefit is an increased availability of resources to the central government by way of the private actors involved with

policy making and application. Governance is significant and different from other networked forms of administration, specifically New Public Management (NPM) because the government's resources stay under the control of the government. The role of government and private actors is different in governance theory despite being rooted in government (Peters and Pierre 1998). In comparison, the New Public Management approach looks to bring governing outside of the control of government and replace it with a completely business oriented and market controlled form of governing. New Public Management results in more competition with a focus on results and objectives (Rhodes 1996). Governance still results in non-governmental actors having influence on policies.

The German literature sees it in a very similar way, however, they focus more on maximizing the resources that are available and the leveling out of power between the private and public sector. Governance is a form of governing that utilizes private public partnerships to maximize the skills of actors in order to utilize all of the resources available (Borzel 1997). This leads to something that looks more like the New Public Management form of governance and takes power out of the hands of the central bureaucracy. This radical shift, like that of New Public Management takes power out of the hands of the central bureaucracy and can lead to many of the feared risks of governance.

This can lead to a delegitimization of the central government's authority and a lack of accountability, two of the biggest negative implications associated with governance. When the government cedes authority and power over the development or implementation of a policy it brings into question their ability to

govern (Peters and Pierre 1998). Essentially, they must turn to the private sector because they need help and cannot do it alone. This can bring the people to question their authority and strength as rulers. The private sector's individual interests are inherently viewed with more skepticism.

While the blurring of power can bring about more pragmatic policy solutions, governance may lack the traditional modes of accountability when the outcomes are not as desirable. In a democracy, voters hold officials accountable through elections. When members are not directly elected it is more difficult for the populous to hold them responsible for their actions (Stoker 1998).

European nations, like Great Britain, have historically strong unified central governments and as a result the change is very significant and dramatic. It has been found that the stronger the state, the more reluctant they are to turn to a governance model and abandon the stronger central bureaucracy form of governing (Peters and Pierre 1998). Meanwhile Scandinavian countries and the Low Countries of Belgium, the Netherlands and Luxembourg have all prescribed to the practice of governance for decades (Peters and Pierre 1998).

While in Europe there has been push back to the concept of governance and of the central government giving up authority, in the United States that is not the case. First, America's federal structure grants powers to different levels of government and the federal government is inherently limited in its powers. Additionally, gaining independence from Great Britain there has been an inherent distrust of government power in the United States. As a result the private sector has been involved in governing in America for a very long time (Peters and Pierre 1998).



The private sector is involved in government activities on many levels. It is most predominant at the local level. While the federal government bureaucracy is large and its powers are spread across the nation, local governments are smaller and have better relationships with their constituencies. Additionally, they are responsible for providing a great amount of resources and programs to their communities despite having a smaller bureaucracy and budget. With fewer resources at their fingertips and a stronger and more trusting relationship with the private sector local governments are more inclined to work with the private sector (Peters and Pierce 1998).

This devolution of government power is not always looked at so favorably. Donald Kettl argues that governance strains the traditional roles of actors and negatively hinders the ability for governments to provide high quality services (2000). This debate gains in importance when one looks at the effects of governance on policy outcomes.

Private sector influence on public policy can have significant effects on the actions of government. As a result, governance has been regularly studied especially in the setting of municipal government's in the United States. As the level of government closest to the people in the federal system, municipal government's actions directly impact their constituents and thus their methods are regularly critiqued and analyzed. Private actors' access to decision making coalitions can have tangible and dramatic influence on policy outcomes. In the United States one way to understand a municipality's actions is through regime theory, a governance-based approach to understanding local policy.

## Regime Theory

Cities must consistently rely on the resources of nongovernmental actors in order to effectively deliver goods and services. Those actors share broad interests with the government, nonetheless their narrow private interests may not always align with those of the government. This need for resources inherently gives some actors in society more influence on the policies and programs of government than others. Urban regime theory utilizes a political economy approach to understand who has access to and influence over the decision making process in urban areas. In Stone's seminal work, "Regime Politics: Governing Atlanta 1946-1988" he defines an urban regime as "the informal arrangements by which public bodies and private interests function together in order to be able to make and carry out governing decisions" (1989, 3). The regime is collaboration amongst actors delivering policies that would not be possible with only government resources.

While governance is rooted in political science and an emphasis on governmental control, regime theory and more specifically urban regime theory is rooted in political economy (Elkin 1987; Stone 1989; Dowding 2001; Mossberger and Stoker 2001; Davies 2002). American Political Economy is defined by two basic assumptions. First is a popular control of the institutions of government. Second is private control of the business enterprise (Stone 1989). Regime theory sees the regime as bridging the gap between the business community and the government to increase access to resources and govern the municipality.

At the heart of a regime is the "governing coalition" which is the core informal group that has access and influence over decision-making (Elkin 1987;

Stone 1989). This coalition includes actors coming from a variety of sectors with diverse interests. Ultimately, all actors in the coalition are looking to maximize their own interests. Private actors exploit their own preemptive power to gain access to the governing coalition and influence policies. The broad interests of the actors in the “governing coalition” are similar, yet in specific situations individual interests may contradict the goals of the regime. For example, a publicly traded utility company’s main interest is profits and charging more for their services. The general population of a municipality probably would not believe it is in their best interest to pay more for gas or electricity each month.

This is where regime theory becomes analytically difficult. The goal of a regime is to empower those within it by maximizing the interests of multiple parties in order to bring about results that could not have been achieved independently. Stone identifies this coordination of efforts across institutions as “civic cooperation” (Stone 1989). Cooperation does not always happen. In order for a regime to be successful actors must commit to it and sometimes be willing to sacrifice (Stone 1989). Cooperation is not necessary, but it is valuable. Sometimes regimes are able to influence actors into believing their interests align with those of the regime in the long-run. This is problematic when specific actors are systematically influential over others (Mossberger and Stoker 2001).

While this alignment of divergent interests and resources into a “governing coalition” is important in regime theory analysis, the theory is rooted in who has access to the decision making process and who does not (Mossberger and Stoker 2001). Gaining access to a regime is dependent on having resources to give.

Stakeholders capitalize on their power and resources to gain access to the decision-making coalition. The business community is one group that always has resources, specifically financial, available and almost always is part of a governing coalition. This influence leads to effects on policy. The business community's strong influences on regimes leads many to emphasize economic development policy. Even when the regime is not a "development" regime by nature there is almost always a focus on increasing economic development. Increasing economic development does not only benefit the business community. It also can lead to increases in property tax revenues, one of the main revenue streams for cities. This co-benefit yields positive outcomes for the regime and the business interests (Dowding 2001).

In Elkin's 1987 book entitled, "City and Regime in the American Republic" he grounds his view of urban regime politics in political philosophy. He emphasizes that liberal democracy promises some sort of political and economic equality, but also an increased ability to use resources efficiently in order to help the people (Elkin 1987). Regime theory exemplifies the inherent difficulty in balancing these two promises. On a similar note, he discusses the two goals of a city. The first goal, equality, is an absence of systematic biases that result in some interests being systematically favored over others. Second is efficiency, which is the city's political institutions being organized to promote social intelligence. He sees the lack of political equality and social intelligence in society as a failing of popular control of government (Elkin 1987). This can have dramatic effects on policies in cities and is seen in the development of "Sustainable Chicago 2015" that follows.

Elkin finds that businesses have affected popular control over the formal

government structures, which threatens the core of the American political economy.

In order to build the cities and liberal democracies that Tocqueville and Mill discussed, cities must be robust and able to withstand outside pressures. This is even more important because political institutions, specifically those of cities are training grounds, which are “formative of the sort of citizenry that is necessary if a commercial republic is to flourish” (Elkin 1987).

Regimes are about balancing influence and access to resources for the betterment of society in the same way that governance is about balancing influence and access to policy making and implementation for the betterment of society. Having disproportionate influence over public policy can be very advantageous for some, but also can have harsh consequences for others. Regime theory, through its basis in political economy, demonstrates how those with important resources, like the business community, are privileged in these forms of governing. Critics argue regime theory is actually more of a model than a theory, because it cannot explain variation in formation of regimes or ultimately policy outcomes (Mossberger and Stoker 2001; Dowding 2001). In order to understand how influence actually affects policy outcomes one must go one step further and look at the structure of these governance networks or governing coalitions.

### **Network Theory**

Governance theory and urban regime theory are both studies of policy networks impacting the way in which policy is created and different actors influence the outcomes. Ultimately, these interactions between independent agents are at the heart of all social sciences. Social networks are the basis for societies as they are the

interactions amongst independent actors who work together for any reason, but that is what creates a society (Borgatti et. al 2009). The makeup, structure and presence of a network can have dramatic effects on policies that emerge from government.

Networks in regards to governance and policy can be defined in many ways. Governance networks as described above are the public-private informal governing networks that allow actors outside of government to influence policy outcomes from outside of government (Rhodes 1996; Stoker 1998; Peters and Pierre 1998). Urban regimes can be identified as a type of informal governing network based on who is in the “governing coalition” and who has access to the resources (Stone 1989). Urban regimes set themselves apart because they transcend time and political parties or administrations. Those in the “governing coalition” have long-term influence and access to policy making and government.

Network theory instead is focused on the basic relationships. Provan and Kenis define a network as a group of three or more independent actors who are all working together to achieve not only their own goals, but greater mutual goals (2007). The best definition for our purposes is any group of independent actors that work together to create policy. This definition helps to understand the role of networks in bringing together diverse actors under unified broad goals, despite their potentially conflicting narrow interests. It will soon be evident that the actors involved in the development of “Sustainable Chicago 2015” came from a wide range of backgrounds and interests and their influence was not comparable.

Historically, networks have also had very different roles in policy making.

According to Thatcher's article, "The Development of Policy Network Analyses: From Modest Origins to Overarching Frameworks" the concept of networks associated with policy was popularized in the 1970s with the concepts of a "policy community" alongside the concept of an "issue network" (1998).

In Europe, policies were being created by groups of both government workers and independent interest groups. These "communities" as Richardson and Jordan labeled them, worked in concert together by sharing information and collaborating to create policies (Richardson and Jordan 1978). At the same time, Heclo was studying policy making in the United States and observed groups coming together to work on policy specific to individual issues in what he called "issue networks" (Heclo 1978). These groups had much greater turnover when issues changed and relied on activists, government workers and academics whose major focus was on that specific policy area. This was significant and different from the "policy community" because there was much less unity in mission and goals to bring about better policy for society. Instead, it was more focused on the best policy for one specific issue, with less regard for the whole (Heclo 1978).

Both of these types of analysis lacked explanatory power. These environments were only really applicable in specific situations, the literature was never fully developed and there was never a link established between the presence of these groups and changes in the policies that resulted (Thatcher 1998). While they did not transform policy analysis, these two approaches set the stage for governance theory alongside further development of network theory and explanatory typologies that do influence policy outcomes.

Theories are not important unless they have some explanatory value. As time has gone on there has been more analysis into which types of networks tend to occur in which types of situations, as well as how network typologies yield specific outcomes.

In “The Selection of Policy Instruments: A Network-Based Perspective” by Bressers and O’Toole they look to make that next step by analyzing the relationship between network typologies and policy instrument choice (1998). They categorize networks based on two criteria. First they look at a network’s cohesion or their unity of goals, and then they look at their interconnectedness or the strength of the relationships between different players within the network (Bressers and O’Toole 1998). Findings suggest that networks use policy instruments that have the least amount of impact on the structure of the network. For example, networks with strong cohesion and strong interconnectedness have no need for a normative appeal. When cohesion is not strong there needs to be a normative appeal. A normative appeal is necessary to unify a group of actors towards the same broader goal. This is not necessary when a network has strong cohesion. When there is weak interconnectivity and weak cohesion, they find that implementation must be done by those outside of the policymaking process because they are not as connected. These networks, however, typically create policies that mandate implementation by target groups (Bressers and O’Toole 1998).

Aside from the specifics, their major finding is that the, “best way of optimizing policies may be to look beyond the instruments themselves and into the social setting in which they- or agreements about them – were actually shaped”



(Bressers and O'Toole 1998, 236-237). This is significant because it shows that the make up of a network has a real and tangible effect not only on the policy that is produced, but also on the effectiveness of that policy. If policy is to be implemented successfully the policy network must be developed with an understanding of what type of policies are desired.

In a similar type of article looking at network typologies and their effectiveness, Provan and Kenis categorize networks by the structure of power and decision making of networks (2007). They look at how brokered the network is and have three categories, Shared Participant Governance, Lead Organization Governed Networks and Network Administrative Organization (NAO) networks. Each of these categories has more unified and direct leadership, however the authors argue that all types can be successful. Success for Provan and Kenis comes down to four important factors: trust, size, goal consensus and the nature of the task (Provan and Kenis 2007). Identifying these different factors helps to best understand both which type of network would be most useful, but also why certain networks are either effective or not effective in different situations. Like Bressers and O'Toole they argue that the greater the difference between the contingency factors and the type of network the less likely the network is to be effective (Provan and Kenis 2007).

Relationships with leaders dramatically influence policy outcomes and network effectiveness. Interactions between leaders and the actors in their networks not only impact policy outcomes, but also the effectiveness of the leaders themselves (Balkuni and Kilduff 2006). Increasing the number of actors that leaders connect with can help to maximize the productivity of the network. Berardo found

that including more partnerships increased the likelihood of getting funding for a program in water management districts in Florida, but if too many partnerships were created it hurt the network (2009). This balance between leadership and participation is significant because eventually networks become oversaturated and not effective, taking away from their purpose.

Of late there has been more of a focus on networks that do not always rely on hierarchical interactions. One type of these networks in the literature are “collaborative policy networks”, which focus more on reciprocity and interactions amongst participants not on network structures and their leadership (DeLeon and Varda 2009). Networks and the interactions amongst actors can dramatically influence the policies that come out of government. These many models show that the literature is conditional. A diverse set of factors can influence the outcome of networks in different ways depending on the situation.

### **Significance**

Ultimately all actions that people do and all of the social sciences are rooted in the study of networks. Functioning societies are formed through autonomous individuals working together (Borgatti et. al. 2009). Governance, regime and network are distinct fields of research, yet their goals are similar. Governance refers to a shift in policy making that led to an involvement of new actors outside of the formal government structure, while policy networks typically refer more to the influence in policy making (Blanco, Lowndes and Prachett 2011). In contrast regime theory looks at a longstanding regime of people that have influence over policymaking that transcends political party or elections (Dowding 2001).

Policy networks, governance and regime theory all analyze the policy process to better understand policy changes. This is significant because it can help to shed light on reasons why different policies have come out of governments at different times or different levels. In order to understand policy outcomes in today's networked society, one must understand the structure of the network that creates the policies. Networks, specifically their actors and structures, can be both predictive and explanatory of today's public policies at all levels of government. Time and time again network analysis is used to better understand anything from the management of fish wild life areas (Sandstrom and Rova 2010) to regional partnerships for economic development (Olberding 2002) and from civic engagement in politics (Hanson et. al 2010) to urban environmental policies (Gibbs and Jonas 2000).

The explanatory value of network analysis is unparalleled in understanding the diversity of public policy solutions at all levels of government. A better understanding of the structures and factors that lead to different outcomes could bring about more efficient, responsible and representative governing. In the case of "Sustainable Chicago 2015" understanding the governance structure and the actors that were involved in the development of the plan can help to explain how social justice and economic equity present themselves in the plan and how far the city went in their definition of sustainability. Before applying these themes to "Sustainable Chicago 2015" it is necessary to have an understanding of how the literature has addressed the concepts of sustainability and its application in urban politics.

## CHAPTER THREE

### SUSTAINABILITY

First publicized in the 1987 United Nations report out of the World Commission on Environment and Development entitled, “Our Common Future”, sustainability is a broad term with many different meanings and applications. The Brundtland Report, as it is commonly referred, connected development and environmental resource protection. In this document, sustainable development is defined as that which “meets the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs” (WCED 1987, 8). Since the publication of this report, sustainability has transcended the vocabulary of practitioners, policy makers and analysts of nearly every aspect of modern society.

The level of government with largest responsibility for both economic and physical development, cities have found themselves at the center of the sustainability dialogue. Municipal policies have dramatic and long-standing effects on both the built and unbuilt landscapes of their communities. The Census Bureau predicts that the American population will surpass 419 million by 2050 (U.S. Bureau of the Census 2004). Over 70% of Americans are already living in urban areas (United Nations 2005). With little action coming out of the federal government cities must act now to ensure the sustainability of America’s communities (Daniels 2008, 24).

In order to comprehend the application of sustainability in that urban arena, it is necessary to have a deeper and more nuanced understanding of the complex term. This next section expands beyond the Brundtland report's definition of sustainability and reviews the literatures of environmental, economic and social sustainability in addition to literature addressing the role of social justice within sustainable policy making. The theoretical base will allow for a better comprehensive look at the empirical literature of sustainability in the context of American cities.

### **Sustainability: Comprehensive View**

Ever since the Brundtland Commission's report, the term sustainability has been applied to an array of situations and circumstances. It has even been proposed as the guiding principle for all work in public administration (Fiorino 2010). Sustainability comes from the discourse surrounding environmental preservation and climate change. This also is the area, typically, where it is applied. In Portney's seminal work on sustainable cities he acknowledges that there are six different definitions of sustainability. He argues that the most important definition is related to carrying capacity, or the amount of life a region can support without environmental degradation (Portney 2003). A limitation in the literature is that much of the scholarship about sustainability focus only on the environmental aspects of sustainability. This is a problem because sustainability is not just about the environment.

The International City Management Association takes the Brundtland

Commission's definition and "further defines the concept as central to the professional management of local government, with three interdependent elements: environmental stewardship, economic development, and social equity" (ICMA 2007, 2). The definition continues on to "recognize that... without a solid financial foundation and strong institutions, [local governments] cannot attain their environmental, economic, and social goals" (ICMA 2007, 2). Dale labels this common approach to defining sustainability as the "three legged stool of the economy, environment and society" (2012, 4-5). In public administration and the business sector this is often referred to as "triple bottom line" accounting (Norman and MacDonald 2004). No longer can an entity just look at their finances. They must also look at their effects on the environment and the society in which they reside (Roberts and Cohen 2002).

The ICMA definition refers to equity, but does not expand on it. Julian Agyeman conceptualizes the role of equity and labels it as "just sustainabilities" (2013). The concept, Agyeman writes, has four main pillars. The first pillar is improving the quality and life of wellbeing. The second, a familiar concept from the Brundtland Commission is meeting the needs of present and future generations. It is the third where "just sustainabilities" differentiates itself from the other definitions. The third pillar states "justice and equity in terms of recognition, process, procedure and outcome" (Agyeman 2013, 7). Lastly, but equally as important as the other conditions is, "living within ecosystem limits" or "one planet living" (Agyeman 2013, 7). The significance of this definition of just sustainability is that all four elements

carry equal weight. While Portney identifies the carrying capacity or ecosystem limits as the most important, Agyeman values them all. Agyeman believes that in order to be sustainable there must be a recognition of the other and an elimination of privilege (Agyeman 2013).

Sustainability is not a simple concept. It has been applied in many different arenas, with diverse understandings of the term. All definitions lead to back to the Brundtland Commission Report and the basic idea of living life today so as not to hurt the ability of future generations to live their own lives. A full discussion of sustainability requires the analysis of environmental, economic and social sustainability. That is followed by a look at how equity weaves through all three pillars of sustainability.

### **Environmental Sustainability**

Sustainability is most often used in association with its environmental aspect because the term has its roots in the environmental preservation and environmental justice movements. The Brundtland Report emphasized environmental degradation in the developing world. The commission recognized that economic and social sustainability are factors to help reduce human impacts on the environment. While it is important to balance the three aspects of sustainability, the environmental aspect is unique. It is the venue in which both economic and social actions occur. Moreover, human impacts on the environment are urgent and have long-term implications (Adams 2006; Fiorino 2010).

This environmental focus can be seen throughout the literature. One place

that it is extremely evident is in the book, "Growing Greener Cities: Urban Sustainability in the Twenty-First Century" which focuses entirely on the environmental aspect of sustainability and sustainable development. They use Matthew Kahan's definition of a green city as a place with "clean air and water, pleasant streets and parks" that is also "resilient in the face of natural disasters and faces little risk of infectious disease. Its residents have strong, green behavioral habits, like taking public transit, practicing recycling and water conservation, using renewable energy" (Kahan 2006, 4). This definition of a green city is very similar to what many call a sustainable city (Portney 2003).

Environmentalists and policy makers are fearful that the dialogue around sustainability is becoming oversaturated with different concepts (Goodland and Daly 1996; Robinson 2004; Morelli 2011). This dramatic increase in policies that associate themselves with sustainability has led to some seeing the term as having little significance anymore. It has become a term used for marketing purposes and one that lacks legitimacy (Morelli 2011). Morelli argues that the term does have meaning, but only when "preceded with a delineating modifier like 'ecological' or 'agricultural' or 'economic'" (Morelli 2011, 2).

Goodland and Daly are much more concerned about the future of sustainability in their article, "Environmental Sustainability: Universal and Non-Negotiable" (1996). They write that "although environmental sustainability is needed by humans and originated because of social concerns, environmental sustainability itself seeks to improve human welfare and social sustainability by



protecting the sources of raw materials used for human needs” (Goodland and Daly 1996, 1003). They argue that environmental sustainability is a clear concept focusing on protecting natural resources. They also see that when the word “development” is incorporated, “the discussion becomes quite different, and murkier” (Goodland and Daly 1996, 1002).

Environmental sustainability is the heart of the discourse around sustainability. All of these definitions recognize that sustainability is about preserving resources for the future, but the question is the role of the other two pillars of sustainability. When development or social sustainability are factored in the focus on environmental preservation is lost. True sustainability, however, relies on all three pillars of sustainability. Economic sustainability is typically voiced as the second main pillar of sustainability because in order to avoid environmental harm and allow for economies to thrive into the future, people must be financially stable enough to not rely on natural resources for survival.

### **Economic Sustainability**

An economically sustainable system must be able to produce goods and services on a continuing basis, to maintain manageable levels of government and external debt, and to avoid extreme sectoral imbalances which damage agricultural or industrial production (Harris 2003, 1).

At the most basic level economic sustainability is about “maintenance of capital” or keeping financial resources available into the future (Goodland and Daly 1996, 1003). Sheth, Sethia and Srinivas further conceptualized economic sustainability as having two major components. The first is the “firm-centric aspect of financial performance” and the second is “relating to economic interests of

external stakeholder, such as a broad based improvement in economic well being and standard of living” (Sheth, Sethia and Srinivas 2011, 24). Economic sustainability allows for future generations live and prosper financially.

One way that economic sustainability materializes itself in the dialogue is through “sustainable development”. In many cases sustainability is used interchangeably with sustainable development, even though adding the term development changes the conversation. Development focuses the conversation on economic wellbeing, taking attention away from environmental preservation (Goodland and Daly 1996). As a society based on a free market economy and focused on growth, it is important for business and civic leaders to recognize that development cannot continue at current levels while still being sustainable. Portney argues that development must be carried out with a recognition of its effects on the environment because if it is not the environment will eventually hinder the possibility of economic growth (Portney 2003).

Economic sustainability and sustainable development typically present themselves as environmentally friendly development and energy efficiency programs (Saha and Paterson 2008). Buildings, specifically those with a lot of square footage, use a great deal of energy. Consequently, the promotion of sustainability measures amongst the business community can bring about great effects on the environment, but also financial savings in energy use (Svara, Watt and Jang 2013). When businesses cut their energy usage they save money, but they also minimize their negative effects on the environment. This connection between saving

money and saving the environment is what pushes sustainable development policy forward and why many have been convinced to start adapting these policies from the for profit community (Daley, Sharp and Bae 2013).

Not all natural resources are renewable. Economic sustainability and sustainable development are about maximizing the utility of the resources used, but also acknowledging that resources cannot be used at the same rate (Harris 2003, 3). The Brundtland Commission report was created because developing nations were utilizing too many natural resources in their development process (Zanoni and Janssens 2009). Ensuring that development will not hinder future generations will require innovation and recognition by stakeholders that preserving for the future is important.

Those stakeholders that enter the conversation around economic sustainability and sustainable development are not always interested in sustainability. The business community historically has focused on profits. Doing something that might be more expensive just to help future generations is not necessarily in their interest. This has led to a false use of the term in ways that are not necessarily sustainable, but helps their profits (Choi and Ng 2010; Goodland and Daly 1996; Sheth, Sethia and Srinivas 2010). Despite their inherently divergent interests, it is important to bring the business community onboard in the public policy arena because of their ability to make a change.

Engaging this community can be done in many ways. One way is to use policies to control the degree and type of business practices that are taking place.

This can be done through changing land use zoning so as to control development. However, it is more advantageous to work with businesses and encourage sustainable growth and development of green jobs (Daley, Sharp and Bae 2013; Zeemering 2009).

Recently policies have emerged focusing on the marketing of goods and services that are “sustainable” or “green”. Marketing a product as “green” “misses the broader problem of modern endless consumption” (Choi and Ng 2011, 70). Kassiola states that these efforts “are inconsistent with ecological limits and are producing an unsustainable, unsatisfying and undesirable society” (2003, 12). There are positives of “green” products, but they must be watched carefully to ensure that they actually are products that will not harm the environment (Morelli 2011). The US Federal Trade Commission addressed these issues in 2010 when it proposed new limits on products that could be marketed with “green” or sustainable labels (Morelli 2011).

Without economic sustainability it is not possible for society to progress in a truly sustainable fashion. While economic sustainability does stand within environmental sustainability, without economic vitality and strength, the environment will almost always fall second to economic prosperity. For that reason it is essential to find sustainable development patterns and business practices that minimize resource consumption and maximize the utility of resources so as not to harm the environment for future generations.

## Social Sustainability

While environmental and economic sustainability receive a great deal of attention in the literature and in practice, social sustainability is less prevalent. Choi and Ng argue that “the social dimension of sustainability is concerned with the well being of people and communities as a noneconomic form of wealth” (Choi and Ng 2011, 70). In the search for a definition of sustainability Zanoni and Janssens write that sustainability is “necessarily understood as a dynamic, power-laden social and cultural process” (2009, 20). This definition of sustainability roots itself in the social interactions specifically within cities. Cities and communities are at their core a series of relationships and networks of people working together in formal and informal environments. In order to address sustainability one must start with the people that make up a community and their social interactions (Zanoni and Janssens 2009).

While economic and environmental sustainability are focused on financial and natural resources respectively, social sustainability is focused on “human capital” (Goodland and Daly 1996, 1003). In McKenzie’s article, “Social Sustainability: Towards Some Definitions” he lists nine features of the condition of social sustainability. They focus on things like “equal access to key services” and “cultural relations” and a “sense of community responsibility” (2004, 12). Harris’ definition echoes his sentiments by stating “a socially sustainable system must achieve fairness in distribution and opportunity, adequate provision of social services including health and education, gender equity, and political accountability

and participation” (2003, 1). This provisioning of non-financial services is the crux of social sustainability and a key element of that is embracing diversity.

Understanding diverse communities and networks is essential to the concepts behind social sustainability. In order to best address these issues one must consider the interests of all people in the community, specifically minority groups and those who are least represented. Their voices are significant in the community and true sustainability requires hearing the voices of everyone. Those without a voice must be acknowledged and included. In Wang, Hawkins and Lebrede’s study of city sustainability measures they focus on programs and policies that spread resources amongst different social groups, like increased access to transportation, food, and affordable housing, a theme established by Mazmanian and Kraft (2012; 2009).

Overall, social sustainability is about preserving identities and diversity in order to make relationships amongst people sustainable into the future and to bring about better economic and environmental sustainability. Sustainability is about everyone and about moving society forward. As cities grow in population they also grow in diversity. The perspectives and voices of all people in society must be understood and heard in order for society to advance sustainably into the future, be it environmentally, economically or socially.

### **Equity: The Foundation of Sustainability**

How the three pillars of sustainability described above interact is not easily understood. Some argue that sustainability can be visualized as a series of

concentric circles, with the success of the society and the economy being rooted in the environment and others see it as more of a Venn diagram, with each sharing interests in the others, but not relying on them (McKenzie 2004). Others argue that they are best understood independently (Goodland and Daly 1996). While their connections can be debated, one theme weaves through all three elements of true sustainability and that is equity.

The Brundtland Commission report states that “inequality is the world’s main environmental problem” (WCED 1987). The significance of equal access to the three imperatives of sustainability, environmental, economic and social, is embedded throughout the report (Dale 2012). One of the International City Management Association’s four main elements was “social equity” (2007) and equity is vital for sustainability for Agyeman (2013). Despite being at the core of what sustainability means, this concept of equity is rarely explored and analyzed.

In Petrucci’s passionate article entitled, “Sustainability – Long View or Long Word?” he argues that sustainability has become a “plastic” word that is used by policy makers and scholars without a true understanding of what it means, especially in regards to equity and social justice (2002). He argues that the world will not be a sustainable place until it is also a just place with equal opportunity for all peoples (Petrucci 2002). Petrucci believes that in order for the world to actually achieve this goal, the reliance on the free market economy must come to an end. Inherently, he writes, the free market economy is unjust and promotes growth, but not equal opportunity (Petrucci 2002). When looking at the analysis of economic

sustainability presented above this makes sense. An inherent focus on growth and profits makes sustainability difficult to attain.

In order to be sustainable, all people must be represented in the discussion and everyone's interests must be advanced. Bringing about truly just sustainability might rely on radical changes, but much of it relies on that cultural element of sustainability and the importance of space and place. It is essential to work with communities to address their needs in culturally relevant ways while still addressing environmentally sustainability. Livable communities programs and initiatives for shared streets are policy solutions that help make people healthier, happier and more caring for one another. This understanding of the other is vital in bringing about equity in sustainability according to Agyeman (2013).

### **Equity in the Three Pillars**

One place that equity is seen in the dialogue of sustainability is in the environmentalism versus environmental justice debate. Within environmental sustainability the key actors are typically environmental interest groups and environmental justice advocates. Environmentalists and the environmental movement historically have focused on wilderness preservation, however in the last couple of decades they have been under attack from the environmental justice movement (DeLuca 2007). In the early 1990's the environmental justice movement came onto the scene with a human centric perspective. Starting with the First National People of Color Environmental Leadership Summit in Washington D.C. in 1991 the movement looked to shed a light on the disproportionate number of



minority communities facing environmental hazards. The environmental movement was dominated by a white male voice and had little regard for the access to and use of resources by the poor and working classes (Sandler and Pezzullo 2007).

Nonetheless, these movements can work together and in order for sustainability to become a reality they must. Jamieson argues that justice must be at the heart of environmentalism because it will bring about more preservation of nature, but also lead to more efficient uses of resources so that underserved communities do not bear an unequal burden of environmental harm (Jamieson 2007). This is a way that equity presents itself in the sustainability dialogue.

This conflict between environmentalism and environmental justice is one of many inherent conflicts embedded within the concept of sustainability. Another regards the debate of jobs versus the environment. Historically policies that create jobs also led to environmental harm (Sandler and Pezzullo 2007). That tension can be overcome through things like green jobs and promoting industries that do not harm the environment. As discussed in the economic sustainability section above, businesses have interests that go directly against the interests of long-term sustainability and equity in particular. In order to bring about sustainability the business community must understand the effects their efforts have on communities and help to empower them in a way that can be beneficial for both the community and their bottom line (Choi and Ng 2010; Sheth, Sethia and Srinivas 2010).

Equity is already understood as a key to social sustainability. From getting diverse perspective on issues to encouraging both intragenerational and

intergenerational dialogue, interaction and understanding it is about valuing all people. Equity in sustainability however is not just an element of social sustainability. Equity and social justice must also be incorporated into understandings of both environmental and economic sustainability. All people must be able to live sustainably if societies wish to prosper in the future.

### **Equity in the Greater Dialogue**

Valuing equity in the sustainability dialogue is not the norm. Portney, widely acknowledged as a leading scholar in the field, does not see equity as an important factor in sustainability, especially in America. While he does acknowledge that the Brundtland commission values equity, he sees that as only affecting the developing world. The global poor, as he describes, overuse resources out of necessity and extreme poverty, something that is not present in American society. He asks the question of, “Why does there need to be equity in order to advance sustainability?” (Portney 2003, 162). Since that is not necessary in his opinion he does not believe equity must be advanced as a part of sustainability. Instead, he agrees with the “jobs versus the environment” dichotomy, stating that social justice and environmental protection are incompatible because people in the middle-class must block those in lower classes from advancing too high and using too many resources (Portney 2003). Despite him not agreeing with the need to merge the two concepts, he does identify that some cities, like San Francisco and Austin, are incorporating social justice and equity into their sustainability practices (Portney 2003).

The empirical research on the issue shows a very similar mindset.

Sustainability is about the environment and the economy. The next section will look at the empirical literature to see how cities have taken on the concept of sustainability and how researchers have studied it. While theorists and general scholars understand that without a focus on equity true sustainability is not possible, in practice that is not the focus of cities or the people studying them.

### **Cities and Sustainability**

The federal government has not made any dramatic steps in sustainability and environmental policy since the 1990 Clean Air Act Amendments and it does not seem like there will be any major legislation passed in the near future (Daniels 2008). As the level of government that can have the strongest impact on the daily lives of residents and can bring about the most systemic changes, cities have become hotbeds for research on sustainability policy and its implementation, or lack thereof. A majority of the literature on public policy and sustainability focuses on what cities are addressing sustainability and how they are addressing it.

In 2003 Portney wrote the seminal work entitled, "Taking Sustainable Cities Seriously". He analyzed the sustainability plans of 24 cities to determine which cities were actually implementing policies addressing sustainability. Within his book he was specifically focused on environmental sustainability.

One subset of the literature addresses the role of citizen participation and influence on sustainability policies. In a survey of cities with 75,000 or more residents Daley, Sharp and Bae found that a general civic capacity is important in sustainability policy, but that specific interests like business and environmental

groups have little impact on sustainability policy. Additionally, they found that long-term membership in the International Council for Local Environmental Initiatives, better known as ICLEI, correlates with more sustainable policy initiatives. This was significant because it shows that being part of a larger network with pressures to bring about sustainable policy can lead to tangible changes in policies (Daley, Sharp Bae 2013). Lastly they found that cobenefits, or reductions in costs associated with sustainable policies, only really correlate with policy change in in-house policies not in policies that are applied to the greater society. Overall the Daley, Sharp and Bae article gives a systematic understanding of what leads to community-wide sustainability initiatives (2013).

Two other articles find significance in stakeholder engagement. First Portney and Berry found that the top ranked cities in their study of 44 cities had higher scores for political and civic engagement than did the middle and low ranked cities, with regard to sustainability (2010). Those top ranking sustainable cities, however, had a higher proportion of people with very low political and civic engagement, showing a more polarized community (Portney and Berry 2010).

Stakeholder engagement also correlated significantly with capacity to actually implement sustainability measures in Wang, Hawkins and Lebrede's survey of American cities (2012). They also found that higher capacities for political support and financial resources were correlated with more sustainability related policy, but managerial capacity had the strongest correlation (Wang, Hawkins and Lebrede 2012). This is significant because it shows the importance of city managers

in implementing policy across these diverse and sometimes daunting governance networks.

In a similar study Saha explored what factors cause cities to invest in sustainability using the SustainLane data from the 50 largest cities in the United States (2009). Focusing on four categories of independent variables (political culture, institutional, economic and intergovernmental), Saha found that political culture had a strong correlation with sustainability initiatives. Particularly areas with “unconventional cultures” dominated by young, educated, progressives and white-collar jobs were more likely to invest in sustainability. He also found that cities with lower poverty rates and less manufacturing had more sustainability related investments (Saha 2009). This is logical because there are fewer stakeholders whose interests counteract those of sustainability and environmental protection.

Svara, Watt and Jang utilized the 2010 ICMA survey of local governments to help explain what types of cities were investing in sustainability (2013). They rate cities on a 1-100 scale in their investment in sustainability and find that the average city is only an 18. However their multivariate regressions do find that form of government, percentage of the population that is white and education levels had direct correlations with sustainability policies. They also found that when cities prioritize sustainability they actually do have more policies related to sustainability (Svara, Watt and Jang 2013).

All of these studies look to better understand which types of cities are

focusing on sustainability. Whether via surveys, analysis of plans or census data, they all look for trends in which types of cities are comprehending the issue and mobilizing their networks. And yet, the literature is lacking in two major ways. First many of these studies represent a very small number of cases, making it hard to apply them to the greater discussion. Second, and most importantly, nearly all of them lack any discussion of equity and social justice. As explained above, in order to bring about true sustainability there must be equity and social justice. Wang et al. addresses the shortcoming in their own article stating that, “the sustainability index was constructed to be comprehensive, yet some important local sustainability practices are excluded, such as practices in environmental justice and equity” (Wang, Hawkins and Lebredeo 2012, 851). Further exploration of sustainability in local policy must address these shortcomings, as well as the role of governance networks explored in Chapter 2.

### **Governance Networks and Sustainability**

Sustainability is a concept with an inherently broad scope. In order to meet the needs of the present without compromising the needs of future generations, all aspects of society must be included and all corners of the globe must be on board. It is for that reason why Fiorino writes that sustainability must be a focus of public administration (2010). Bringing all of these interests to the table and working across disciplines to develop a truly sustainable society relies on governance networks and strong regimes. Gibbs and Jonas argue that for local areas to address environmental issues they must utilize the governance and regime approaches

because these interests are essential in being sustainable (2002). This is evident in the definition of the main components of sustainability above. Additionally, they argue that analyzing policy in sustainability and environmental preservation would be more beneficial if analyzed through a governance and regime approach (Gibbs and Jonas 2002).

Underlying all aspects of sustainability are stakeholders with independent interests, many of which are conflicting. From the environment and jobs dichotomy to the battle between environmentalists and environmental justice advocates, sustainability requires many people to work together under a broad concept to bring about policy change. It has been found that the structure of these networks does affect the policies that are implemented on a local level (Sandstrom and Rova 2010). This complex relationship between actors, policies and real world issues has lead to a growing literature on cities and how they address issues of sustainability as described above. Nonetheless, the literature lacks a true analysis of how the interests of stakeholders in the decision making process affected the policies of cities.

Comprehensive sustainability policy starts with an understanding of who was involved in developing it. Governance networks and their membership have a dramatic effect on the policies that are coming out of cities, as seen in Chapter 2. If a city is going to bring about policies that get to the root of sustainability and its true meaning, then all of the actors involved must understand what true sustainability is and the significance of social justice and economic equity in sustainability.

The following research plan looks to address issues of network governance in relationship to sustainability planning. Through a case study of Chicago's sustainability plan, "Sustainable Chicago 2015", the research looks to understand the effect that network members had on the resulting plan and the role that social justice and equity played, both in the plans development and in the final product.



## CHAPTER FOUR

### CHICAGO: A CASE STUDY

#### **The Daley Legacy**

In order to understand “Sustainable Chicago 2015”, it is important to understand the contexts that the plan emerged from. Under Mayor Rahm Emanuel’s predecessor, Richard M. Daley, the City of Chicago had made large strides towards becoming one of the greenest cities in the country. In 1992, Daley created the Department of Environment that launched many environmental initiatives over the years (Ramsey 2008). Under Mayor Daley the Department of Environment was responsible for planting over 600,000 trees and creating 7 million square feet of planted rooftops, the most of any city in America (Kamin 2011). The Daley administration solidified Chicago’s place as one of the nation’s leading innovators in environmental policy with the release of the “Chicago Climate Action Plan” in 2008 (City of Chicago 2008; hereinafter CCAP).

The Chicago Climate Action Plan was a big undertaking for the city. The process included over \$1.5 million in support from philanthropic partnerships and input from hundreds of researchers, community members and business leaders (Parzen 2009). Daley described the plan as “[outlining] a road map of what we hope to achieve by 2020 to expand on our successes in slowing the effects of climate change” (City of Chicago 2008, 3).

The plan has five major strategies. The first four sections focus on mitigation including: Energy Efficient Buildings, Clean & Renewable Energy Sources, Improved Transportation Options and Reduced Waste & Industrial Pollution. The fifth section emphasizes adaptation. Embedded within those five strategies are, “26 actions for mitigating greenhouse gas emissions and nine actions to prepare for climate change” (City of Chicago 2008, 11). All of these goals are under the umbrella of the main target of a 25% decrease in greenhouse gas emissions by 2020 (City of Chicago 2008, 14).

Like the other things in Daley’s tenure as mayor, his sustainability efforts were not perfect. The plan, while innovative, progressive and truly impactful in the climate space, is lacking in the other two pillars of sustainability. The plan lists some outcomes of the plan like job creation, energy savings, water conservation and quality of life (City of Chicago 2008). While these elements do exist in the plan, it is ultimately an environmental plan and not a sustainability plan. It sees economic and social sustainability purely as “cobenefits” of the policies whose main focuses are reducing greenhouse gas emissions (City of Chicago 2008).

The most publicly embarrassing shortfall of Daley’s sustainability policies was the recycling program. The city that hoped to be seen as a glowing example of how a major metropolis can live in concert with the environment did not have citywide recycling pick up (Dumke 2011). Affluent neighborhoods were not the ones that lacked recycling, but it was the poor underserved communities. This glaring example shows that while the Daley administration brought Chicago forward as a leader in environmentalism and sustainability, there was still a great deal of work to

be done especially in regards to equity in sustainability.

### **Emanuel's Turn**

After Daley left office, the city was facing a dire financial situation and needed widespread reforms and innovative policies to address issues of social and economic inequality. Rahm Emanuel, a hard-nosed politician, not afraid to maneuver and bargain in order to get what he wanted, would take up the task (Leonard 2011). With an understanding of the political, economic and social contexts, the Emanuel administration came into office and immediately reformed many parts of the government, bringing in new perspectives into policy networks all around the city and especially in the environmental arena.

In his first municipal budget, Mayor Emanuel announced the closing of the Department of Environment, the cornerstone of Daley's environmental policy agenda. He then announced that the role Chief Sustainability Officer would now be within the Office of the Mayor (The City of Chicago 2011). The Chief Sustainability Officer would be charged with implementing sustainability policies throughout the city's many departments. The woman tasked with the role was Karen Weigert, the former Vice President of ShoreBank and writer and producer of the documentary film "Carbon Nation" (Klettke 2014; Women Driving Excellence 2012). Her first major project would be to define sustainability in the administration's policy agenda. After nearly a year in office the city released "Sustainable Chicago 2015" a three year action agenda building off the goals of the "Chicago Climate Action Plan" to guide the city's sustainability policy agenda (2012). This plan would become the foundation of how the city, under the guidance of Mayor Rahm Emanuel and Chief

Sustainability Officer Karen Weigert, defined and approached sustainability.

## CHAPTER FIVE

### THE RESEARCH: PURPOSE AND METHODS

#### **Purpose Statement and Research Question**

According to governance-based theories, policies are greatly affected by the structure of the public-private networks governing policy-making. The purpose of this study is to examine the extent to which the membership of the governance network is reflected in policy, specifically in Chicago's sustainability plan, "Sustainable Chicago 2015". In sum this research aims to understand the role that social justice and economic equity played in the development of Chicago's sustainability plan and policy network. Two research questions are examined.

The first part of the analysis focuses on understanding if "Sustainable Chicago 2015" addresses issues related to social justice and economic equity, an aspect of sustainability that is often ignored. In order to understand the role that social justice and economic equity played in "Sustainable Chicago 2015" the goals of the plan must be understood. What did the city and actors involved see as the purpose of developing a municipal sustainability plan? What were the goals of the plan that the city created? Then within the development of the plan, how did the decision-making coalition go about developing a plan to achieve those goals?

"Sustainable Chicago 2015" came on the heels of the "Chicago Climate Action Plan" released in 2008. This progression from a climate specific plan to a

sustainability plan begs the question of how the actors involved in the development of “Sustainable Chicago 2015” defined and operationalized the term sustainability.

A deeper understanding of the governance network involved in creating the plan must be understood. First, what actors were involved and not involved in the development of “Sustainable Chicago 2015”? What were the implications of including and not including specific policy interests on the resulting plan? How did the actors’ definitions of sustainability materialize themselves in how far the city went in pursuing policies related to all three aspects of sustainability in “Sustainable Chicago 2015”?

Examining these research questions will give an understanding of one city’s approach to sustainability as well as the impact of the governance network on the policies’ emphasis on equity and social justice.

### **Research Methods and Design**

Chicago is an ideal city for this research to take place. Chicago is a major urban area with an extensive sustainability plan and stakeholders who have diverse resources and interests. Additionally, Chicago is especially concerned with sustainability as it faces environmental hazards as well as dire fiscal problems and social inequalities. Having recently gone through a political transition, it is an ideal city to study because the need for reform and for social justice policies is apparent and an analysis of the new administration’s approach could be telling to how the city sees sustainability in general.

## Content Analysis

The research is composed of a two-part qualitative analysis. The first is a content analysis of the plan itself. A sound understanding of the role of social justice and economic equity in “Sustainable Chicago 2015” starts with a sound understanding of the plan itself. Consisting of 7 themes, 24 goals and 100 key actions, a content analysis of the final plan is conducted to determine how equity and social justice are included in the final document. It helps to understand if social justice and economic equity were clearly emphasized in the text of “Sustainable Chicago 2015”.

The content analysis was done by first going through the entire document and coding if specific themes, goals and key actions emphasized one of the three pillars of sustainability. The description of each element helps to understand the real purpose of each policy. Throughout the analysis each specific policy was coded for whether or not it emphasized social justice and economic equity. Policies that did emphasize these issues were separated into two groups, the first were policies that explicitly emphasized equity or social justice and the second group addressed the issues in a more implicit way.

The policies were separated through a key word search for terms that emphasized differences amongst neighborhoods or specific Chicagoan’s lacking resources. The implicit acknowledgements were found through an understanding of the communities that policies were being implemented in. An example of this would be the closure of the Fisk and Crawford generating stations that are in

predominately Latino and poor neighborhoods, but the plan did not acknowledge that action being for those underserved communities. This difference is significant because municipal plans set the agenda and define the terminology, thus how explicitly equity and social justice were acknowledged could lead to a significant finding.

### **Network Analysis**

The second phase of the analysis examines the governance network that was involved in the development of the plan. Several participants are listed in the acknowledgements section. The policy interests of those actors were analyzed to study the types of policy ideas present.

As described in Portney's seminal work, there is a difference between what a municipality says it wants to accomplish and what it actually does (2003). In order to look past the actual text of the plan and associated documents qualitative interviews were conducted with participants involved in the development of "Sustainable Chicago 2015". These interviews focused on the individual stakeholder's perceptions of the planning process and how network member interacted in order to develop the plan.

In scheduling the interviews the goal was to include a diverse set of actors who were involved in different capacities within the planning. Potential subjects were selected from those mentioned in the acknowledgements section. A two-part snowball methodology was utilized to discover subjects (Miles and Huberman 1994). The first round was made possible through direct contacts and through



| Subject                | Title  | Organization Representing                      | Role in Development                                   | Source of Contact Information |
|------------------------|--|--|---|-------------------------------|
| Karen Weigert          | Chief Sustainability Officer                             | City of Chicago (Office of the Mayor)          | Project Lead/ Sustainability Council                  | Philip Hale                   |
| Olivia Cohn            | Chicago Climate Action & Sustainability Specialist       | Global Philanthropy Partnership                | "With Additional Support From"/ Historical Consultant | Aaron Durnbaugh               |
| Tom McKone             | Principle  | Civic Consulting Alliance                      | Technical Consultant                                  | Aaron Durnbaugh               |
| William Abolt          | Vice President Energy & Sustainability                   | Shaw Environmental & Infrastructure            | Consultant/ Green Ribbon Committee                    | Aaron Durnbaugh               |
| Hipolito (Paul) Roldan | President and CEO  | Hispanic Housing Development Corporation       | Green Ribbon Committee Co-Chair                       | Phone Call                    |
| Sunil Garg             | Vice President, Chief Information and Innovation Officer | Exelon Corporation                             | Green Ribbon Committee                                | Karen Weigert                 |
| Carlos Nelson          | Executive Director                                       | Greater Auburn-Gresham Development Corporation | Green Ribbon Committee                                | Phone Call                    |
| Adele Simmons          | President  | Global Philanthropy Partnership                | Green Ribbon Committee                                | Aaron Durnbaugh               |

Table 1. Final Interview Subjects. This table describes the interview subjects and the source of their contact information.

mutual connections between the research and the subject. The second round came from interviewee connections to others whom they thought should be involved. The interviews were conducted between December and January of 2014-2015.

As seen in Table 1, of the seven from the original list, the researcher gained contact information of four of them from Aaron Durnbaugh, former employee at the Department of Environment and currently the director of sustainability at Loyola University Chicago, one contact was received from Philip D. Hale, vice president of government affairs at Loyola University Chicago and the other two were reached via cold calling and emailing their respective offices. The eighth subject came out of the snowball methodology. Many subjects cited the involvement of the utility providers in developing "Sustainable Chicago 2015". The plan itself cites Sunil Garg, the senior vice president, chief information and innovation officer at Exelon Corporation as being a member of the Green Ribbon Committee. An interview subject, Karen Weigert, provided his contact information.

The subjects come from diverse backgrounds. Five subjects were members of the Green Ribbon Committee, a group of civic leaders that work with the city on implementing and developing environmental policies. Hipolito Roldan was the co-chair of the Green Ribbon Committee and he represented the Hispanic Housing Development Corporation, an affordable housing developer located in downtown, but with properties all over the city. Adele Simmons is the President of the Global Philanthropy Partnership and is heavily involved in the city's climate related work, having once worked at Metropolis 2020, and, like Roldan, was involved in the

planning of the “Chicago Climate Action Plan”. Another member of the Green Ribbon Committee was Carlos Nelson, the Executive Director of the Greater Auburn Gresham Development Corporation. Nelson’s work focuses on underserved communities and building up the neighborhood where he has spent a majority of his life. Sunil Garg had experience in all three sectors, the public, private and non-for profit, including work under Mayor Daley and in the Clinton White House. At the time of the plan Garg was the Vice President of Exelon, a power company that operates in 47 states and the parent company of ComEd, the electricity provider for the Chicagoland region. For Exelon, he was in charge of information technology, physical and cyber security and also innovation.

There were also two subjects that acted as consultants to the city on the project. The first, William Abolt of Shaw Environmental & Infrastructure (hereafter Shaw), was also a member of the Green Ribbon Committee. Abolt’s background was in government work specifically focused around environmental and energy issues, including eleven years working for the City of Chicago under Mayor Daley. Shaw assisted with the technical details of the project. The main consultant in terms of developing the content and the network was the Civic Consulting Alliance. Tom McKone, the principle at the Civic Consulting Alliance who led the environmental and sustainability efforts of the organization was interviewed for the project. The Civic Consulting Alliance is an organization that helps public sector clients leverage resources of private sector partners to create stronger policies; they were involved in all aspects of the development of “Sustainable Chicago 2015”.

The last two interview subjects were Olivia Cohn and Karen Weigert. Olivia Cohn was mentioned in the acknowledgements with the other municipal employees under the “with additional support from” label. Despite having a desk in the Mayor’s Office at the time, Cohn was working for the Global Philanthropy Partnership. She stated that she helped to provide historical clarity in developing the plan. The only true city employee interviewed for the research was Karen Weigert, the Chief Sustainability Officer for the City of Chicago. She was in charge of the whole project and gave an important prospective of the focus of the plan from the official city perspective.

This diverse group of subjects all participated in audio taped interviews that lasted approximately one hour at a location of their choice. This was typically in their offices. One subject, Olivia Cohn, was interviewed over the telephone because she has since relocated to Alaska. Subjects consented to being interviewed and acknowledged that their identities could be disclosed in the research.

The interviews included five sections of questions. The first set of questions focused on the interview subject themselves and their organization. This helped to understand their background and the organization they were representing. The second section focused on defining the term sustainability and included open-ended questions as well as a question that asked participants to rate how significant they believed different terms were in regards to sustainability. It also included questions about how sustainability was defined by their organization and how sustainability presented itself in the mission of the organization. The third section focused on the

development of “Sustainable Chicago 2015”, the purpose of the plan, the purpose of their involvement, how they were involved and who else was or was not involved. The fourth section focused on the process of how the plan was developed and interactions amongst network members. The fifth and final section focused on the plan that resulted and if they felt it achieved its goals, if they achieved their own personal goals, who benefitted the most from the plan and could have been negatively effected, and ultimately if the plan addresses issues of social justice and economic equity.

These eight interviews were used to provide a diverse and representative sample of actors and portray how various actors were involved in the development plan and the different interests that were represented during decision-making. The sections that follow analyze the content of all eight of these interviews alongside the contents of the plan itself to understand the role of social justice and economic equity in the development, planning and policies of “Sustainable Chicago 2015”.

## CHAPTER SIX

### ANALYSIS: THE PLAN

Over the past year and a half my administration has directed historic investments in energy efficiency, transportation, and infrastructure that will create jobs and foster opportunities for Chicagoans to make sustainability a part of their lives and their experience of the city. Now is the time to plan for the next set of innovations and investments that will further our leadership on these issues (City of Chicago 2012, 2).

Released only four years after the city conducted a two-year process to develop the “Chicago Climate Action Plan”, the sustainability plan was going to be different. While the comprehensive climate action plan set goals for 2020 and 2050, “Sustainable Chicago 2015” was the first plan released by the city that focused on sustainability and not just the environment.

This chapter analyzes the sustainability plan itself to understand how the city conceptualizes sustainability and if any of the three elements: environmental, economic, and social, receive more or less focus. And if any of the three elements (economic, environmental and social) receive more or less attention. The chapter begins with a quantitative look at the 24 Goals and 100 Key Actions embedded within “Sustainable Chicago 2015” to understand which of the three pillars received the most attention. That is followed by an overview of how many goals and actions either explicitly or implicitly address issues of social and economic equity. After looking at the aggregates, the seven themes will be looked at individually to uncover their purpose and to see the extent to which equity is present. How will the Emanuel

Administration pursue, “a future for Chicago that is sustainable and economically competitive” (City of Chicago 2012, 36) while also addressing issues of equity?

### **7 Themes. 24 Goals. 100 Key Actions**

The introduction states that “[*Sustainable Chicago*] is a clear commitment of what government needs to and will do. It is also a roadmap for how Chicagoans, at home and at work, can get involved” (City of Chicago 2012, 04). This twofold purpose for the plan is established over the course of 7 themes, 24 goals and 100 key actions that are to be executed. At first glance, the seven themes consist of four that inherently focused on environmental sustainability: *Energy Efficiency* and *Clean Energy, Water and Wastewater, Waste and Recycling* and *Climate Change*. One theme, *Economic Development and Job Creation*, is rooted in economic sustainability. *Transportation Options* and *Parks, Open Space, and Healthy Foods* are loosely correlated with two elements of sustainability, economic and social. On the surface, none of the themes seem to address issues related to equity. The goals and specific actions within the seven themes deserve a more in-depth analysis.

### **The Three Pillars**

Each of the “Goals” and “Key Actions” were coded as focusing on environmental, economic and/or social sustainability (The full results of the coding can be found in Appendix A). Table 2 and 3 show how many of the goals and key actions respectively emphasized each component of sustainability or a mixture of different components. Table 2 shows that of the 24 goals, 10 of them focused only on environmental sustainability, three on social and one on economic sustainability.

|   | Economic | Environmental | Social   | Economic<br>Environmental | Economic<br>Social | Environmental<br>Social | Economic<br>Environmental<br>Social | Total     |
|---|----------|---------------|----------|---------------------------|--------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------------------|-----------|
| 1.Economic<br>Development<br>and Job Creation | 0        | 1             | 0        | 1                         | 0                  | 0                       | 0                                   | 2         |
| 2.Energy<br>Efficiency and<br>Clean Energy    | 0        | 1             | 0        | 2                         | 0                  | 0                       | 0                                   | 3         |
| 3.Transportation<br>Options                   | 1        |               | 1        | 3                         | 2                  | 0                       | 0                                   | 7         |
| 4.Water and<br>Wastewater                     | 0        | 2             | 1        | 0                         | 0                  | 1                       | 0                                   | 4         |
| 5.Parks, Open<br>Space, And<br>Healthy Foods  | 0        | 1             | 1        | 0                         | 1                  | 0                       | 0                                   | 3         |
| 6.Waste and<br>Recycling                      | 0        | 2             | 0        | 0                         | 0                  | 0                       | 0                                   | 2         |
| 7.Climate<br>Change                           | 0        | 3             | 0        | 0                         | 0                  | 0                       | 0                                   | 3         |
| <b>Total</b>                                  | <b>1</b> | <b>10</b>     | <b>3</b> | <b>6</b>                  | <b>3</b>           | <b>1</b>                | <b>0</b>                            | <b>24</b> |

Table 2. Sustainability in the 24 Goals. This table sums up each of the key actions across the seven themes and which components of sustainability they emphasize. See Appendix A for a full list of each key action and how it was coded.



|   | Economic | Environmental | Social    | Economic<br>Environmental | Economic<br>Social | Environmental<br>Social | Economic<br>Environmental<br>Social | Total      |
|---|----------|---------------|-----------|---------------------------|--------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------------------|------------|
| 1.Economic<br>Development<br>and Job Creation | 1        | 3             | 0         | 3                         | 0                  | 0                       | 1                                   | 8          |
| 2.Energy<br>Efficiency and<br>Clean Energy    | 0        | 6             | 0         | 6                         | 0                  | 0                       | 0                                   | 12         |
| 3.Transportation<br>Options                   | 2        | 10            | 6         | 2                         | 9                  | 0                       | 0                                   | 29         |
| 4.Water and<br>Wastewater                     | 0        | 14            | 5         | 0                         | 0                  | 1                       | 0                                   | 20         |
| 5.Parks, Open<br>Space, And<br>Healthy Foods  | 0        | 3             | 6         | 0                         | 1                  | 2                       | 1                                   | 13         |
| 6.Waste and<br>Recycling                      | 0        | 9             | 0         | 0                         | 0                  | 0                       | 0                                   | 9          |
| 7.Climate<br>Change                           | 0        | 7             | 0         | 0                         | 0                  | 2                       | 0                                   | 9          |
| <b>Total</b>                                  | <b>3</b> | <b>52</b>     | <b>17</b> | <b>11</b>                 | <b>10</b>          | <b>5</b>                | <b>2</b>                            | <b>100</b> |

Table 3. Sustainability in the 100 Key Actions. This table sums up each of the key actions across the seven themes and which components of sustainability they emphasize. See Appendix A for a full list of each key action and how it was coded.

Table 3 tells a similar story that 52, just over half of the 100 key actions, emphasized environmental sustainability alone, 17 emphasized social sustainability and three focused only on economic sustainability. These numbers do not tell the whole story as many goals and actions concentrated on multiple pillars of sustainability at the same time.

The combination of economic and environmental sustainability occurred more often than any other combination. The six goals were twice as many as any other combination. The 11 key actions, while only one more than the economic and social, are still significant considering that nine of the economic social goals came from one specific theme. This is logical because measures like reducing energy consumption are not only environmentally sustainable, but also save people, organizations and the city itself money (Svara, Watt and Jang 2013). The strong relationship between environmental and economic sustainability, especially in regards to sustainable development, was thoroughly explained in Chapter 3 and materializes itself very clearly in “Sustainable Chicago 2015”.

Tables 4 and 5 put the shared cases under each of the three pillars. While some goals and key actions are now accounted for two or even three times, it helps to show how much “Sustainable Chicago 2015” emphasized each of the three pillars of sustainability in total. In these tables one finding is especially clear and that is the significance of environmental sustainability. 17 goals and 70 key actions focus on environmental sustainability. That is significantly more than the 10 goals and 26 key actions for economic sustainability and 7 goals and 34 key actions for social sustainability. There were more key actions focused on environmental sustainability

than on economic and social sustainability combined (61). Sustainability at its core is about preserving the environment and that is evident in the plan.

|  | Economic  | Environmental | Social   | Total     |
|--|-----------|---------------|----------|-----------|
| <i>1.Economic Development and Job Creation</i> | 1         | 2             | 0        | 3         |
| <i>2.Energy Efficiency and Clean Energy</i>    | 2         | 3             | 0        | 5         |
| <i>3.Transportation Options</i>                | 6         | 3             | 3        | 12        |
| <i>4.Water and Wastewater</i>                  | 0         | 3             | 2        | 5         |
| <i>5.Parks, Open Space, And Healthy Foods</i>  | 1         | 1             | 2        | 4         |
| <i>6.Waste and Recycling</i>                   | 0         | 2             | 0        | 2         |
| <i>7.Climate Change</i>                        | 0         | 3             | 0        | 3         |
| <b>Total</b>                                   | <b>10</b> | <b>17</b>     | <b>7</b> | <b>34</b> |

Table 4. The Three Pillars in the 24 Goals. This table sums up how many goals emphasized each pillar of sustainability.

|  | Economic  | Environmental | Social    | Total      |
|--|-----------|---------------|-----------|------------|
| <i>1.Economic Development and Job Creation</i> | 5         | 7             | 1         | 13         |
| <i>2.Energy Efficiency and Clean Energy</i>    | 6         | 12            | 0         | 18         |
| <i>3.Transportation Options</i>                | 13        | 12            | 15        | 40         |
| <i>4.Water and Wastewater</i>                  | 0         | 15            | 6         | 21         |
| <i>5.Parks, Open Space, And Healthy Foods</i>  | 2         | 6             | 10        | 18         |
| <i>6.Waste and Recycling</i>                   | 0         | 9             | 0         | 9          |
| <i>7.Climate Change</i>                        | 0         | 9             | 2         | 11         |
| <b>Total</b>                                   | <b>26</b> | <b>70</b>     | <b>34</b> | <b>130</b> |

Table 5. The Three Pillars in the 100 Key Actions. This table sums up how many key actions emphasized each pillar of sustainability.

## Just Sustainabilities

|   | Not at All | Implicit | Explicit | Total     |
|---|------------|----------|----------|-----------|
| 1.Economic Development and Job Creation | 2          | 0        | 0        | 2         |
| 2.Energy Efficiency and Clean Energy    | 3          | 0        | 0        | 3         |
| 3.Transportation Options                | 6          | 1        | 0        | 7         |
| 4.Water and Wastewater                  | 4          | 0        | 0        | 4         |
| 5.Parks, Open Space, And Healthy Foods  | 1          | 1        | 1        | 3         |
| 6.Waste and Recycling                   | 1          | 0        | 1        | 2         |
| 7.Climate Change                        | 3          | 0        | 0        | 3         |
| <b>Total</b>                            | <b>20</b>  | <b>2</b> | <b>2</b> | <b>24</b> |

Table 6. Just Sustainability in the 24 Goals. This table describes which goals emphasize concepts of social and economic equity implicitly or explicitly.

|   | Not at All | Implicit | Explicit | Total      |
|---|------------|----------|----------|------------|
| 1.Economic Development and Job Creation | 2          | 0        | 1        | 8          |
| 2.Energy Efficiency and Clean Energy    | 3          | 0        | 0        | 12         |
| 3.Transportation Options                | 6          | 3        | 0        | 29         |
| 4.Water and Wastewater                  | 4          | 0        | 0        | 20         |
| 5.Parks, Open Space, And Healthy Foods  | 1          | 4        | 1        | 13         |
| 6.Waste and Recycling                   | 1          | 1        | 1        | 9          |
| 7.Climate Change                        | 3          | 0        | 0        | 9          |
| <b>Total</b>                            | <b>89</b>  | <b>8</b> | <b>3</b> | <b>100</b> |

Table 7. Just Sustainability in the 100 Key Actions. This table describes which key actions emphasize concepts of social and economic equity implicitly or explicitly.

Sustainability is also rooted in equity and social justice (WCED 1987; ICMA 2007; Dale 2012; Agyeman 2013). The goals and key actions were also coded as to how they addressed issues related to social and economic equity. They were coded into three groups: Those that did not address issues of equity at all were coded as “not at all”, those that dressed issues of equity, but did not clearly state it were

coded as “implicit” and those that clearly stated their intent were coded as “explicit”. While these issues will be addressed further, Tables 6 and 7 give a first look at how significant equity was in the City of Chicago’s definition of sustainability. Of the 24 goals in “Sustainable Chicago 2015” 20 of them did not address issues of social and economic equity at all, 2 implicitly addressed them and 2 explicitly addressed them. The data is equally as telling regarding the key actions. 89 key actions did not address equity at all, 8 did so implicitly and only 3 out of 100 explicitly addressed inequalities in the City of Chicago.

A first look at the 24 goals and 100 key actions embedded within “Sustainable Chicago 2015” paint a bleak picture. The plan seems to focus very intently on environmental sustainability with some mentions of economic and social sustainability, but throughout the three themes equity plays a minimal role and when it is present it is implicit and not explicitly significant. Coding into groups does not tell the whole story. Each theme is rich with explanatory content of their purpose, policies and impacts. The next section will focus on to that content so as to fully comprehend the policy goals and priorities of “Sustainable Chicago 2015”.

### **Theme 1: Economic Development and Job Creation**

| <b>Theme</b>                                    | <b>Goals</b>   | <b>Sustainability</b>     |
|---|--|---------------------------|
| <b>1. Economic Development and Job Creation</b> | 1. Establish Chicago as a Hub for the Growing Sustainable Economy  | Economic                  |
|   | 2. Accelerate the Economy in Chicago by Assisting People and Companies in Adopting Sustainable Practices | Economic<br>Environmental |

Table 8. Theme 1: *Economic Development and Job Creation* and Related Goals.

The plan begins with a focus on the local economy. The first of the seven themes establishes that this plan goes beyond climate considerations. Clearly, its focus on making sure there are jobs in the future displays the city's emphasis on economic sustainability. Analyses of the goals show a more complex story.

Both of the goals in this theme apply the term sustainability in a broad and ambiguous manner. The key actions embedded within the goals make it apparent that this theme emphasizes environmental sustainability as it relates to economic development and jobs. Of the eight key actions within the two goals, one focuses purely on economic sustainability, while three target environmental sustainability alone. Three additional goals are a combination of economic and environmental sustainability and the eighth addresses all three types of sustainability. As seen in Table 5 that leads to seven environmental, five economic and one social sustainability focused key action in a theme that on its face seems to focus largely on economic sustainability. It is significant that only one of the key actions can be labeled as purely economically focused.

The first goal merges economic development with issues of environmental sustainability through an emphasis on environmental jobs, innovation and business practices. Goal two continues that emphasis on environmentally friendly business practices. As described in the literature in Chapter 3 and seen in the broad view of the themes above, economic sustainability does not happen without environmental sustainability. The sustainable economy that the plan is focused on creating is one with jobs that preserve the environment, not one that reduces financial pressures in the future through new fiscal policies.

Social sustainability is much less prevalent in this section of the plan. Of the eight specific actions within the first theme, only one involves social issues. That action, under Goal 2, is to

Determine training gaps based on planned investments, and expand educational training opportunities in environmental programs at City Colleges, Chicago Public Schools and Greencorps Chicago along with departments' and sister agencies' work with the community (City of Chicago 2012, 09).

The emphasis on education alone connects this action with social sustainability. Who it is focused on, however, is very significant in this case. The goal addresses community colleges, public schools and a jobs training program for underserved youth. Its emphasis on "training gaps" makes it the first goal of "Sustainable Chicago 2015" to explicitly emphasize equity in sustainability. Increasing job opportunities in sustainable industries for the underserved communities that those sister agencies and partners work with will lead to true sustainability for all Chicagoans.

On its face Theme 1: *Economic Development and Job Creation* has a focus on economic sustainability, but that is buried within the greater pursuit for environmental sustainability. This theme is the first glimpse at how the city conceptualizes economic sustainability and that is within an environmental framework. Like many others (Harris 2003; Daley, Sharp and Bae 2013) the City of Chicago seems to believe that in order to have an economy that will sustainably move into the future, there must be investments in industries that do not hurt the environment as well as in infrastructure that supports those industries.

## Theme 2: Energy Efficiency and Clean Energy

| Theme  | Goals  | Sustainability            |
|--|--|---------------------------|
| <b>2. Energy Efficiency and Clean Energy</b> | 3. Improve Citywide Energy Efficiency by 5%  | Economic<br>Environmental |
|  | 4. Improve Overall Energy Efficiency in Municipal Buildings by 5%  | Economic<br>Environmental |
|  | 5. Create an Additional 20 MW of Renewable Energy, Consistent with the Illinois Renewable Portfolio Standard | Environmental             |

Table 9. Theme 2: *Energy Efficiency and Clean Energy* and Related Goals.

The energy efficiency initiatives laid out in this section of the document directly correlate with economic development. The first sentence of the theme states that, “energy efficiency holds the potential to address the long-term energy needs of a growing city while fostering economic development and job creation” (City of Chicago 2012, 12). The focus is on saving money and reinvesting it in the city’s infrastructure and businesses with an environmental focus. Theme 2 has an emphasis on infrastructure improvements and saving costs through environmental actions.

This theme focuses on the goals set forth in the “Chicago Climate Action Plan”. At the time of planning, Chicago had reached 22% of its 2020 emissions reduction goal as it related to energy efficient buildings (City of Chicago 2012). The energy efficiency of buildings is directly correlated with environmental sustainability because buildings account for 71% of Chicago’s carbon emissions (City of Chicago 2012). Despite the inherent focus on environmental sustainability, concentrating efforts on improving the environmental impacts of buildings can also help to reduce energy costs.



The first two goals of Theme 2 are coded in Table 2 as economic and environmental sustainability primarily because they reduce emissions, but also because they help save the city, its residents, and its businesses money. The description of Goal 3, which focuses on improving citywide energy efficiency explicitly emphasizes the opportunity for cost savings (City of Chicago 2012). While the description of Goal 4, which focuses on improving energy efficiency in municipal buildings, does not discuss the financial incentives, it is implied. Goal 4 instead focuses on making the city a leader in green buildings, a non-financial aspiration. This dichotomy between descriptions shows the different approach the city takes to stimulating change in environmental practices for themselves and for the private interests in the city. Both goals are focused on environmental sustainability, but worded differently based on the audience.

The descriptions of the two goals may be different, but the actions are very similar. The 10 specific actions in these two goals are all coded to be both economic and environmental sustainability, but they make little mention of economic sustainability or cost savings. In proposing municipal policy changes, the city does not need to validate it through cost savings, but when working with private businesses and homeowners that must be the focus.

The third goal of Theme 2, Goal 5 is purely focused on environmental sustainability through creating renewable energy. All four of the key actions, as well as the description of the goal, focus on environmental sustainability and municipal actions that will take place. There is no need to convince stakeholders of the personal benefits in this goal because it requires no private sector commitment.

Theme 2: *Energy Efficiency and Clean Energy* is, at first glance, only about environmental sustainability, however, there are many mentions of cost savings and economic sustainability. These cost savings seem to be more focused on large buildings that are concentrated in the downtown area. All of the 14 buildings that are highlighted as the initial partners in the, “Retrofit Chicago Commercial Buildings Initiative” are located within one mile of City Hall (City of Chicago 2012, 13). Despite mentioning actions related to homes and residential properties, there are no specific quantifiable actions or policies related to residential buildings. Other properties in the city’s neighborhoods are also not addressed. Theme 2 has a very downtown focus on energy efficiency in large skyscrapers and increasing cost savings for the municipality itself and big businesses.

### Theme 3: Transportation Options

| Theme                            | Goals   | Sustainability            |
|----------------------------------|---|---------------------------|
| <b>3. Transportation Options</b> | 6. Increase Average Daily Transit Ridership                                   | Economic<br>Social        |
|                                  | 7. Accelerate Transit-Oriented Development Around Transit Stations            | Economic<br>Social        |
|                                  | 8. Make Chicago the Most Bike and Pedestrian Friendly City in the Country     | Social                    |
|                                  | 9. Improve Freight Movement and Accelerate High-Speed Passenger Rail Projects | Economic                  |
|                                  | 10. Advance Sustainability Leadership at Chicago’s Airports                   | Economic<br>Environmental |
|                                  | 11. Strengthen the Infrastructure to Advance Vehicle Efficiency               | Economic<br>Environmental |
|                                  | 12. Reduce Municipal Fossil Fuel Consumption by 10%                           | Economic<br>Environmental |

Table 10. Theme 3: *Transportation Options* and Related Goals.

“We have always been a city built around transportation – first water, then

rail, then roads. This will continue to be true as our transportation system continues to evolve” (City of Chicago 2012, 19). Mayor Emanuel was correct; transportation affects the daily life of almost all of Chicago’s residents, businesses and visitors. Transportation is also the first theme in “Sustainable Chicago 2015” that addresses issues related to environmental, economic and social sustainability.

Of the seven goals under Theme 3, three of them have a focus on social sustainability. The theme’s introduction states that, “diverse and affordable transportation options are essential to the quality of life for all Chicagoans” (City of Chicago 2012, 16). Transportation can help make Chicago’s many neighborhoods stronger and more interconnected. Transportation is also significant because it inherently affects “all Chicagoans,” though specifically underserved Chicagoans who rely on public transportation for their daily needs.

Goal 8 has a specific emphasis on building communities. It states that “making it easier for Chicagoans to bike and walk will help foster connections between communities, boost our local economy and facilitate healthy lifestyles” (City of Chicago 2012, 17). These healthier and more interconnected communities can bring about the social interactions needed for a socially sustainable community (Zanoni and Janssens 2009).

The economic sustainability of transportation, both for residents and for businesses, is rooted in infrastructure developments. Four of the six economic sustainability related goals in Theme 3 have a specific focus on infrastructure improvements. From modernizing the CTA Red Line, to efforts at the city’s airports and train yards, the development of infrastructure is fundamental for the economic

sustainability of transportation (City of Chicago 2012).

Environmental sustainability, although not the main focus of this section, is still a driving force behind most of the actions. Goals 10, 11, and 12 directly focus on environmental sustainability and the goals related to alternative transportation do so in a more subliminal way. Increasing ridership in public transportation and developing more alternative transportation options leads to less fossil fuel emissions. Despite only having three goals coded for environmental sustainability at all, twelve key actions emphasized environmental sustainability, only one less than economic (13) and three less than social (15).

This theme does allude to the need for transportation options for all and includes projects specifically addressing underserved communities. Nonetheless, it is still lacking an explicit recognition of who relies most heavily on transportation. The redevelopment of the south branch of the Red Line is specifically through an underserved, historically African American community, but there is no overt acknowledgment of that. That is seen in Tables 6 and 7 because only one goal and three key actions were coded for implicit recognition of just sustainability and none explicitly acknowledged inequality.

*Transportation Options*, with its seven goals is the only theme in “Sustainable Chicago 2015” with more than four goals. The fact that this one theme accounts for nearly 30% of the goals in the whole document shows that it is significant, but also complex. Transportation is an issue that big cities like Chicago must address as they continue to grow into the future (Portney 2003). In developing transportation policy, the City of Chicago and its sister agencies must take into account all three of

sustainability's pillars, but they must also take into account the questions related to equity and "just sustainabilities".

#### Theme 4: Water and Wastewater

| Theme                   | Goals   | Sustainability          |
|-------------------------|---|-------------------------|
| 4. Water and Wastewater | 13. Decrease Water Use by 2% (14 Million Gallons Per Day) Annually                | Environmental           |
|                         | 14. Enhance Stormwater Management to Reduce Sewer Overflows and Basement Flooding | Environmental           |
|                         | 15. Transform the Chicago River into our Second Waterfront                        | Social                  |
|                         | 16. Protect Water Quality and Enhance Access to Lake Michigan                     | Environmental<br>Social |

Table 11. Theme 4: *Water and Wastewater* and Related Goals.

"Chicago is blessed with abundant water, and we must preserve and protect our greatest natural resource for generations to come" (City of Chicago 2012, 22). From the miles of coastline along Lake Michigan to the Chicago River, water has always been a defining characteristic of Chicago. The four goals that make up the water and wastewater section focus on preserving that resource and the non-economic benefits it can give to the city, its residents and visitors.

The first goals of Theme 4 focus specifically on the infrastructure necessary to avoid environmental harm, while preserving water. The key actions set forth in Goal 13 concentrate on improving infrastructure so the city can reduce its impacts on the environment and not waste as much water (City of Chicago 2012). The second goal focuses on improving infrastructure to avoid the negative effects that water bring to the built environment, but does not acknowledge any financial savings. Despite the implicit cost savings and economic benefits that come with

repairing an aging infrastructure, economic sustainability, cost savings and job creation get no mention in these or any of the goals and actions of Theme 4.

Social sustainability comes through in the second two goals that focus on access to water for recreational activities. Goal 15 focuses on increasing access to the river, not for economic purposes, but for recreational purposes, stating that, “the river has always played a crucial role in the economic development of Chicago, and today it holds the potential of becoming a second waterfront for Chicago’s residents and visitors” (City of Chicago 2012, 23). Goal 16 keeps the focus on social sustainability, but involves much more in relation to environmental sustainability. The key actions embedded in Goal 16 focus more on pollution and water quality in Lake Michigan so as to improve consistent access to the lake. Of the four actions, three focus on social sustainability and two focus on environmental sustainability.

Issues of equity receive no mention in the goals and key actions of Theme 4, even implicitly, despite the theme’s major focus on social sustainability. There is a map that shows the existing and proposed public boat launches in the city, of which many are on the south and west side, however, it is not known which of those are new. Moreover, creating public boat launches in historically underserved communities does not bring about social change or increased access to boating.

Theme 4, *Water and Wastewater*, is about preserving a natural resource, water. 15 key actions and three goals are environmentally focused, while six key actions and two goals emphasize social sustainability. Water is an important resource for Chicago and improving the water related infrastructure, as well as making it accessible to all Chicagoans, is essential if Chicago wishes to be a

sustainable city in the future.

### Theme 5: Parks, Open Space, and Healthy Food

| Theme   | Goals  | Sustainability     |
|---|--|--------------------|
| <b>5. Parks, Open Space, and Healthy Food</b> | 17. Increase the Number of Public Spaces and Parks Accessible for Chicagoans   | Social             |
|   | 18. Increase Options for Accessing Local or Healthy Food in Every Neighborhood | Economic<br>Social |
|   | 19. Improve and Protect Chicago's Natural Assets and Biodiversity              | Environmental      |

Table 12. Theme 5: *Parks, Open Space, and Healthy Food* and Related Goals.

The three goals of Theme 5 look to expand on Chicago's motto as a "City in a Garden" by including initiatives focused on creating healthy alternatives for all Chicagoans. This section is the first to explicitly mention Chicago's underserved communities. It states that "although Chicago boasts a thriving world-class restaurant scene and residents enjoy fruit and vegetables from all over the world, many neighborhoods experience monumental health challenges and a retail environment that offers few healthy food choices" (City of Chicago 2012, 26).

One goal and one key action explicitly address "just sustainabilities" while an additional goal and four more key actions do so implicitly in Theme 5. This corresponds with an increased concentration on social sustainability with 10 of the 13 key actions and two of the three goals addressing issues of social sustainability.

The first two goals focus on building healthy communities and public spaces to help develop the healthier and more vibrant city that true social sustainability requires. Goal 17 does this through investments in public spaces, specifically parks. Goal 18 addresses the food gap discussed earlier through four key actions ranging

from increasing urban agriculture to business partnerships focused on bringing healthy foods into Chicago (City of Chicago 2012). This goal is significant because it addresses social sustainability specifically in underserved communities. The plan states that increased access to food will “[strengthen] our communities and [improve] the health of Chicagoans” (City of Chicago 2012, 26).

The third goal goes on a different path than the first two. Goal 19 concentrates on environmental sustainability through true biocentric environmentalism. Its focus is on the other living things that inhabit the city. The goal’s description emphasizes the protection of natural habitats to “deliver a better natural environment for all residents” (City of Chicago 2012, 27).

Economic sustainability, while not the focus of any of the goals of Theme 5, is weaved throughout the section. In describing the development of open spaces and parks, the plan states that these improvements “will increase property values” (City of Chicago 2012, 26). The plan also puts a financial value on the urban forest and even Goal 18, which is focused on food deserts, has an incentive for business development (City of Chicago 2012).

Theme 5: *Parks, Open Space and Healthy Food* has three very diverse goals. The first two have a focus on social sustainability and the third focuses on environmental sustainability. The most significant goal in Theme 5 is Goal 18, because it is the first to explicitly address the inequalities that are present in the city. It is also significant that while this theme and none of its corresponding goals have economic focuses, economic incentives are still highlighted throughout. Environmental and economic sustainability find their way into the foreground



despite the theme's focus on social issues.

### Theme 6: Waste and Recycling

| Theme                  | Goals   | Sustainability |
|------------------------|---|----------------|
| 6. Waste and Recycling | 20. Increase Access to Recycling and Improve Policies to Promote Waste Reduction and Re-Use | Environmental  |
|                        | 21. Incorporate Standard Green Practices in All City Operations                             | Environmental  |

Table 13. Theme 6: *Waste and Recycling* and Related Goals.

The Emanuel administration created “Sustainable Chicago 2015” to build on the legacy they inherited from the previous administration. Recycling always tainted the Daley administration and needed to be fixed. The Emanuel administration acknowledged that in order to address sustainability, they needed to address recycling and waste reduction in general (City of Chicago 2012). These issues are addressed in two separate goals that focus on recycling in the community and within municipal operations respectively.

Goal 20 addresses waste in many aspects of society. The first key action, and one that is a significant statement for a city that hopes to be recognized amongst the nation's most sustainable, is to expand curbside recycling pickup to all city residents (City of Chicago 2012). In addition to a statement of sustainability, it also focuses on underserved communities and equity because it grants something to all residents of the city. The plan quotes Mayor Emanuel as stating that “no longer will Chicago be a tale of two cities when it comes to recycling” (City of Chicago 2012, 31).

Residential waste is important and makes a statement, but it does not

account for a majority of the city's waste streams. The other key actions in Goal 20 focus on those programs and facilities with larger waste streams like festivals, schools, and construction and demolition, which account for "over 60% of the waste generated in the city" alone (City of Chicago 2012, 31). Goal 21 internalizes the waste reduction efforts into city operations. The efforts of Goal 20 and 21 hope to make a more concentrated impact on the city's waste streams.

Theme 6: *Waste and Recycling* is the second theme with a goal that explicitly acknowledges inequality in the City of Chicago and it also focuses exclusively on environmental sustainability. Both goals and all nine key actions are environmentally focused. There is a section on the "Waste to Profit Network", but otherwise this theme, unlike the others, does not address issues related to the economy or economic sustainability in any way.

### Theme 7: Climate Change

| Theme             | Goals   | Sustainability |
|-------------------|---|----------------|
| 7. Climate Change | 22. Reduce Carbon Emissions from All Sectors  | Environmental  |
|                   | 23. Improve Local Air Quality by Accelerating Performance Towards Federal Standards and Decreasing Greenhouse Gas Emissions | Environmental  |
|                   | 24. Protect the City and Its Residents by Preparing for Changes in the Climate  | Environmental  |

Table 14. Theme 7: *Climate Change* and Related Goals.

Together, all seven areas in this roadmap will help achieve Chicago's climate goals while at the same time creating local jobs and saving money. Energy, transportation, water, waste and land use are integrated components in addressing climate change (City of Chicago 2012, 34).

The last of the seven themes places "Sustainable Chicago 2015" within the

broader context of Chicago's climate goals as established in the "Chicago Climate Action Plan". All nine of the key actions within the three goals are environmentally focused. While two key actions do integrate community engagement and thus social sustainability, all nine of the key actions within the three goals are focused on environmental sustainability.

This theme, while important, is mainly a conclusion and shows that all of the previous themes had climate change implications. Visually it is even a different theme than the other six. All six of the previous themes had a section entitled, "Economic Development Profile" and another on "Climate Impact", but this theme does not. The three goals under the theme are not as specific or measurable as those in the other themes. The first two goals emphasize carbon mitigation, while the third focuses on adapting to the changes that will come from climate change.

The second mitigation goal, Goal 23, is the only goal in Theme 7 that will actually have tangible effects on the environment and climate through its emission reductions. Many see one of the key actions as the shining star of the Emanuel administration's sustainability initiatives and one of the great successes of the plan, the closure of the Fisk and Crawford generating stations (City of Chicago 2012). This accomplishment is a landmark change and should be highlighted and praised. It is not, however, a key action that could result from the plan because it was already nearing completion (end of 2012) when the plan was published (fall of 2012) (City of Chicago 2012).

It is also a key action that addresses inequality in the city. Both of the generating stations were in majority minority communities that lacked resources,

but the plan did not explicitly address that. They simply said they were “operated in two of Chicago’s communities” (City of Chicago 2012, 35).

The weakness of Theme 7: *Climate Change* does not mean that the plan is not focused on mitigating the city’s impacts on the climate or preparing for the impacts of climate change. Many of the first 21 goals in the plan have carbon reduction components and in every theme before this one there is a section entitled, “climate impact”. What it really means is that the plan has already spoken for itself. It would be repetitive to address the issues once again in a section on climate change. The commitment to still having a theme entitled *Climate Change*, despite its presence throughout the plan, shows that the climate is at the crux of the plan and is weaved throughout.

### **Conclusion**

“Sustainable Chicago 2015” is a complex document with broad implications. When the 7 themes, 24 goals and 100 specific actions analyzed above are put together some trends shine through. The city’s guiding document for all work in sustainability is bookended by its two guiding principles, economic development and climate change.

The three pillars of sustainability do not receive equal consideration. The primary focus of the document is environmental sustainability, as it was weaved throughout every single theme and addressed in 70 key actions and 17 goals. Economic sustainability is a guiding principle to the document, however, all of the economic innovations are grounded in environmental sustainability. It is acknowledged in 26 key actions and 10 goals. The third pillar of sustainability, social

sustainability, receives more attention than many would have expected (34 key actions and seven goals), however, it definitely comes third to environmental and economic sustainability in its glorification.

The plan on its face seems to address the three pillars of sustainability adequately and really can lay claim to being a sustainability plan. Where it really comes up short is in addressing issues of economic and social equity. Of the 24 goals and 100 key actions, only four goals and 11 key actions address issues related to “just sustainabilities”. It is even more apparent when looking at explicit recognition because only two goals and three key actions explicitly acknowledge their focus on issues of social justice and economic equity. While many of the initiatives in the plan do have implications for Chicago’s underserved communities the focus is more embedded within the goals and actions. As a document that hopes to guide the city into the future and inspire others to work in sustainability this can have significant effects.

In order to understand how the plan ended up the way it did one must take a look at who was involved in the plan’s development. The next chapter will give an in-depth analysis of the governance network and stakeholders responsible for the development of “Sustainable Chicago 2015” to understand roles of the different pillars of sustainability as well as social justice and economic equity.

## CHAPTER SEVEN

### ANALYSIS: THE NETWORK

Governance networks can dramatically impact the policies of local governments. As seen in Chapter Two, there is a substantial literature describing the influence of stakeholders on policy development (Bressers and O'Toole 1998; Gibbs and Jonas 2000; Provan and Kenis 2007; DeLeon and Varda 2009; Hanson et. al 2010). Collaboration amongst diverse actors in a network maximizes resources through mutual dependence and can lead to policies that are truly greater than the sum of their parts (Rhodes 1996; Peters and Pierre 1998; Provan and Kenis 2007). While studies have examined the effects of networks on sustainability policy, it is still a largely understudied area of policy-making. It is important to understand who was involved and their interpretations of sustainability. This chapter analyzes the network that was involved in the development of "Sustainable Chicago 2015." Eight interviews were conducted. Overall, it is found that a diverse set of actors were at the table, however, there was also a lack of representation for minority and underserved groups and a saturation of environmental and economic voices.

The chapter begins with a brief analysis of actors mentioned in the acknowledgements section and is followed by an in depth analysis of 1) how interview subjects perceived the concept of sustainability, 2) the goals of the plan and 3) the network and decision making process that led to "Sustainable Chicago

2015.” This chapter examines sustainability policy-making through the lens of policy network theory to understand how Chicago ended up with the 7 themes, 24 goals and 100 specific actions that make up “Sustainable Chicago 2015.”

### **The Decision Making Coalition: On Paper**

At its core, “Sustainable Chicago 2015” is a plan intended to guide municipal actions. The “Sustainability Council” that is acknowledged at the beginning of the plan is described as “a group of department leaders, chaired by Mayor Emanuel, committed to achieving the goals laid out in this roadmap and delivering a more sustainable Chicago” (City of Chicago 2012, 04). The council’s eleven members consist of Mayor Emanuel, Chief Sustainability Officer Karen Weigert and nine department representatives. This group was influential in the municipal side of the plan, but they were not alone in its development. Weigert, the city official coordinating the plans development, acknowledged that the city had a lot of support from partners and stakeholders.

It is those partnerships that shaped the mayor and the city’s vision for sustainability. The acknowledgements section thanks the “Green Ribbon Committee” (City of Chicago, 2012, 37) and a list of other organizations that the city “received input and feedback” from in the development of the plan (City of Chicago 2012, 37). The organizations mentioned in these lists give a preliminary glimpse at who had input into the policies and actions of “Sustainable Chicago 2015”.

### **Green Ribbon Committee**

The “Green Ribbon Committee” was originally established by Mayor Daley, but was still very influential in the Emanuel administration. Weigert described the

committee as “an outside advisory group” that “provide council on climate and sustainability to the city and to the mayor and that group was one that we met with several times throughout the course of the process.” Chaired by Deputy Mayor Steven Koch and Hipolito Roldan, President and CEO of the Hispanic Housing Development Corporation, the thirteen member committee is comprised of stakeholders representing various organizations and industries that have a great deal of influence on the city’s policies.

| Type of Organization                       | Green Ribbon Committee | Additional Support From |
|--|------------------------|-------------------------|
| Private Business/Industry                  | 6                      | 10                      |
| Economic dev. Corporation                  | (1) 1                  | 1                       |
| Planning Consortia                         | 1                      | 4                       |
| College/University                         | 1                      | 2                       |
| Private/Community Economic Dev. Foundation | (2) 2                  | (4) 5                   |
| Non-Profit                                 | 2                      | (1) 12                  |
| Chamber of Commerce                        | 0                      | 1                       |
| Ad Hoc Citizen Group                       | 0                      | 1                       |
| County                                     | 0                      | 1                       |
| State Government                           | 0                      | 2                       |
| Regional Organization                      | 0                      | 1                       |
| Union                                      | 0                      | 2                       |
| Utility                                    | 0                      | 2                       |
| <b>Total</b>                               | <b>(3) 13</b>          | <b>(5) 44</b>           |

Table 15. Organizations Listed in Acknowledgements. This table categorizes the organizations acknowledged on pages 37-38; the numbers in parentheses are the number of organizations who focus on issues related to social justice and economic equity.



Through an online search for the missions and descriptions of organizations that committee members represent one many notice trends pertaining to who was at the table. Participants were categorized according to the 2009 International City Management Association list of economic development actors.

As seen in Table 15, the thirteen members of the committee consist of six representatives of private business, two private/community economic development foundations, one private economic development foundation, one university and one planning consortia. The last two, the Joyce Foundation and the Global Philanthropy Partnership could be associated with private/community economic development foundations, but may also be considered as non-profit organizations.

Looking more deeply into the six private business representatives, two represent property management and real estate, two large law firms, one large utility provider and one described as “an engineering and infrastructure and program management company” (William Abolt, Shaw Environmental). Only a brief glance is needed to see that only three of the thirteen different organizations represented in the Green Ribbon Committee focus their work on underserved communities. Those are Hipolito Roldan, the President and CEO of Hispanic Housing Development Corporation, Bernard Loyd, the President of Urban Juncture and Carlos Nelson the Executive Director of the Greater Auburn-Gresham Development Corporation.

### **Non-Committee Participants**

Other organizations were also acknowledged and thanked “for providing time and expertise” (City of Chicago 2012, 37). Non-profits were the most

prominent. The second column of Table 15 shows that there were 12 non-profit organizations in addition to five foundations, two unions, two universities and one ad hoc citizens group. There were also 10 organizations representing private business/industry and two utility providers. Overall these findings show that a diverse and broad group of stakeholders provided input and helped to develop the plan.

After examining the missions of the listed actors it is clear that a very small portion explicitly focus on issues of social justice or economic equity. Only five of the 44 organizations acknowledged work in this area (four non-profits, one foundation). Even so, organizations like the Sierra Club, one of the largest environmental organizations in the United States, were coded for social justice because of their environmental justice work. That could be problematic because that organization and many other environmental organizations focus more on natural preservation than on the environmental conditions people experience, even in the environmental justice dialogue (Sandler and Pezzullo 2007).

Understanding the types of organizations the plan credits for their input or that are represented on the Green Ribbon Committee paints a strong picture. Less than 25% of the Green Ribbon Committee, arguably the most influential group on the plan outside of government, represented community voices and one of them was a housing development corporation. There was the same amount of representatives from law firms as community groups.

This trend is also seen in the organizations credited for their input with five, less than 12%, of the 44 organizations including mentions of social justice in their

missions. There is a much larger representation of big businesses and utility providers in this list.

Although diverse, certain types of groups were vastly underrepresented. The business community was numerically much more influential in the plan. However, the interactions amongst actors and their individual inputs are not explained in the lists. As seen in Chapter 2, the structure of governance networks can have dramatic implications on the policies that come out of them (Bressers and O’Toole 1998; Provan and Kenis 2007). The perspectives of interview subjects help to understand the structure of the decision-making coalition and how these organizations worked with the city to develop “Sustainable Chicago 2015”. If the administration hoped to build a plan that could be judged on the success of all communities, then the lack of representation of social justice community voices could be problematic.

### **The Decision Making Coalition: Subjects’ Perspectives**

Over the course of the eight interviews with partners involved in the development of “Sustainable Chicago 2015”, specific actors were repeatedly recognized as being involved in the creation of the plan, while others who were explicitly mentioned in the paper did not receive as much attention. These interviews, while they occurred nearly three years after the plan was developed help to shed light on who really was at the center of these conversations, and who was on the periphery. Those heavily involved in the process had the opportunity to shape the plan and influence its focus and final objectives. This section will highlight the groups that participants remember being at the table as well as those they do not remember.

## At The Table

Four different sets of actors were repeatedly mentioned for their role in the development of the plan. The most commonly recognized actor was the city itself, specifically Chief Sustainability Officer Karen Weigert. William Abolt of Shaw Environmental, a member of the Green Ribbon Committee believed that “the primary driver was the city through the mayors office, then the individual departments.” Hipolito Roldan, the chair of the Green Ribbon Committee and the President and CEO of the Hispanic Housing Coalition echoed the city’s role, stating that the key player was the “the city itself with all of its various departments. He also acknowledged that “Karen Weigert, she is the [Chief] Sustainability Officer, but she is really the coordination with all of the city departments.” Sunil Garg, the Vice President of Exelon, agreed that, “Karen [Weigert] was in an obviously important role as a driver of this and I don’t think it would have happened without her.” In all of the eight interviews it was very clear that the city was the driving force behind the plan, with the Chief Sustainability Officer bringing together the set of actors involved in the discussions. Her perspective will be invaluable throughout the analysis.

The city did not do it alone and Weigert acknowledged that they “were very lucky to have outside consulting support through Civic Consulting Alliance and through what was then Shaw.” These two consulting companies, the Civic Consulting Alliance in particular, helped to drive the work forward. Olivia Cohn, a consultant from the Global Philanthropy Partnership with a desk in the Mayor’s Office stated that the Civic Consulting Alliance, “are the people who were reaching out to people

for specific information.” Tom McKone of the Civic Consulting Alliance even acknowledged that “Shaw provided the great framework for it.” Both Shaw and the Civic Consulting Alliance’s influence as consultants on the plan was significant because they were involved at every stage of development.

The Green Ribbon Committee and other private entities were also acknowledged for their roles. Adele Simmons, a member of the Green Ribbon Committee and President of the Global Philanthropy Partnership stated that, “The Green Ribbon Committee was pretty involved.” Olivia Cohn understood that, “one of those key audiences... is the Green Ribbon Committee.” The involvement of the Green Ribbon Committee was significant for many subjects, but the specific actors and organizations they brought up had a trend.

It is also clear that many businesses leaders and non-profits with significant environmental interests were also involved. Weigert stated that, “All of the major not for profits that are within the environment space we tried to meet with and [in] some cases we were able to meet with multiple times.” She continued on to say that “we were able to bring the plan in front of corporate leaders who were thinking about sustainability.” Carlos Nelson the Executive Director of the Greater Auburn Gresham Development Corporation acknowledged that business representatives like “Chris Kennedy...at the Merchandise Mart” and organizations like “Boeing” were involved, but also “the Joyce Foundation is heavily involved as well, the Comer Foundation, other foundations and civic organizations.” These big names also included people like Adele Simmons of the Global Philanthropy Partnership and Joyce Alberding of the Joyce Foundation who many subjects acknowledged was at

the forefront of environmental work in the city.

Utilities were another key voice with a specific interest around the environmental and economic sustainability of the city. Many of the interview subjects, from Adele Simmons to Carlos Nelson brought up the utility companies of Exelon and ComEd. As utility providers profit from energy use their interests may be seen as in direct conflict with the goals of sustainability planning. For that reason their perspective is very valuable in the research.

According to the interview subjects it was clear who they recall was involved in the development of “Sustainable Chicago 2015”. First and foremost it was the city and specifically Chief Sustainability Officer Karen Weigert, who coordinated the project. The next group was the consultants from Shaw Environmental and the Civic Consulting Alliance. The third group was key civic leaders and business representatives. The last group regularly acknowledged, and most significantly, was the utility providers, ComEd and Exelon.

The initial list of interview subjects included representatives of all of these sectors except for the utility providers. As a result a representative of that sector was added to the list of subjects and rounded out the analysis.

Before looking further into the interests of the eight interview subjects and their perspectives on the plan it is important to understand who may not have been involved or who had less input.

### **Not at the Table**

I thought it was pretty inclusive given the charge and it built on the planning efforts of the climate action plan the city had developed over multiple years as well as a number of other plans that had been developed. If we were

starting from scratch you could identify a whole bunch of parties that it would have made sense to involve, but given the long history of public engagement and action around the issue it was probably about right (William Abolt, Shaw Environmental).

The scale of this project was not small. It had broad ambitions to conceptualize how the city would address a new term, sustainability. Many interview subjects reiterated Abolt's sentiment that considering the context, the plan's development was inclusive. Weigert believed the plan was focused on getting a lot of perspectives and "if we missed someone that's shame on us. Our goal was to be inclusive and to really get great ideas." Adele Simmons, a champion of the project did not think anyone was missing. When asked if anyone's opinions were missed she said, "No I think everybody was involved."

Of the eight subjects interviewed, the three minority voices were the only ones that believed there were voices missing in the development of "Sustainable Chicago 2015". Even though Sunil Garg of Exelon "thought that from a representation perspective they did a nice job of having people from the non-profit, private and government sector" he understood that something was missing. He stated that, "it's a pretty standard group of folks that typically come together around these things and I think a really good group and I think sometimes it's always good to have our thinking challenged." He could not conceptualize who that voice was that could have presented an alternative, but he knew the network was not complete.

Hipolito Roldan of the Hispanic Housing Development Corporation and Carlos Nelson of the Greater Auburn Gresham Development Corporation knew the

voice that was missing. In order to implement this new concept, new pathways had to be forged and they were outside of downtown. Community voices were barely represented in the decision-making coalition responsible for the development of “Sustainable Chicago 2015”. Roldan acknowledged that “there were not a lot of community folks.” The other interview subject whose work is focused in communities echoed this sentiment. Carlos Nelson, the Executive Director of the Greater Auburn Gresham Development Corporation stated that, “what we found is a large percentage of the population especially in underserved communities are contributing to this issue that we have, yet many of us were not at the table.”

These two community based voices were meant to represent huge constituencies of people, specifically racial and ethnic minority populations; however, they were the only ones that acknowledged their own presence. Roldan acknowledged Nelson stating that “there was a guy named Carlos Nelson, so he is a community person, but I think he was alone, between him and I, I think we were probably it.” Nelson agreed, stating that there were “not a lot of other small not for profits. I mean matter of fact I would venture to say that we were one of the only.” The other six subjects did not recognize the lack of a community voice, nor did they even acknowledge the presence of a community voice. None of these other subjects mentioned either Roldan or Nelson as important voices in the development of “Sustainable Chicago 2015”.

The only two people that really acknowledged this lack of a community voice were those whose work is concentrated in communities. Roldan stated that, “I sort of consider myself a community folk, but I am here in the loop, but I spend a lot of



time in neighborhoods and that's where most of our work is in neighborhoods.”

Nelson understood his reasons to be there. When asked what his organization hoped to achieve through being involved in the development of “Sustainable Chicago 2015” his answer was clear, “representing the underserved community and having a voice at the table.”

This lack of a community voice is a significant finding in understanding the roles of communities in the final plan. It is also important that none of the other voices even acknowledged the few community based organizations and voices that were present. This shows that despite having a seat at the table they were not heard and may not have been valued as much as the downtown voices.

In order to implement a plan that reimagines how Chicago addresses sustainability, voices outside of the traditional establishment needed to be there, but also have their voices heard and valued. The fact that all three representatives of minority communities recognized something missing shows that actors do not always just represent their work. Minority representatives of other organizations, not explicitly representing the interests of minority communities, still might be more likely to recognize a lack of minority voices. Stakeholders are much more dynamic and complex than their job titles. The goals of individuals as well as their understanding of the goals of the plan can lead to influence and changes that affect the final product.

### **The Interests of Stakeholders**

This diverse set of actors had unique understandings of sustainability, the purpose of the plan and their own private interests that they valued. Balancing out

the varying interests of the different actors, the mission, and purpose of the city would be essential in developing a robust sustainability action agenda. The analysis of the network continues now with an examination of how interview subjects conceptualized the term sustainability, what they thought goals of the plan were and what their individual goals were in participating in its development. In support of the governance theory, “Sustainable Chicago 2015”, like other government policies, was shaped by the interests of the stakeholders who developed it.

### **Sustainability**

Sustainability is a dynamic concept that is commonly used, but not necessarily understood. Chapter 3 laid out the many components of sustainability and how it can be widely interpreted. In order to understand the policy interests that the actors represented one must understand how they saw sustainability.

Throughout the interviews all of the actors understood that sustainability was about being able to sustain life into the future. Karen Weigert, the Chief Sustainability Officer of Chicago, said that “[she tends] to use the traditional definition of being able to meet the needs of the populations today without prohibiting populations in the future to be able to meet their needs.” This understanding of the future was echoed by all of the subjects, but they all conceptualized how that could be done in very different ways.

The two consultants, Tom McKone of the Civic Consulting Alliance and William Abolt of Shaw Environmental were the only subjects who emphasized all three pillars of sustainability in their definitions, but they both had extensions of how they saw sustainability. Abolt stated that sustainability for him “is balanced

approaches that provide value, environmental, economic and community value for both the individual organization pursuing the activity and its stakeholders and customers and the entities it interacts with.” He valued all three pillars, but he also acknowledged the significant role of his clients and their intentions. McKone emphasized the environmental component of sustainability after emphasizing the “triple bottom line” of economy, social and environmental. He stated “you have three bottom lines, there are a lot of people that look at various bottom lines by themselves whether they are the economic or the social, but we were really focused on the environmental side of it.” He recognized the three components of sustainability, but noted that his work was focused on the environment. This is interesting because both of these consultants emphasized their work in their personal definitions of sustainability. Abolt’s focus on environmental sustainability within the three pillars would be repeated by many of the subjects.

Environmental sustainability receives the most attention of all three pillars of sustainability in the literature and the interview subjects also highlighted it. Adele Simmons, member of the Green Ribbon Committee and President of the Global Philanthropy Partnership defined sustainability as, “doing all we can to ensure that the planet is preserved for our children and that we have clear air and the plants and animals and life that we value.” Others echoed this biocentric view of sustainability, but they focused more on people’s lifestyles.

Both Olivia Cohn and Carlos Nelson see sustainability as a way of life focused on the environment. Cohn said, “Sustainability is really a word that pertains to a lifestyle and is about making smart decisions.” She continues on to concentrate her

definition on environmental sustainability stating that “when you are thinking about something being sustainable it’s essentially environmental work because you are making smarter decisions to do everything in a less environmentally impactful way if it’s something that’s going to last.” This idea of making decisions conscious of their environmental impact is how Carlos Nelson defines sustainability. As a representative of underserved communities, sustainability is about a deeper understanding of the effects people have on the environment. He defines sustainability as “being conscious of the things that make up our environment and the impact that we play on that environment.” Both of their definitions are grounded in the day-to-day lifestyles of Chicagoans that may not be involved in sustainability work at all.

The focus on being able to live life into the future is also significant in the definitions of Hipolito Roldan and Sunil Garg, although they both focus on energy efficiency. Roldan, the head of a housing development corporation states, “sustainability to me is creating efficiencies in the use of energy and how we live our daily lives.” Efficiencies and specifically energy efficiency is the focus of Garg’s definition of sustainability that asks the question, “have you developed systems that allow for the continuous operation of that system over time?” The fact that the developer whose work is largely focused on saving utility expenses and the utility provider both focus on energy efficiency is very interesting and sheds light on their interests in the process.

Of the eight actors interviewed they all understand that sustainability is about living into the future. A majority of their definitions focus on environmental

sustainability and energy efficiency and only two of the eight even bring up social sustainability, but it is not the focus of their definition.

A significant finding in this section is that none of the actors brought up social and economic equity or community development in their definitions. Even Roldan and Nelson, who represent community voices and later on recognized the need for community voices, did not acknowledge social and economic equity in their definitions. By the time they had been asked about who was involved in the network and who was not they had been asked about the role of issues like economic equity, food access and environmental justice in their definitions of sustainability. With that they could have realized the need for those voices, but it is very significant that they did not at the onset see community development as even being apart of their definitions of sustainability. These interests are further explored now to understand why stakeholders were involved in the development of the plan and what they wanted to get out of being involved in the development.

### **Purpose of Involvement**

Many of those interviewed made it clear that strengthening the city of Chicago and ensuring the new administration's focus on sustainability was an important reason behind their involvement. Consultant Tom McKone made it clear throughout his interview that both his own goal and the goal of the Civic Consulting Alliance's partnership with the City of Chicago were to "deliver a world class city." In helping the new administration build this world class city, sustainability was an important element. Olivia Cohn of the Global Philanthropy Partnership echoed this idea, but also expanded it to a focus on the environment. She stated that her

organization “really wanted to support sustainability and the environmental goals of the City of Chicago... and really make sure that environmental issues were a priority in the incoming administration.” As an environmental policy maker who puts a lot of stake in green issues, Cohn addressed her own policy priorities as a reason behind being involved.

Cohn was not alone. Many stakeholders told of how their individual interests influenced their involvement in the development of “Sustainable Chicago 2015”. William Abolt of Shaw Environmental stated that his goal was “to develop an approach for cities related to sustainability in addressing impacts that would be supportive of the client that we were working with, the City of Chicago.” He continued on to say that he hoped the involvement “would be engaging and beneficial to our employees that were working on it and that would be a work output that we could build on.” As a consultant he understood that the plan could help his organization in the future development of other sustainability plans. While he cared deeply about the success of the city, a former city employee under the Daley Administration and a longtime resident of the Chicagoland region, he was focused on his own organization. He only mentioned the city’s goals within his own goals by stating that they hoped to create a plan that “would be supportive of the client we were working with, the City of Chicago.”

Sunil Garg of Exelon also acknowledged his organization’s own interests as a reason behind their involvement. He stated that one reason they were involved was “to participate in something we think is important, I mean it’s something that would sustain us.” Energy companies are reliant on sustainability and not ruining the

environment or else they will no longer have a revenue stream for themselves. He also acknowledged that they had something to give to the City because as an organization so reliant on natural resources and on the environment they had done a lot of work on the issue. He stated that, “part of the question is how do you most economically get to the right outcome and we have thought a lot about that and done a lot of modeling around that.” He had something to bring to the table. As described in Chapter 2 increasing the pool of resources available is the basis for a networked model of public policy (Rhodes 1996; Stoker 1998; Peters and Pierre 1998). As a stakeholder with resources to give, his voice had the opportunity to be heard, but he also always had a focus on his customers.

Another stakeholder that focused on getting his own interests through in the plan was Carlos Nelson from the Greater Auburn Gresham Community Development Corporation. When asked what his organization hoped to achieve through being involved in the development of “Sustainable Chicago 2015” his answer was clear. He stated that he was there “representing the underserved community and having a voice at the table.” While voices like Garg said their involvement was focused on giving resources, like money or research, Nelson stated that, “our contributions were representative of what the community is saying.” This discrepancy between a community voice and a voice from a large for-profit entity is significant.

All of the actors were focused on making Chicago a better place, but they also had their own interests to represent, from their consulting company to their shareholders and the communities of the south side. Nevertheless, those voices and interests were not given the same value. Before an analysis of the decision making

structures is completed, it is important to see what the actors saw as the purpose behind the plan because their individual interests were so diverse.

### **Purpose of the Plan**

It was nearly a consensus for interview subjects that “Sustainable Chicago 2015” hoped to give the city a guiding document for its sustainable policy initiatives. Chief Sustainability Officer, Karen Weigert said, “we created the plan to articulate both for ourselves and for the broader community the integrated benefits that we wanted to deliver.” She saw it as having a purpose both within government and in the community. The plan was built to be used, “for internal management... and it also creates the priorities so that the broader community can partner and know where we are going and to help deliver the shared benefits.” As the city official tasked with developing the plan, it was expected that she would think the purpose of the plan was similar to what is written in the plan.

Throughout conversations with the actors, a theme in the inspiration behind developing a plan was the Emanuel Administration creating something of their own. Tom McKone and his team at the Civic Consulting Alliance suggested for Weigert to create the plan. He said that, “you had a set of recommendations.... To help deliver a world class city and through that one of the things that we recommended was creating a public plan that outlines sustainability.” Adele Simmons of the Global Philanthropy Partnership and a leader in environmental policy work in the city said that, “[Emanuel] needed to own something and what he did was look at the climate action plan and say ‘OK what do we have to do in the next three years in order to implement it’”. She continued on to say, “it is about implementing, doing what we



needed to do now to ensure that we met the goals of the 2020 plan.” Sunil Garg of Exelon and the Green Ribbon Committee echoed the plan’s renewed emphasis on sustainability when he stated that “Rahm [Emanuel] had just come into office and he wanted to update [The Chicago Climate Action Plan]”. The plan was about more than climate, it was about prioritizing with the concept of sustainability. The plan gave the city a chance to say, “Are these the right priorities? Has the world changed? What might we do differently?” “Sustainable Chicago 2015” not only built on the Chicago Climate Action Plan, but also redefined the city’s priorities.

The plan gave the city an answer to the questions of how they were going to address sustainability. Olivia Cohn, a consultant to the city working for the Global Philanthropy Partnership at the time said that, “Sustainable Chicago 2015’ really served as a way that you have a communication tool with the public about the environmental work the city of Chicago was doing or was going to continue to do under the new administration.” The plan, “sets a foundation” and it “sets a vision” for sustainability in the city according to Tom McKone of the Civic Consulting Alliance. William Abolt of Shaw Environmental, the other main consulting firm working on the project said “a clear objective” was “accountability for actions and alignment of carbon goals with the mission, function, investments, authorities of the city.” The consensus was clear from Karen Weigert to the plan itself that the plan is there to give the city a lens from which to approach these issues of sustainability. However, the path that lens was focused on is not as clear.

### **Policy Goals: The Actors Interpretation**

The plan’s goals on paper show a diversity of policy approaches to the seven

themes with application in many corners of the city. And yet, the actors involved in the development do not see the plan as having such a diverse set of goals. The actors really saw that the plan was focused on environmental sustainability and job creation. The two main targets for the plan were seen really as the business community and the city officials themselves.

The plan's environmental aspects shined through in the development of the plan. William Abolt said that the goal of the plan was, "from my perspective, to accelerate the city's progress towards meeting its carbon reduction targets by better aligning the city's goals with its core mission and function." Sunil Garg recalled the process as, "being relatively structured and particularly around reducing carbon." This sentiment was reiterated by Tom McKone of the Civic Consulting Alliance when he said, "the plan was meant to address environmental sustainability." This focus on environmental sustainability did come with a newfound incorporation of economic sustainability and green jobs.

The Emanuel administration brought with them a newfound focus on job creation. Hipolito Roldan, the President of the Hispanic Housing Coalition, who was involved with the development of the "Chicago Climate Action Plan", said, "Mayor Emanuel and his leadership...within the context of the sustainable goals...are more focused on job creation." One specific policy that many subjects brought up was the creation of the Greencorps Youth Employment program that employed 600 Chicago youth in a jobs training program focused on horticulture and bikes for six weeks during its first summer in 2013. This combination of jobs and the environment, however, was mainly focused in the loop and in working with large for profit

companies.

The focus on big business and on those with resources was repeated throughout the interviews. It came out most apparently in the interview with Carlos Nelson, the executive director of the Greater Auburn Gresham Development Corporation. When asked what the goals and policy priorities of “Sustainable Chicago 2015” were, Nelson said, “that the priorities were getting big corporations who account for a large amount of energy usage to become environmentally conscious.” He acknowledged the importance of that because of their large energy usage, but he was not alone in his opinion. Roldan, who represents minority communities in much of his work, echoed the sentiments stating that, “the down office buildings are going to [benefit the most]” from the plan because “if you wanted to sort of maximize your focus and effort and production, then where is the most square footage? It’s of course in downtown office buildings. So that seems to be a logical place to start.” They both agree that starting with the loop and with energy efficiency focuses are logical, but the problem comes in the discrepancy between what the plan says and what the actors remember as significant.

### **Conclusion**

Networks influence policies. As described in Chapter 2, it is important to understand the network that helped to develop “Sustainable Chicago 2015” and how that led to the plan that the city has today. From an analysis of the actors acknowledged in the plan itself it is clear that community voices were not adequately represented, especially community voices with a focus on social justice. Additionally, it was seen that minority voices did not have very much influence on

the plan.

Lists of actors at the table in the appendix of a plan do not necessarily tell the whole story. For that reason the interview subjects were asked about who else was involved in the planning of “Sustainable Chicago 2015”. Through those interviews there were two major findings. The first is that only the minority and community voices themselves acknowledged that something was missing, specifically community voices, from the development of the plan. The second is that none of the other actors ever acknowledged the presence of these minority and community voices in the decision-making coalition. The interviews were conducted three years after the plan’s development, however, it is significant that none of the actors acknowledged that community voices were involved.

It is important to look at who is involved, but also at their interests and their interpretations of the goals of the plan. In defining sustainability none of the actors brought up social and economic equity, but they all had an inherent focus on environmental sustainability. They all were involved in the development of the plan because they had a hope to help the City of Chicago. They also had their own personal interests that brought them to the table, from sustaining their business industry to helping underserved communities. Ultimately, like in many sustainability dialogues, actors were mainly focused on environmental preservation.

These diverse interests and understandings of sustainability led to different conceptualizations of the purpose of the plan itself and the policy goals of the plan. Stakeholders agreed that the plan helped to guide the new administration’s work and also bring the concept of sustainability to the forefront. What types of policies

came under that umbrella of sustainability was not as evident in the interviews. Many of the interviewees focused on environmental sustainability and the concept of job creation, while only a few of them thought about community development. Additionally a small minority of actors acknowledged that the plan was very downtown focused and did not emphasize the communities that make up Chicago.

This analysis of the network helps to give another glimpse into “Sustainable Chicago 2015” in helping to understand how the city ended up with the plan it did and whose interests were represented in the development of the plan and the policies that would result. The network responsible for developing “Sustainable Chicago 2015” was filled with members of the establishment and lacked voices that were focused on equity and social justice. The next chapter will take the analysis of the plan itself conducted in Chapter 6 and combine it with the analysis of the network in this chapter to draw conclusions about the research questions. In bridging the gap between the network and the plan, the next chapter will address how the network and the decision-making process strengthened some voices and drowned out others in order to create “Sustainable Chicago 2015”.

## CHAPTER EIGHT

### DISCUSSION

“Sustainable Chicago 2015” with its 7 themes, 24 goals and 100 key actions is a product of collaborative action among stakeholders to guide work related to sustainability in Chicago under Mayor Rahm Emanuel. This chapter looks to build on the analysis of the plan and the network to see how the interests and goals of stakeholders were integrated into the plan. According to governance and network theory, the plan should strongly resemble the interests of those who developed it. In many respects this is true; nonetheless, certain actors’ goals are not reflected within the plan. Building a plan of this magnitude and scope required input from many actors. The first section of this chapter compares the network and the plan to understand how the goals of the actors compare to those of the plan. Analysis of the findings clearly indicates that some interests, specifically those of Chicago’s communities, were not as influential as others.

In order to understand why those certain key actors were not as satisfied with the resulting plan, one must understand the roles and interactions of the various actors. The second part of this chapter does just that and unveils that despite a collegial and open discourse some views were marginalized and failed to voice their opinions. This implies that involvement does not necessarily lead to influence.

The third section of this chapter analyzes the role of social justice and economic equity in “Sustainable Chicago 2015”. It is clear that the lack of community voice in the network led to a lack of community related initiatives in the plan. Some stakeholders believed that equity was an important part of the plan, while others did not think it should have been. Ultimately, it is a plan built by the downtown establishment focused heavily on business’ role in sustainability in the City of Chicago.

### **The Plan and the Network: A Comparison**

The policy goals embedded within the plan strongly mirror those highlighted during the interviews. In both contexts, there was an emphasis on the environment and on environmental sustainability as it relates to the economy. Issues of social sustainability within “Sustainable Chicago 2015” were not highlighted amongst actors as significant policies. The literature shows that social sustainability initiatives are typically not emphasized within plans and policies, not to mention the fact that very few of the actors interviewed were focused on social issues.

Comparisons of the plan and interviews show strong similarities. In fact, a majority of the eight interview subjects were quite pleased with the plan. Both of the consultants agreed that it was a good guiding document. On a scale of 1 to 5, with 1 being the lowest and 5 being the highest, William Abolt from Shaw Environmental gave the plan a 5. He stated that because “the framework reflected best practices applied to cities.” He did acknowledge that “the planning period is not done.” Thus, he gave it a four overall. But he said, “It has exceeded expectations around transparency, accountability and organizing.” Tom McKone of the Civic Consulting

Alliance “was really happy with how this turned out, both because the design is very good [and] the content I think is very good.” These positive feelings towards the plan were echoed by Chief Sustainability Officer Weigert who stated that “I thought when it came out that it was right on target.”

Support for the final plan was not as unanimous across the Green Ribbon Committee. Abolt was on the Green Ribbon Committee and others repeated his views like Adele Simmons and Sunil Garg. The Vice President of Exelon, Garg, gave the plan a four because “it gave us a roadmap. I mean part of what you wanted to do was for the administration to give it a roadmap and a set of priorities that you could look back and say, ‘O.K. Did you do xyz?’” The Green Ribbon Committee was not unanimously content with the plan the city adopted.

When asked the same question, another voice on the Green Ribbon Committee and the lone community voice amongst interview subjects, Carlos Nelson, stated that, “it was a lot of fanfare, I would say two.” He eventually moved that number up to a three because it was focused on the plan itself achieving its goals. He stated that, “I think it brought a diverse group together for an overall discussion around a common issue which is a tough thing to do in a metropolis like Chicago, but as I indicated earlier in this diverse group there were still a lot of missing pieces on the representation side.” The fact that the only community voice at the table gave the lowest score for the plan achieving its goals is significant.

In regards to his organization’s involvement, Nelson’s responses were a tale of two stories. Like the other interview subjects he said his organization was “pleased” with its involvement, giving it a four. At the same time, he did not feel as if



his organization achieved its goals of being involved. He was the only subject interviewed believed his organization's were not met. Organizationally he:

Would say 2 and that is only because we should have carried the, we should have been more, we should have included more like organizations across the region, we should have taken on that role or we should have taken on that shortage and so gotten the word out to be more, as opposed to this is our community.

Nelson was indecisive about what he should have done, but he knew the plan did not address his community. In this quote he said, "we should have" five different times, but he did not ever fully grasp what he "should have" done. As the lone true community voice on the Green Ribbon Committee he had the burden of representing all of Chicago's communities and that task was a large one. He acknowledged that he did not necessarily represent communities adequately, but he should not have had that responsibility alone. The interests of Chicago's communities and specifically underserved communities should have been significant for all the committee members. Neighborhood voices should have been more involved.

This finding that the only representative of underserved communities was the only person to not rate the plan as having achieved its goals with either a four or five and the only person who said that his organization did not achieve its goals is significant. The plan did not address Chicago's neighborhoods and that shined through in his responses. This finding starts to paint the picture of why issues related to social and economic equity are not highlighted within the plan. Before the final discussion on the role of social and economic equity within the plan, the structure of the decision making process itself must be addressed.

## The Decision Making Process

The structure of policy networks has a significant influence on the ways in which stakeholders influence policy outcomes. Through interviews with the subjects it became clear that the process was heavily focused on executing Mayor Emanuel's vision and working with city departments to do so. It was also found that amongst the actors involved there was little disagreement and everyone was positive about their experience. This leads to a finding that ultimately actors may not have had as much influence on the plan as they may have thought, but were instead consulted with to materialize the mayor's vision. Thus the structure may not have mattered as much as one might have expected because the goal was to bring about the mayor's vision.

### Structure

The structure and the decision making was primarily driven by the Chief Sustainability Officer and the Mayor's Office after consultation with departments and sister agencies with technical consulting assistance from Civic Consulting Alliance and our company (Shaw Consulting). That was how it worked in terms of decision making and structuring and there were points of interaction with external stakeholders to vet ideas both formally and informally at different kind of points along the way.

William Abolt summed up the structure of the decision-making coalition succinctly. The plan came from the Mayor's Office with consultation from other city agencies. Not many of these goals were new. It has already been established that one major focus of the plan was to lay out the mayor's agenda. The other consultant interviewed, Tom McKone emphasized that "ultimately it was Karen [Weigert] as the Chief Sustainability Officer [who] would choose what to recommend and what not to recommend within the plan." Acknowledging Weigert's role in the Office of

the Mayor, McKone was sure to reiterate that “it is published out of the Office of the Mayor with the mayor’s letter on the front so the mayor’s office had ultimate approval of what goes out there as the mayor’s agenda on sustainability.” Weigert agreed that “it’s the mayor’s plan” but she also said they “used a pretty consultative process.” Weigert shaped the network to include supporting interests that would make the mayor’s vision become a reality.

The major consultations came from the city’s departments. Olivia Cohn said that “[Tom McKone and Connie Kresgie from the Civic Consulting Alliance] are the people who were reaching out to people for specific information.” McKone acknowledged that “we sat down with the various departments that have expertise in these areas... and said what are your specific goals and what do you think is achievable by 2015 within this topic area.” These consultations looked at what was already happening in the city in order to bring them into the plan.

Members of the Green Ribbon Committee were used more as advisors to look at ideas and help to shape them, not necessarily to come up with them. Sunil Garg of Exelon Corporation stated that “Karen [Weigert], as I remember, was very good at coming up with certain important outcomes and goals” he continued on to say “and then we tried to look at all of the different initiatives and [tried] to group them into specific areas and then [tried] to understand the potential impacts of different ones.” Hipolito Roldan of the Hispanic Housing Development Corporation said that different experts presented to the Green Ribbon Committee, stating that “we on the board simply look at the concepts.” Policies did not come out of the Green Ribbon Committee, but instead they were vented through it.

Not many of the policies in “Sustainable Chicago 2015” were new ideas nor were they ambitious. In addition to the policies that came out of the departments, many were built off of the “Chicago Climate Action Plan” and the mayor’s transition plan. Weigert acknowledged that “about a dozen and a half of [the 55 topics of focus in the transition plan] were explicitly about sustainability.” Weigert saw the transition plan as “the anchor and then we had the long term climate vision that the city had already put forward in the Chicago Climate Action Plan.” McKone echoed this sentiment when he stated that

There are a few [goals] that were developed in terms of staff conversations that were in [the plan], but a lot of the broader ones either came from the Mayor’s agenda as he was coming into office or existing within the climate action plan and then were sort of brought into this and then other ones were other goals that had been sort of set for by departments that were sort of codified in this as well.

Having “Sustainable Chicago 2015” so firmly rooted in preexisting plans and initiatives is helpful because it is more likely to be successful and help the city continue forward. It can also constrain the plan’s ambition, anchoring it in the past and in the mayor’s vision.

Both of the consultants who were tasked with developing the plan, Tom McKone and William Abolt, as well as a consultant on all of the city’s environmental work, Olivia Cohn, agreed that the plan’s goals lack ambition. In discussing how stakeholders were engaged with the plan, Cohn acknowledged that if the process was “changed a little bit, perhaps some of those goals would have been a little bit more aggressive because instead of having a point at the Civic Consulting Alliance for example reaching out to a point at the Department of Transportation and saying,

'What's going to be happening?' There could have been a person that said, 'Hey person running such and such city department lets set a goal for this.'" McKone recalled the only real argument in the decision making process related to "can we just push it a little bit farther." In the end he found that they did not push it further even after recommendations from groups like the Green Ribbon Committee. Looking back, Abolt agrees that "Sustainable Chicago 2015" like other first plans, "aren't as ambitious as they could be, particularly coming off of a climate plan that was highly ambitious and long term." This lack of ambition and innovation leads one to analyze interactions amongst stakeholders.

### **Interactions**

The interactions were varied, but subjects agreed that they happened in formal settings, like meetings for the Green Ribbon Committee and with department heads, as well as in some informal settings. A key finding of these interactions is that not one of the subjects interviewed reported significant conflicts or disagreements about which policies went into the plan. Adele Simmons, President of the Global Philanthropy Partnership, stated that "I don't think there was a lot of conflict, I mean there was a lot of agreement."

The conflict that did exist amongst stakeholders was about details and specifics, not about broader goals. Weigert said the conversations "[were] about refining and putting [the policy goals] in the right context and the right structure." Garg said that some of the policies that had less data to support their impact like "the whole bike path piece... how important was that to the quality of life in the city?" Even Carlos Nelson, a representative of underserved communities and a

subject whose answers did not always go with the trends said, after a long, contemplative pause, “I would say there wasn’t a lot of conflict, I would venture to say that the things that were most challenging for some of us, were the fringe topics.” There was little conflict, and when it happened it was not significant.

### **Implications**

It was not a top down structure, which is good, you know.... Even though the city’s environmental folks helped preside over much of the discussion, over much of the planning, over much of the process, as well as the [Civic Consulting Alliance], I think it was a balance, there was balanced input from all parties involved.

These statements by Carlos Nelson, the Executive Director of the Greater Auburn Gresham Development Corporation have two significant elements. The first is that he cites it was “the city’s environmental folks” that presided over the planning, insinuating a focus on environmental sustainability. Second, and even more significant, is the collegial culture that Nelson describes. Sunil Garg, Vice President of Exelon Corporation, “thought everybody played well together.” Yet, he recognized “that the biggest concern that I have in those things are you have some dominant voices and... have you created an environment where people feel like they can disagree or put forth a different point of view?” He believed that “Karen did a pretty good job of that” and Nelson’s quote from above shows that he agreed.

Feeling like you “can disagree or put forth a different point of view” is a lot different than actually being able to. Carlos Nelson knew his role was “representing the underserved community and having a voice at the table.” Despite feeling pleased with his involvement and feeling as if everyone had a chance to put in their input he knew the plan lacked in social and economic equity. Just because there was minority

representation and he had a seat at the table does not mean that he influenced the policies and focus of the plan. This is seen in the Regime Theory literature regarding how regimes can make members of the regime push aside their own personal interests in order to move the interests of the greater regime forward (Elkin 1987; Stone 1989; Dowding 2001; Mossberger and Stoker 2001; Davies 2002).

Early on in the interview with Nelson he recalled a great experience on the Green Ribbon Committee, feeling as if his opinions were valued and that he had a voice in the planning of “Sustainable Chicago 2015”. After giving the plan low scores for achieving its goals and his own organization’s goals, as well as acknowledging that “big businesses... would reap financial benefits and social benefits as well, but not the residents in the city” the researcher asked again if his input was heard throughout the process. After a long pause he stated:

I don’t think it was, I guess not. You know I am just so focused on what I came out of there knowing, ‘O.K. We can impact, we have got these goals in the plan, this is what we can do in our small little minute piece of the world.’ So yeah I didn’t no. I would say no.

This was the mayor’s plan. The plan lacked in innovation because it was really based in the vision of the mayor and rooted in past plans like the “Chicago Climate Action Plan” and the mayor’s transition plan. The lack of progressive policies resembles the members of the committee. The network was shaped by the Mayor and Weigert to evaluate, what she identified as “the mayor’s plan.”

The governance network that developed “Sustainable Chicago 2015” had a collegial culture that made actors feel valued. However, if one’s own interests were not part of the mayor’s vision, or in previous plans, then they were not going to be

included in the new plan. The network's ability to silence voices and keep people happy led to actors feeling welcome and included, but lacking in true voice. While this might not have been why policies addressing social and economic equity were not included, it did silence voices that were present to represent communal interests relating to social and economic equity.

### **Social and Economic Equity**

Ideas of social justice and economic equity do weave through the plan in different ways, from Theme 5: *Parks, Open Space, and Healthy Food* to the elimination of the coal fired power plants in minority communities. Many of those policies address social sustainability and the equity is more subliminal. As seen in Chapter 6, two goals and three key actions out of the 24 goals and 100 key actions embedded in "Sustainable Chicago 2015" explicitly focus on issues of social justice and economic equity and state their purpose as such (Tables 6 and 7 page 61). This lack of emphasis on these issues is a direct resemblance of the network that developed it, its structure, and the goals and interests of the stakeholders involved. The plan itself was not explicitly built as one that focused on these issues and that was seen in both the description of the plan's goals in Chapter 6 and in how the actors described the goals in Chapter 7.

Weigert believed that the plan did address these issues, but she stated that "it's not a fully comprehensive plan to address social equity throughout the city of Chicago so I don't want to structure it in that way. In the course of the plan we have aspects that are about delivering throughout Chicago." While it was not a plan focused on economic equity and social justice, Weigert believed it tried to address



the issues indirectly, stating that “I think its embedded in there.” The consultants reiterated her sentiment that it was not a plan focused on social and economic equity. Tom McKone acknowledged that “it appropriately brought those topics into what is ultimately an environmental sustainability plan... but I wouldn’t say that this is a comprehensive plan that addresses everything from economic development to social justice.” Olivia Cohn reiterated that “it’s more of a city oriented plan” and “it’s not really a community oriented plan, but yes I think it is intended to do that.”

The Green Ribbon Committee acknowledged that this was not the purpose of the plan. Adele Simmons, President of the Global Philanthropy Partnership stated that “its not a social and economic report.” Sunil Garg acknowledged that the city had some measures about theses issues “[but] overall no [the plan does not address social and economic equity]... I mean I think it’s a very downtown sort of establishment comfortable [plan].”

This was reiterated by both of the community voices interviewed. Hipolito Roldan and Carlos Nelson acknowledged that the plan did not address issues of social and economic equity. Roldan stated that “I don’t know that we are addressing that in a way that is going to be meaningful.” Nelson said, “I think it’s more focused on the industry, corporations and their involvement, their role, less about, so that the people that work in the corporations aren’t necessarily translating what they are doing on the work.” He continued on to say that “most residents aren’t even aware of the plan... the audience was really corporate America.”

The Green Ribbon Committee also recognized that other voices needed to be at the table if the plan hoped to address issues of social and economic equity.

Simmons went on to say that “they need to address it, but then you need other groups whose central focus that is.” Garg made it very clear that “if you were to go out and do this in a way that you engage the neighborhoods in a different way, I think the priorities might be different in terms of how people think about it.” Including more voices like Carlos Nelson with interests in underserved communities could have led to opportunities to speak up. The network was there to support a strong mayor. As Garg stated previously, there was a lack of a contradictory voice. If the community voice had more seats at the table they, may have had the strength to have an impact.

### **Conclusion**

Having a seat at the table does not ensure representation. “Sustainable Chicago 2015” is a plan focused on environmental and economic sustainability with some elements of social sustainability and a few mentions of equity. This is a result of the interactions amongst network actors. Actors were hoping to bring forward their own personal interests, but at the end of the day it was “the mayor’s plan” and their voices were not heard.

This case study shows that governance network theories may overestimate the potential for network actors to truly influence policy when faced with a strong leader, in this case mayor Emanuel, set on delivering a vision. The causal direction is brought into question because it seems as if the network was shaped by the vision instead of the vision being shaped by the network. This is significant because the policies embedded within the plan not only shape the city; they also shape how sustainability manifests itself in the City of Chicago. It sends a message that

sustainability for the City of Chicago is about the environment and economic development that minimizes environmental impacts while creating jobs.

## CHAPTER NINE

### CONCLUSION

*Sustainable Chicago* continues the work that has already begun by setting clear goals, ambitious timelines, and a renewed determination to engage all Chicagoans in shaping the future of our city (City of Chicago 2012, 05).

In the fall of 2012, the City of Chicago unveiled “Sustainable Chicago 2015”. It is a three-year action agenda that involves 7 themes, 24 goals and 100 key actions intended to guide the city’s work in sustainability under the leadership of Mayor Rahm Emanuel. In Chapter 3 a review of the literature shows that sustainability is a complex term has been defined in various ways since the Bruntland Commission Report of 1987 first defined it as development that “meets the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs” (WCED 1987, 5). Most scholars agree that sustainability has three major pillars: environmental, economic and social sustainability.

As cities begin to embark on more sustainable futures, it is time to examine how cities around the country are conceptualizing sustainability and if they are taking all elements seriously (Portney 2003). It is clear in the literature and in practice that one area many fall short on is the role of social justice and economic equity in municipal sustainability efforts. “Just Sustainabilities”, a term popularized by Julian Agyeman addresses the need for equity in sustainability policies (Agyeman 2013). Everyone must have equal access to environmental quality, economic

opportunity and socially vibrant communities to support and improve sustainability.

“Sustainable Chicago 2015” not only guided work on sustainability in Chicago, but it conceptualized how the administration and the city defined sustainability. It was the first plan in the city’s history that actually used the word sustainability in a significant way. Through a descriptive analysis of the plan and qualitative interviews with stakeholders involved in the network responsible for the plan, this research looks to understand how far the City of Chicago advanced sustainability and focuses specifically on how social justice and economic equity were reflected in the network of actors that created it.

Despite an overt emphasis on policies addressing economic and environmental sustainability, the plan addressed issues of social sustainability throughout. When the plan is looked at more deeply it is found that most of the initiatives are related to environmental sustainability in some way and the economic development is within the context of environmental sustainability. Social sustainability initiatives are more focused on building communities and increasing interactions amongst the city’s residents and visitors.

Social and economic equity were more implicitly addressed and did not receive very much explicit attention. Only two goals and three key actions explicitly acknowledge a focus on addressing inequities, despite many others having an impact on underserved communities. These goals are the ones related to increasing recycling to all Chicagoans and bringing healthy foods to all of Chicago’s neighborhoods.

Through interviews with network actors it was found that only one of them was focused on representing underserved communities and he felt as if his voice was not heard. The governance network responsible for the development of “Sustainable Chicago 2015” included diverse voices, but did not adequately represent the communities of Chicago and that ultimately impacts the plan. At the end of the day it was a network that was selected by the city and consisted of regular voices involved in policymaking brought together to support the mayor’s agenda.

Everything aside, “Sustainable Chicago 2015” brought forward the mayor’s vision for what sustainability would look like in Chicago. The purpose of the network was to create a plan that supported the Mayor’s vision, but that did not lead to innovation and input in the policies. It was found that the network culture was one of acceptance and not of challenge, leading many voices to not entirely be heard or acknowledged. This also led the plan to lack ambition and forward thinking in many of its policy goals.

### **Implications**

This article is not a critique of “Sustainable Chicago 2015”, but an analysis of the process in which actors participated in influencing the contents. The action agenda lays out Mayor Emanuel’s vision and guides sustainability in the City of Chicago. “Sustainable Chicago 2015” brought together a coalition of voices to set a “comprehensive vision” for sustainability in the city of Chicago. The three-year action agenda was not intended to address social and economic equity. That is seen through a lack of policies explicitly focused on addressing the inequalities that

threaten Chicago's sustainable future and explained by inadequate community representation in the policy network responsible for its development or in a lack of these policies in the mayor's vision for sustainability.

The plan defines what types of policies and actions are understood as being related to sustainability in Chicago. As one interview subject stated, "one of the best things about having a plan is that people who make it a priority... can say the city is on board or people can say, 'hey I would like to help you do this work by doing such and such within your plan.'" This plan brought people together under sustainability, but it also limits what initiatives and programs are included in what it means for Chicago to be sustainable. Specifically, the people and organizations working to strengthen Chicago's underserved communities are not explicitly part of the sustainability dialogue in the city.

Instead of going out of the way to highlight the inequalities and how the administration and the city will tackle them, "Sustainable Chicago 2015" chose to address them indirectly. When discussing the rebuilding of the Dan Ryan Branch of the Red line in Theme 3, or the closure of the Fisk and Crawford generating stations in Theme 7, they did not highlight that those projects would benefit minority and underserved communities, but instead they simply acknowledged the benefit that would come for Chicago.

In Mayor Emanuel's transition plan it states that "Chicago can only succeed as a city if every part of Chicago succeeds" (City of Chicago 2011). If that is truly the goal of the city and of all of its work, then the city must acknowledge the importance of communities, specifically underserved communities, in making Chicago better

and ensuring long-lasting sustainability. In order to do this, a more representative coalition of actors must be at the table in developing the city's policies and agendas and they must also have the opportunity to be heard.

This research examines a single city. Further research must study the role of social justice and economic equity within sustainability. With growing cities and the world feeling increased effects of climate change, sustainability and specifically the sustainability of cities will be put under a spotlight. The sustainability of the future must address the needs of underserved communities and include minority voices in the decision-making process. Cities, like Chicago, cannot grow into the future without addressing the rampant inequalities that fill the streets.



## APPENDIX A

### 24 GOALS AND 100 KEY ACTIONS CODED FOR THE THREE PILLARS AND JUST SUSTAINABILITY

The following tables code the goals (bold) and key actions for the three types of sustainability and if they acknowledge equity explicitly, implicitly or not at all.

### Theme 1: Economic Development and Job Creation

| Goals (Bold) and Key Actions  | Type of Sustainability (Economic, Environmental, Social) | Just Sustainability |
|---|--|---------------------|
| <b>1. Establish Chicago as a Hub for the Growing Sustainable Economy</b>  | <b>Economic</b>  | <b>Not at all</b>   |
| Increase investment and research through activities including a Chicago clean tech summit and sharing of sustainability related data. | Economic   | Not at all          |
| Implement new technologies to advance sustainable solutions by using smart grid and clean energy applications.                        | Environmental  | Not at all          |
| Recruit companies and individuals with the most innovative clean energy and sustainability solutions to Chicago...                    | Economic<br>Environmental                                | Not at all          |
| Increase demand for sustainable products and approaches by adopting a green procurement policy.                                       | Economic<br>Environmental                                | Not at all          |
| <b>2. Accelerate the Economy in Chicago by Assisting People and Companies in Adopting Sustainable Practices</b>                       | <b>Economic<br/>Environmental</b>                        | <b>Not at all</b>   |
| Double the number of offices and businesses making operations more sustainable...   | Environmental  | Not at all          |
| Support sustainability and green building education for the public...   | Environmental  | Not at all          |
| Determine training gaps based on planned investments, and expand educational and training opportunities in environmental programs...  | Economic<br>Environmental<br>Social                      | Explicit            |
| Identify, prioritize and eliminate code barriers to sustainable practices.  | Economic<br>Environmental                                | Not at all          |

## Theme 2: Energy Efficiency and Clean Energy

| Goals (Bold) and Key Actions  | Type of Sustainability (Economic, Environmental, Social) | Just Sustainability (Not at all, Implicit, Explicit) |
|---|--|--|
| <b>3. Improve Citywide Energy Efficiency by 5%</b>  | <b>Economic<br/>Environmental</b>                        | <b>Not at all</b>                                    |
| Support homes and businesses to achieve 20% energy efficiency improvements...   | Economic<br>Environmental                                | Not at all   |
| Support and advance the installation of smart meters in Chicago's businesses and households.  | Environmental  | Not at all   |
| Double the number of LEED-certified buildings.  | Economic<br>Environmental                                | Not at all   |
| Include energy efficient technologies in all street lighting replacements   | Economic<br>Environmental                                | Not at all   |
| <b>4. Improve Overall Energy Efficiency in Municipal Buildings by 10%</b>   | <b>Economic<br/>Environmental</b>                        | <b>Not at all</b>                                    |
| Target 10 million square feet of municipal buildings for energy reduction of 20%.   | Economic<br>Environmental                                | Not at all   |
| Achieve at least 10% improvement in energy efficiency in all CPS school operations, targeting a 50% school participation rate through the shared energy savings program | Economic<br>Environmental                                | Not at all   |
| Double the number of LEED-certified public buildings  | Economic<br>Environmental                                | Not at all   |
| Track and report energy consumption at City facilities  | Environmental  | Not at all   |

**Theme 2: Energy Efficiency and Clean Energy (Continued)**

| Goals (Bold) and Key Actions   | Type of Sustainability (Economic, Environmental, Social) | Just Sustainability (Not at all, Implicit, Explicit) |
|--|--|--|
| <b>5. Create an Additional 20 MW of Renewable Energy, Consistent With the Illinois Renewable Portfolio Standard</b>  | <b>Environmental</b>                                     | <b>Not at all</b>                                    |
| Install 10 MW of renewable energy on City properties.  | Environmental  | Not at all   |
| Explore locally-produced, renewable energy opportunities...  | Environmental  | Not at all   |
| Cut the solar permit approval time in half, and reduce the complexity of zoning for local solar installations.   | Environmental  | Not at all   |
| Work with ComEd, the State of Illinois, and other partners to assist in achieving the Illinois Standard goals of 9% of electricity coming from renewable energy by 2015 and 25% by 2026. | Environmental  | Not at all   |

### Theme 3: Transportation Options

| Goals (Bold) and Key Actions   | Type of Sustainability (Economic, Environmental, Social) | Just Sustainability (Not at all, Implicit, Explicit) |
|--|--|--|
| <b>6. Increase Average Daily Transit Ridership</b>   | <b>Economic<br/>Social</b>                               | <b>Implicit</b>                                      |
| Complete full reconstruction of the Dan Ryan (southern) branch of the Red Line, complete facelifts for seven stations on the north Red Line.               | Economic<br>Social                                       | Implicit   |
| Continue progress on full Red and Purple Line modernization...   | Economic<br>Social                                       | Implicit   |
| Complete Renewal of 100 train stations... ensuring they are “safe, dry, and bright.”   | Economic<br>Social                                       | Implicit   |
| Replace or rehabilitate more than 1,500 CTA buses with new, low-emission buses and replace or rebuild nearly 1,000 CTA railcars                            | Economic<br>Environmental                                | Not at all   |
| Install Bus Tracker LED signs at 400 bus shelters and turnarounds. Install Train Tracker signage... and other technological amenities in all rail stations | Economic<br>Social                                       | Not at all   |
| Launch Bus Rapid Transit with a pilot route.... Plan for additional corridors  | Economic<br>Social                                       | Not at all   |
| Implement a travel demand management program to connect people with commuting options  | Economic Social  | Not at all   |
| <b>7. Accelerate Transit Oriented Development Around Transit Stations</b>  | <b>Economic<br/>Social</b>                               | <b>Not at all</b>                                    |
| Amend the Chicago Zoning Ordinance by adding a definition for Transit Oriented Development   | Economic<br>Social                                       | Not at all   |
| Identify additional “pedestrian streets” (as defined in the zoning code) around CTA stations   | Social   | Not at all   |
| Coordinate transit improvements with streetscape improvements and complete street implementation   | Social   | Not at all   |

**Theme 3: Transportation Options (Continued)**

| Goals (Bold) and Key Actions   | Type of Sustainability (Economic, Environmental, Social) | Just Sustainability (Not at all, Implicit, Explicit) |
|--|--|--|
| <b>8. Make Chicago the Most Bike and Pedestrian Friendly City in the Country</b>   | <b>Social</b>  | <b>Not at all</b>                                    |
| Add 100 miles of protected bicycle facilities.   | Social   | Not at all   |
| Launch bike sharing system...  | Economic<br>Social                                       | Not at all   |
| Release a pedestrian master plan...  | Social   | Not at all   |
| Enhance adopt and use the revised Complete Streets Guidelines...   | Social   | Not at all   |
| Reduce bicycle and pedestrian fatalities...  | Social   | Not at all   |
| <b>9. Improve Freight Movement and Accelerate High-Speed Passenger Rail Projects</b>   | <b>Economic</b>  | <b>Not at all</b>                                    |
| Coordinate efforts with Metra as the Englewood Flyover project begins construction...  | Economic   | Not at all   |
| Identify additional available funding sources...   | Economic   | Not at all   |
| Modernize Union Station to expand its role as a transportation hub.  | Economic<br>Social                                       | Not at all   |
| <b>10. Advance Sustainability Leadership at Chicago's Airports</b>   | <b>Economic<br/>Environmental</b>                        | <b>Not at all</b>                                    |
| Pursue significant infrastructure investments...   | Economic<br>Environmental                                | Not at all   |
| Advance strategies to reduce airport consumption by 15%, divert 50% of airport waste, and maintain a fleet with 20% low emission vehicles and develop innovative approaches to airport operations... | Environmental  | Not at all   |
| Promote partnership opportunities to support innovations in aviation...  | Environmental  | Not at all   |

**Theme 3: Transportation Options (Continued)**

| Goals (Bold) and Key Actions  | Type of Sustainability (Economic, Environmental, Social) | Just Sustainability (Not at all, Implicit, Explicit) |
|---|--|--|
| <b>11. Strengthen the Infrastructure to Advance Vehicle Efficiency</b>                                    | <b>Economic<br/>Environmental</b>                        | <b>Not at all</b>                                    |
| Improve traffic signal timing for cars and buses...   | Environmental  | Not at all   |
| Achieve a taxi fleet comprised of 75%-80% hybrid or compressed natural gas vehicles.                      | Environmental  | Not at all   |
| Install a dense network of electric vehicle charging stations.  | Environmental  | Not at all   |
| Encourage the use of clean fuels, clean vehicle technologies and develop alternative fuel infrastructure. | Environmental  | Not at all   |
| <b>12. Reduce Municipal Fossil Fuel Consumption by 10%</b>  | <b>Economic<br/>Environmental</b>                        | <b>Not at all</b>                                    |
| Reduce the number of vehicles in the City's fleet.  | Environmental  | Not at all   |
| Increase efficiency of garbage services.  | Environmental  | Not at all   |
| Replace 3% of on-road fleet vehicles with green fleet annually.   | Environmental  | Not at all   |
| Reduce the energy intensity of CTA rail service by 12% from 2011 levels.                                  | Environmental  | Not at all   |

**Theme 4: Water and Wastewater**

| Goals (Bold) and Key Actions   | Type of Sustainability (Economic, Environmental, Social) | Just Sustainability (Not at all, Implicit, Explicit) |
|--|--|--|
| <b>13. Decrease Water Use by 2% (14 Million Gallons Per Day) Annually</b>  | <b>Environmental</b>                                     | <b>Not at all</b>                                    |
| Meter 50% of all water accounts.   | Environmental  | Not at all   |
| Replace 320 miles of water main.   | Environmental  | Not at all   |
| Collaborate on greywater policy, including codes, to allow for expanded use.   | Environmental  | Not at all   |
| Pilot water reductions programs and technologies at City-owned facilities.   | Environmental  | Not at all   |
| Track and report water use at City facilities.   | Environmental  | Not at all   |
| Launch a water conservation strategic plan...  | Environmental  | Not at all   |
| <b>14. Enhance Stormwater Management to Reduce Sewer Overflows and Basement Flooding</b>   | <b>Environmental</b>                                     | <b>Not at all</b>                                    |
| Create a comprehensive green infrastructure plan...  | Environmental  | Not at all   |
| Explore partnerships with the Metropolitan Water Reclamation District to implement neighborhood-level green infrastructure pilots. | Environmental  | Not at all   |
| Convert 1.5 million square feet of impermeable surface into pervious surfaces every year.  | Environmental  | Not at all   |
| Replace or reline 275 miles of sewer main and line 56,000 structures...  | Environmental  | Not at all   |
| Support the completion of the first stage of the Tunnel and Reservoir Plan.  | Environmental  | Not at all   |
| Increase Opportunities to return rainwater to Lake Michigan.   | Environmental  | Not at all   |



**Theme 4: Water and Wastewater (Continued)**

| Goals (Bold) and Key Actions  | Type of Sustainability (Economic, Environmental, Social) | Just Sustainability (Not at all, Implicit, Explicit) |
|---|--|--|
| <b>15. Transform the Chicago River into our Second Waterfront</b>   | <b>Social</b>  | <b>Not at all</b>                                    |
| Add to riverfront trail...  | Social   | Not at all   |
| Create new recreational opportunities along the river...  | Social   | Not at all   |
| Support disinfection of sewage discharge into the Chicago River.  | Environmental  | Not at all   |
| Collaborate with key stakeholders to advance Chicago River revitalization efforts.                                | Social   | Not at all   |
| <b>16. Protect Water Quality and Enhance Access to Lake Michigan</b>  | <b>Environmental<br/>Social</b>                          | <b>Not at all</b>                                    |
| Create better lakefront access with infrastructure improvements...  | Social   | Not at all   |
| Decrease bacteria sources into the Lake to reduce swim advisor days.  | Environmental<br>Social                                  | Not at all   |
| Use the latest technology to provide faster, more accurate information about beach water quality to the public... | Social   | Not at all   |
| Reduce salt usage in all snow removal programs.   | Environmental  | Not at all   |

### Theme 5: Parks, Open Space and Healthy Food

| Goals (Bold) and Key Actions   | Type of Sustainability (Economic, Environmental, Social) | Just Sustainability (Not at all, Implicit, Explicit) |
|--|--|--|
| <b>17. Increase the Number of Public Spaces and Parks Accessible for Chicagoans</b>                                  | <b>Social</b>  | <b>Implicit</b>                                      |
| Invest in innovative new public spaces, including the Make Way for People initiative, to create open active streets. | Social   | Not at all   |
| Increase the number and varieties of programs for residents...   | Social   | Not at all   |
| Increase Chicago Park District acreage by more than 180 acres.   | Social   | Implicit   |
| Open Bloomingdale Trail, open North Grant Park... and open new LEED-certified field houses in at least two parks.    | Environmental<br>Social                                  | Not at all   |
| Support the access to, integration and promotion of cultural elements in public spaces.                              | Social   | Not at all   |
| <b>18. Increase Options for Accessing Local or Healthy Food in Every Neighborhood</b>                                | <b>Economic<br/>Social</b>                               | <b>Explicit</b>                                      |
| Double the number of acres of urban agriculture.   | Economic<br>Environmental<br>Social                      | Implicit   |
| Provide LINK card assistance at all farmers markets.   | Social   | Explicit   |
| Create partnership opportunities for regional businesses and farms that deliver healthy food into the city.          | Economic<br>Social                                       | Implicit   |
| Encourage more individual production of healthy food on public and private spaces.                                   | Social   | Implicit   |

**Theme 5: Parks, Open Space and Healthy Food (Continued)**

| Goals (Bold) and Key Actions  | Type of Sustainability (Economic, Environmental, Social) | Just Sustainability (Not at all, Implicit, Explicit) |
|---|--|--|
| <b>19. Improve and Protect Chicago's Natural Assets and Biodiversity</b>                    | <b>Environmental</b>                                     | <b>Not at all</b>                                    |
| Drive habitat restoration and public engagement in the Calumet region.                      | Environmental<br>Social                                  | Not at all   |
| Increase and protect habitat that is friendly to bird and other species...                  | Environmental  | Not at all   |
| Protect the tree canopy in the public right of way; support tree canopy work on other land. | Environmental  | Not at all   |
| Continue to enforce the terrestrial and aquatic invasive species ordinance...               | Environmental  | Not at all   |

**Theme 6: Waste and Recycling**

| Goals (Bold) and Key Actions   | Type of Sustainability (Economic, Environmental, Social) | Just Sustainability (Not at all, Implicit, Explicit) |
|--|--|--|
| <b>20. Increase Access to Recycling and Improve Policies to Promote Waste Reduction and Re-Use</b> | <b>Environmental</b>                                     | <b>Explicit</b>                                      |
| Expand the Blue Cart Recycling program to all 600,000 City-collected households.                   | Environmental  | Explicit   |
| Improve policies to promote recycling, composting, and building material re-use.                   | Environmental  | Not at all   |
| Pilot and scale best practices for waste reduction at a major festival.                            | Environmental  | Not at all   |
| Divert 75% eligible municipal construction waste.  | Environmental  | Not at all   |
| Meet or exceed recycling goals at 75% of public schools.   | Environmental  | Not at all   |
| Promote landscape waste reduction and composting among households.                                 | Environmental  | Not at all   |
| <b>21. Incorporate Standard Green Practices in All City Operations</b>                             | <b>Environmental</b>                                     | <b>Not at all</b>                                    |
| Use some materials with recycled content in every construction project.                            | Environmental  | Not at all   |
| Make as many City processes as paperless as possible.  | Environmental  | Not at all   |
| Implement a sustainable operations plan for City facilities.                                       | Environmental  | Not at all   |

**Theme 7: Climate Change**

| Goals (Bold) and Key Actions  | Type of Sustainability (Economic, Environmental, Social) | Just Sustainability (Not at all, Implicit, Explicit) |
|---|--|--|
| <b>22. Reduce Carbon Emissions from All Sectors</b>   | <b>Environmental</b>                                     | <b>Not at all</b>                                    |
| Report updates on carbon emissions.   | Environmental  | Not at all   |
| Partner with universities to use Chicago as a laboratory for climate research, and data gathering.  | Environmental  | Not at all   |
| Increase community engagement to make Chicago more sustainable.   | Environmental<br>Social                                  | Not at all   |
| <b>23. Improve Local Air Quality by Accelerating Performance Towards Federal Standards and Decreasing Greenhouse Gas Emissions</b>                            | <b>Environmental</b>                                     | <b>Not at all</b>                                    |
| Close Fisk and Crawford generating stations earlier than planned, benefitting the city with reduced air pollution.  | Environmental  | Implicit   |
| Reduce Chicago Transit Authority bus particulate matter emissions by 50 percent and nitrous oxide emissions by 30 percent while maintain bus service levels.  | Environmental  | Not at all   |
| Implement the Chicago Clean Diesel Contracting Ordinance's Clean Fleet Score and ban high polluting equipment and vehicles on City projects starting in 2014. | Environmental  | Not at all   |
| <b>24. Protect the City and Its Residents by Preparing for Changes in the Climate</b>   | <b>Environmental</b>                                     | <b>Not at all</b>                                    |
| Prepare for the human impacts of climate change by supporting people with information and services...   | Environmental<br>Social                                  | Not at all   |
| Prepare the natural environment for climate impacts and maintain biodiversity.  | Environmental  | Not at all   |
| Prepare the infrastructure for climate change...  | Environmental  | Not at all   |

## APPENDIX B

### ACTORS' PERSPECTIVES ON THE PLAN AND ITS DEVELOPMENT

The following table shows interview subjects varied responses to how they saw their own roles in the network that developed the plan and the purpose of the plan.

| Subject Title (Organization)  | Goal of Organizational Involvement   | Role in development  | Purpose of the Plan  |
|---|--|--|--|
| <b>Karen Weigert</b><br>Chief Sustainability Officer<br>(City of Chicago)                                     | "make Chicago the most livable competitive and sustainable city"<br>"we really want to support sustainability and the environmental goals of the city of Chicago, the geographic area not necessarily just the city and really make sure that environmental issues were a priority in the incoming administration" | "We led the development of the plan"   | "We had this new team and this new opportunity really build on this fabulous foundation in Chicago and weave something together about what we were going to try to do in the very near term to accelerate the work that was there and really push forward in a few spaces" |
| <b>Olivia Cohn</b><br>Chicago Climate Action & Sustainability Specialist<br>(Global Philanthropy Partnership) | "we really want to support sustainability and the environmental goals of the city of Chicago, the geographic area not necessarily just the city and really make sure that environmental issues were a priority in the incoming administration"   | "I sort of held on to a lot of historical knowledge with the Chicago Climate Action Plan and how that influenced Sustainable Chicago 2015" | "Sustainable Chicago 2015 really served as a way that you have a communication tool with the public about the environmental work the City of Chicago was doing or was going to continue to do under the new administration"  |

| Subject Title (Organization)   | Goal of Organizational Involvement  | Role   | Purpose of the Plan   |
|--|---|--|---|
| <p><b>Tom McKone</b><br/>Principle (Civic Consulting Alliance)</p>   | <p>"To deliver a world class city... [Weigert] came in as the public sector leader... you had a set of recommendations, here is how you deliver on sustainability to help deliver a world class city and through that one of the things that we recommended was creating a public plan that outlines sustainability."</p> | <p>"We helped organize the development of the content that was in the plan... And then reached out to all the city departments in order to determine what they can do to deliver on sustainability."</p> | <p>"The priority is to help make sure sustainability is on the agenda, its to leverage your resources because you have got a lot of people going out there doing a lot of things and sometimes all you have got to do is go out there and think, 'What do I need to do? How do I make it sustainable?'"</p> |
| <p><b>William Abolt</b><br/>Vice President Energy &amp; Sustainability (Shaw Environmental and Infrastructure)</p> | <p>"To develop an approach for cities related to sustainability in addressing impacts that would be supportive of the client we were working with, the City of Chicago, that would be engaging and beneficial to our employees that were working on it and that would be a work output that we could build on."</p>       | <p>"We were the primary external technical and consulting resource for the city in developing the program."</p>  | <p>"To accelerate the city's progress towards meeting its carbon reduction targets by better aligning the city's climate goals with its core mission and function."</p>   |



| Subject Title (Organization)   | Goal of Organizational Involvement  | Role  | Purpose of the Plan  |
|--|---|---|--|
| <p><b>Hipolito (Paul) Roldan</b><br/>President and CEO (Hispanic Housing Development Corporation)</p>      | <p>"I am simply one of I guess seven or eight members of the board...All of us in one small way or another carrying out these 24 goals... we like to think that affordable housing is important to the city, not only for those of us that develop it.... All of that from an extent that we can reduce energy costs by using these mechanism that are already available... that would be the role that we could play."</p> | <p>"I think we on the board simply look at the concepts... you know how far have we come along."</p>  | <p>"That's extremely important, reducing our carbon footprint is extremely important because we all have a responsibility to our grandchildren and what the hell kind of planet we leave them when we are gone."</p> |
| <p><b>Sunil Garg</b><br/>Vice President, Chief Information and Innovation Officer (Exelon Corporation)</p> | <p>"Exelon is an important civic leader ... one is just to participate in something we think is important... I mean its something that would sustain us... two is we have thought a lot about it and sort of particularly from an economic prospective... we thought we could bring some analysis to the table."</p>  | <p>"I was on the committee that reviewed the documents, we did a presentation for Karen Weigert and some folks from the city on the economics of where you should invest if you want to drive reductions in emissions."</p> | <p>"Rahm [Emanuel] had just come into office and he wanted to update it [The Chicago Climate Action Plan], you know were they the right priorities? Were we focused on the right things?"</p>                        |

| Subject Title (Organization)  | Goal of Organizational Involvement  | Role   | Purpose of the Plan  |
|---|---|--|--|
| <p><b>Carlos Nelson</b><br/>Executive Director<br/>(Greater Auburn Gresham Development Corporation)</p> | <p>"Representing the underserved community and having a voice at the table."</p>                            | <p>"Part of the city or mayor's Green Ribbon Committee and being able to represent not just the not for profit side, but also representing, being a community based organization. So our contributions were representative of what the community is saying."</p> | <p>"I would say the priorities were getting big corporations who account for a large amount of energy usage to become environmentally conscious.... And by doing that [getting big corporations to be environmentally conscious] that does have a big impact on the city....but a large percentage of the waste comes from underserved communities, that is a part of the plan as well... but city wide I think that's where a short fall is."</p> |
| <p><b>Adele Simmons</b><br/>President<br/>(Global Philanthropy Partnership)</p>                         | <p>"The goal was to really take the Daley Climate Action Plan and update it and put it in a [new] way."</p> | <p>"I was working very closely with the city, I was helping Karen [Weigert] work on strategy, I met with her regularly... helping Karen move these larger issues forward in the city."</p>   | <p>"I think its trying to move forward on multiple fronts in the areas where we can make the biggest difference to which you see the goals that were outlined in Mayor Daley's plan."</p>  |

## APPENDIX C

### ACTORS' PERSPECTIVES ON THE OUTCOME

The following table shows if interview subjects felt as if the plan achieved its goals, their organization achieved its goals and if the plan addresses issues of social and economic equity.

| Subject Title (Organization)   | Plan Achieve its Goals  | Organization Achieve its Goals   | Addresses Issues of Social and Economic Equity  |
|--|---|--|---|
| <p><b>Karen Weigert</b><br/>Chief Sustainability Officer (City of Chicago)</p>   | <p>"When it came out I thought it was a pretty good plan. Its comprehensive, but its also specific."</p>  | <p>"We actually do use this plan to guide monthly meetings across the city and its structure across the seven themes. Every month we are updated on the goals.. It helps us make sure that we are delivering the actual actions in moving towards those goals."</p>  | <p>"I think it does. It's not a fully comprehensive plan to address social equity throughout the city of Chicago, so I don't want to structure it in that way. In the course of the plan we have aspects that are about delivering throughout Chicago... I think its embedded in there. I think you can be really explicit about direct actions within the plan that that speak to a more inclusive Chicago, creating more pathways for individuals."</p> |
| <p><b>Olivia Cohn</b><br/>Chicago Climate Action &amp; Sustainability Specialist (Global Philanthropy Partnership)</p> | <p>"Its goals should have been a little bit clearer because yes I did think that it accomplished its goals, but I am not sure exactly what the goal is. If the goal is to put in place for this new administration what they are doing on environmental issues, then yes I do think that the goal was accomplished"</p> | <p>"My involvement with the plan was both sort of touching everything, but at the same time I don't know that all of my thoughts were ever fully incorporated... I wish that some of those goals would have been more aggressive... I wouldn't say that I necessarily really accomplished my goal on the plan... I don't think there was a definition on what that was."</p> | <p>"I think that it intended to do that by some of the section on open space and healthy food access because its more of a city oriented plan I think it does it in a way that's doing it from that prospective so its not really a community oriented plan, but yes I think it is intended to do that."</p>  |

| Subject Title (Organization)   | Plan Achieve its Goals  | Organization Achieve its Goals   | Addresses Issues of Social and Economic Equity  |
|--|---|--|---|
| <p><b>Tom McKone</b><br/>Principle (Civic Consulting Alliance)</p>   | <p>"I was really happy with how this turned out, both because the design is very good, the content is very good, it gives you a lot to read and I really like putting these facts in here too because there is a lot of things about Chicago that already makes it a sustainable city that people don't realize."</p> | <p>"Oh yeah I was really happy with it, I thought this rally came out really well."</p>  | <p>"So the plan was meant to address environmental sustainability right so that was the focus of the plan... So I think it appropriately brought those topics into what is ultimately an environmental sustainability plan. I wouldn't say that this is a comprehensive plan that addresses everything from economics, economic development to social justice, you would have another plan of similar length if it was a social justice plan or if it was really an economic development plan."</p>   |
| <p><b>William Abolt</b><br/>Vice President Energy &amp; Sustainability (Shaw Environmental and Infrastructure)</p> | <p>"I think its exceeded expectations around transparency, accountability and organizing, but its still got a ways to go in order to achieve all of its objectives.... If you could look at a criticism or caution... [Its goals] aren't as ambitious as they could be."</p>  | <p>"Our involvement was beneficial and achieved everything that we wanted and expected to achieve... from a business standpoint we wanted to [do] work that would align with the regional interests and sustainability commitments of our staff and organization and it did all of that. So absolutely."</p> | <p>"Yeah absolutely. What we talked about in terms of alignment with mission and alignment of the function of cities with addressing climate it essentially took the last administration's investments and commitments around livability and their separate commitment and ground breaking work on climate and connected it. Once you put the two things together you address more effectively the economic opportunity and social equity issues associated with sustainability initiatives... particularly dealing with climate through sound urban policy."</p> |

| Subject Title (Organization)   | Plan Achieve its Goals   | Organization Achieve its Goals   | Addresses Issues of Social and Economic Equity  |
|--|--|--|---|
| <p><b>Hipolito (Paul) Roldan</b><br/>President and CEO (Hispanic Housing Development Corporation)</p>      | <p>"As I said before we are tracking the specific goals and whether we have achieved them, whether they are achievable and whether it is going to be a challenge to achieve them by 2020 ... it's an amorphous process we are moving on seven fronts."</p>           | <p>N/A</p>   | <p>"I don't know that we are addressing that in a way that's going to be meaningful, I think that we have acknowledged that it exists, but like everything else in this capitalist country and I say that with the best sense of the word, you know those have the dough can make the investments to have the savings and improve their lives."</p>   |
| <p><b>Sunil Garg</b><br/>Vice President, Chief Information and Innovation Officer (Exelon Corporation)</p> | <p>"I think it gave us a roadmap, I mean part of what you wanted to do was for the administration to give it a roadmap and set of priorities that you could look back and say, 'OK did you do xyz?' ... I thought from that prospective it was very successful."</p> | <p>"Yeah I think so... We talked about the goals that we had, one is civic engagement: I think we could all look at it and say look it was a good plan, it was an important plan. I think we were able to communicate to the folks involved [what] we thought about some of these issues."</p> | <p>"Based upon the major pieces there are some things where I would say yes, I mean I think the coal plants that's an important one, overall no.... I think if you were to go out and do this in a way that you engage the neighborhoods in a different way I think the priorities might be different in terms of how people think about it. I mean I think it's a very downtown sort of establishment comfortable plan."</p> |

| Subject Title (Organization)  | Plan Achieve its Goals   | Organization Achieve its Goals   | Addresses Issues of Social and Economic Equity   |
|---|--|--|--|
| <p><b>Carlos Nelson</b><br/>Executive Director (Greater Auburn Gresham Development Corporation)</p> | <p>"I think it brought a diverse group together for an overall discussion around a common issue which is a tough thing to do in a metropolis like Chicago, but as I indicated earlier this diverse group there were still a lot of missing pieces on the representation side."</p> | <p>"I would say 2 (out of 5) and that is only because we should have kind of carried the, we should have been more, we should have included more like organizations across the region, we should have taken on that role or we should have taken on that shortage and so gotten the word out to be more, as opposed to this is our community. So that's yeah."</p> | <p>"I don't think it does... I think its more focused on the industry, corporations and their involvement, their role... I would say on the corporate side I would rate it really high and again in getting the corporate world involved in sustainable Chicago... but there was little lifestyle changes that resulted in the 80% of the population that makes up the city in the underserved communities. So the shortfall is the lack of lifestyle changes that one would hope would come out of a plan like this."</p>   |
| <p><b>Adele Simmons</b><br/>President (Global Philanthropy Partnership)</p>                         | <p>"Well Karen [Weigert] has that all on a chart, so I would just go to that, because she has got that all clearly tracked."</p>   | <p>"It was just to be available to keep some things moving, which I do sometimes by ... being sure meetings get scheduled, being sure that I bring together the funders in the climate space that are supporting all of this, being sure that they are meeting and talking and aligned."</p>   | <p>"Its not a social and economic report so they need to address it but then you need other groups whose central focus that is and you know one of the important things is that the work is linked to the work of neighborhood groups like Carlos Nelson in Auburn Gresham or whatever. So the idea is to not just have it be something separate, but have it connected with what is going on in the neighborhoods... I mean if you look at what has happened in Pilsen to air quality because the coal plant is closing down, that's a big thing for Pilsen "</p> |

## REFERENCE LIST

- Adams, William M. 2006. *The Future of Sustainability: Re-thinking Environment and Development in the Twenty-First Century*, Gland, Switzerland: World Conservation Union.
- Agyeman, Julian. 2013. *Introducing Just Sustainabilities: Policy, Planning, and Practice*. New York: Zed Books.
- Balkundi, Prasad and Martin Kilduff. 2006. "The Ties that Lead: A Social Network Approach to Leadership." *The Leadership Quarterly* 17: 419-439.
- Berardo, Ramiro. 2009. "Processing Complexity in Networks: A Study of Informal Collaboration and its Effect on Organizational Success." *The Policy Studies Journal* 37(3): 521-539.
- Bierbaum, Rosina, Joel B. Smith, Arthur Lee, Maria Blair, Lynne Carter, F. Stuart Chapin III, Paul Fleming, Susan Ruffo, Missy Stults, Shannon McNeeley, Emily Wasley and Laura Verduzco. 2013. "A Comprehensive Review of Climate Adaptation in the United States: More Than Before, but Less Than Needed." *Mitigation and Adaptation Strategies for Global Change* 18(3): 361-406.
- Birch, Eugenie L. and Susan M. Wachter. 2008. "Introduction: Urban Greening and the Green City Ideal." In *Growing Greener Cities: Urban Sustainability in the Twenty-First Century*, eds. Eugenie L. Birch and Susan M. Wachter. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1-8.
- Blanco, Ismael, Vivien Lowndes and Lawrence Pratchett. 2011. "Policy Networks and Governance Networks: Towards Greater Conceptual Clarity." *Political Studies Review* (9): 297-308.
- Borgatti, Stephen P., Ajay Mehra, Daniel J. Brass and Giuseppe Labianca. 2009. "Network Analysis in the Social Sciences." *Science* 323: 892-895.
- Borzel, Tanja A. 1997. "What's So Special About Policy Networks? An Exploration of the Concept and Its Usefulness in Studying European Governance." *European Integration Online Papers* 1(16): 1-28.



- Bressers, Hans Th. A. and Laurence J. O'Toole. 1998. "The Selection of Policy Instruments: A Network-Based Perspective." *Journal of Public Policy* 18(3): 213.
- City of Chicago. 2008. *Chicago Climate Action Plan*. Chicago: Department of Environment.
- City of Chicago. 2011. *Chicago 2011: Transition Plan*, May 11. Chicago: City of Chicago.  
[http://www.cityofchicago.org/dam/city/depts/mayor/supp\\_info/chicago\\_2011\\_transition\\_report.pdf](http://www.cityofchicago.org/dam/city/depts/mayor/supp_info/chicago_2011_transition_report.pdf) (Mar. 6, 2015).
- City of Chicago. 2011. "Mayor Rahm Emanuel Outlines 2012 Budget Proposal To Secure Chicago's Future." City of Chicago: Mayor's Press Office. Oct 12.  
[http://www.cityofchicago.org/city/en/depts/mayor/press\\_room/press\\_releases/2011/october\\_2011/mayor\\_rahm\\_emanueloutlines2012budgetproposaltosecurechicagosfutu.html](http://www.cityofchicago.org/city/en/depts/mayor/press_room/press_releases/2011/october_2011/mayor_rahm_emanueloutlines2012budgetproposaltosecurechicagosfutu.html) (Mar. 6, 2015).
- City of Chicago. 2012. *Sustainable Chicago 2015: Action Agenda*. Chicago: Office of the Mayor.
- Choi, Sungchul and Alex Ng. 2011. "Environmental and Economic Dimensions of Sustainability and Price Effects on Consumer Responses." *Journal of Business Ethics* 104(2): 269-282.
- Dale, Ann. 2012. "Introduction." In *Urban Sustainability: Reconnecting Space and Place*. eds. Ann Dale, William T. Dushenko and Pamela Robinson. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 3-10.
- Daley, Dorothy M., Elaine B. Sharp and Jungah Bae. 2013. "Understanding City Engagement in Community-Focused Sustainability Initiatives." *Cityscape* 15(1): 143-61.
- Daniels, Tom. 2008. "Taking the Initiative: Why Cities Are Greening Now." In *Growing Greener Cities: Urban Sustainability in the Twenty-First Century*, eds. Eugenie L. Birch and Susan M. Wachter. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 11-27
- Davey, Monica and Emma Graves Fitzsimmons. 2011. "Emanuel Triumphs in Chicago Mayoral Race." *The New York Times*, Feb 22.  
[http://www.nytimes.com/2011/02/23/us/chicago-mayor-election.html?\\_r=0](http://www.nytimes.com/2011/02/23/us/chicago-mayor-election.html?_r=0) (Mar. 6, 2015)
- Davies, Jonathan S. 2002. "Urban Regime Theory: A Normative-Empirical Critique." *Journal of Urban Affairs* 24(1): 1-17.

- DeLeon, Peter and Daniella M. Varda. 2009. "Toward a Theory of Collaborative Policy Networks: Identifying Structural Tendencies" *The Policy Studies Journal* 37(1): 59-74.
- DeLuca, Kevin. 2007. "A Wilderness Environmentalism Manifesto: Contesting the Infinite Self Absorption of Humans." In *Environmental Justice and Environmentalism*. eds. Ronald Sandler and Phaedra C. Pezzullo. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 27-56.
- Dowding, Keith. 2001. "Explaining Urban Regimes." *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research* 25 (1): 7-19.
- Dumke, Mick. 2011. "Mayor Daley Continues Effort to Convince Us the City Hasn't Gone Into the Toilet." *Chicago Reader*, Apr 22.  
<http://www.chicagoreader.com/Bleader/archives/2011/04/22/mayor-daley-continues-effort-to-convince-us-the-city-hasnt-gone-into-the-toilet> (Mar. 6, 2015).
- Ferkenhoff, Eric. 2006. "The Greening of Chicago." *Time Magazine*, May 12.  
<http://content.time.com/time/nation/article/0,8599,1193833,00.html> (Mar. 6, 2015)
- Fiorino, Daniel J. 2010. "Sustainability as a Conceptual Focus for Public Administration" *Public Administration Review* (December): 578-88.
- Gibbs, D. and A. E. G. Jonas. 2000. "Governance and Regulation in Local Environmental Policy: The Utility of a Regime Approach." *Geoforum* 31(3): 299-313.
- Goodland, Robert and Herman Daly. 1996. "Environmental Sustainability: Universal and Non-Negotiable." *Ecological Applications* 6(4): 1002-1017.
- Hanson, Royce, Harold Wolman, David Connolly, Katherine Pearson, and Robert McManmon. 2010. "Corporate Citizenship and Urban Problem Solving: The Changing Civic Role of Business Leaders in American Cities." *Journal of Urban Affairs* 32(1): 1-23.
- Harris, Jonathan M. 2003. "Sustainability and Sustainable Development." *International Society for Ecological Economics: Internet Encyclopaedia of Ecological Economics* February: 1-12.
- Hecl, Hugh. 1978. "Issue Networks and the Executive Establishment", in A. King (ed.) *The New American Political System*. Washington: AEI.

- ICMA (International City Management Association). 2007. "Sustainability" *ICMA Management Perspective* Fall: 1-4.  
<http://webapps.icma.org/pm/9001/private/sustainability.pdf?author=&title=Management%20Perspective%3A%20Sustainability&subtitle> (Mar. 3, 2015)
- Jamieson, Dale. 2007. "Justice: The Heart of Environmentalism." In *Environmental Justice and Environmentalism*. eds. Ronald Sandler and Phaedra C. Pezzullo. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 27-56
- Kahn, Matthew E. 2006. *Green cities: Urban growth and the environment*. Washington, DC: Brookings Institution Press.
- Kamin, Blair. 2011. "A Mayor Who Left His Mark on Chicago's Cityscape: Love Him or Hate Him, Daley Made No Little Plans." *Chicago Tribune*, May 9.  
[http://articles.chicagotribune.com/2011-05-09/news/ct-met-kamin-daley-0508-20110509\\_1\\_mayor-richard-j-daley-cityscape-millennium-park](http://articles.chicagotribune.com/2011-05-09/news/ct-met-kamin-daley-0508-20110509_1_mayor-richard-j-daley-cityscape-millennium-park) (Mar. 6, 2015).
- Kassiola, Joel Jay. 2003. *Explorations in Environmental Political Theory: Thinking About What We Value*. Armonk, New York: ME Sharpe.
- Kettl, Donald F. 2000. "The Transformation of Governance: Globalization, Devolution, and the Role of Government." *Public Administration Review* 60 (6):488-497.
- Klettke, Russ. 2014. "Karen Weigert: Second to None." *gb&d*, Sep/Oct, May 9.  
<http://gbdmagazine.com/2014/29-karen-weigert/> (Mar. 6, 2015)
- Leonard, David. 2011. "The Reinvention of Rahm Emanuel." *Bloomberg Business*, Aug 4. <http://www.bloomberg.com/bw/magazine/the-reinvention-of-rahm-emanuel-08042011.html> (Mar. 6, 2015).
- Mazmanian, Daniel A., and Michael E. Kraft, eds. 2009. *Toward Sustainable Communities: Transition and Transformations in Environmental Policy*. 2nd ed. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- McKenzie, Stephen. 2004. "Social Sustainability: Towards Some Definitions." *Hawke Research Institute Working Paper Series* 27: 1-29.
- Morelli, John. 2011. "Environmental Sustainability: A Definition for Environmental Professionals." *Journal of Environmental Sustainability* 1(1): 1-9.
- Mossberger, Karen, and Gerry Stoker. 2001. "The Evolution of Urban Regime Theory: The Challenge of Conceptualization." *Urban Affairs Review* 36(6):810-835.

- Nemes, Judith. 2011. "Chicago Shutting Environmental Department, Adding Eco-Friendly Measures to New Budget." *Crain's Chicago Business*. Oct. 13.  
<http://www.chicagobusiness.com/article/20111013/NEWS02/111019914/chicago-shutting-environment-department-adding-eco-friendly-measures-to-new-budget> (Feb. 28, 2015)
- Norman, Wayne and Chris MacDonald. 2004. "Getting to the Bottom of 'Triple Bottom Line'" *Business Ethics Quarterly* 14(2): 243-262.
- Olberding, Julie Cencula 2002. "Diving into the 'Third Waves' of Regional Governance and Economic Development Strategies: A Study of Regional Partnerships for Economic Development in U.S. Metropolitan Areas." *Economic Development Quarterly* 16(3): 173-186.
- Parzen, Julia. 2009. "Lessons Learned: Creating the Chicago Climate Action Plan." City of Chicago Department of Environment, July.  
[http://www.icleiusa.org/action-center/action-center/learn-from-others/CCAP\\_LessonsLearned\\_final.pdf](http://www.icleiusa.org/action-center/action-center/learn-from-others/CCAP_LessonsLearned_final.pdf) (Mar. 6, 2015).
- Peters, B. Guy, and John Pierre. 1998. "Governance without Government? Rethinking Public Administration." *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory* 8(2):223-243.
- Petrucci, Mario. 2002. "Sustainability – Long View or Long Word?" *Social Justice* 29(1/2): 103-115.
- Plautz, Jason. 2008. "Why You Should Care About Chicago's Climate Action Plan." *North By Northwest*. Sep. 29.  
<http://www.northbynorthwestern.com/story/why-you-should-care-about-chicagos-climate-action/> (Feb. 28, 2015).
- Portney, Kent E. 2003. *Taking Sustainable Cities Seriously: Economic Development, The Environment, and Quality of Life in American Cities*. Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press.
- Portney, Kent E. and Jeffery M. Berry. 2010. "Participation and the Pursuit of Sustainability in U.S. Cities." *Urban Affairs Review* 46(1): 119-139.
- Provan, Keith G. and Patrick Kenis. 2007. "Modes of Network Governance: Structure, Management and Effectiveness." *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory* 18: 229-252.
- Ramsey, Mike. 2008. "The Greening of Chicago." *Illinois Issues*, May.  
<http://illinoisissues.uis.edu/archives/2008/05/greening.html> (Mar. 6, 2015)

- Rhodes, R.A.W. 1996. "The New Governance: Governing Within Government." *Political Studies* 44:652-667.
- . 2007. "Understanding Governance: Ten Years On." *Organization Studies* 28 (8):1243-1264.
- Richardson, J. J. and G. Jordan. 1979, *Governing Under Pressure: The Policy Process in a Post-Parliamentary Democracy*. Oxford: Martin Robinson.
- Roberts, Brian, and Michael Cohen. 2002. "Enhancing sustainable development by triple value adding to the core business of government." *Economic Development Quarterly* 16 (2): 127-37.
- Robinson, John. 2004. "Squaring the Circle? Some Thoughts on Sustainable Development." *Ecological Economics* 48: 36-384.
- Saha, Devashree. 2009. "Factors Influencing Local Government Sustainability Efforts" *State & Local Government Review* 41(1): 39-48.
- Saha, Devashree, and Robert G. Paterson. 2008. Local Government Efforts to Promote the "Three E's" of Sustainable Development in Medium to Large Cities in the United States. *Journal of Planning Education and Research* 28(1): 21-37.
- Sandler, Ronald and Phaedra C. Pezzullo. 2007. *Environmental Justice and Environmentalism: The Social Justice Challenge to the Environmental Movement*. Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press.
- Sandstrom, A. and C. Rova. 2010. "The Network Structure of Adaptive Governance: A Single Case Study of a Fish Management Area." *International Journal of the Commons* 4(1): 528-551.
- Sheth, Jagdish N., Nirmal K. Sethia, and Shanthi Srinivas. 2011. "Mindful Consumption: A Customer-Centric Approach to Sustainability." *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science* 39: 21-39.
- Stoker, Gerry. 1998. "Governance as Theory: Five Propositions." *International Social Science Journal* 50(155): 17-28.
- Stone, Clarence N. 1989. *Regime Politics: Governing Atlanta, 1946-1988*. Lawrence: University of Kansas.
- Svara, James H., Tanya C. Watt and Hee Soun Jang. 2013. "How are U.S. Cities Doing Sustainability? Who Is Getting on the Sustainability Train, and Why?" *Cityscape* 15: 9-44.

- Thatcher, Mark. 1998. "The Development of Policy Network Analyses: From Modest Origins to Overarching Frameworks." *Journal of Theoretical Politics* 10(4): 389.
- The City of Chicago. Mayor's Press Office. 2011. "Mayor Rahm Emanuel Outlines 2012 Budget Proposal To Secure Chicago's Future." Oct 12. [http://www.cityofchicago.org/city/en/depts/mayor/press\\_room/press\\_releases/2011/october\\_2011/mayor\\_rahm\\_emanueloutlines2012budgetproposaltosecurechicagosfutu.html](http://www.cityofchicago.org/city/en/depts/mayor/press_room/press_releases/2011/october_2011/mayor_rahm_emanueloutlines2012budgetproposaltosecurechicagosfutu.html) (Mar. 6, 2015)
- United Nations. 2005. *World Urbanization Prospects: The 2005 Revision*. Nairobi: Department of Economic and Social Affairs/Population Division.
- U.S. Bureau of the Census. 2004. *Census Bureau Projects Tripling of Hispanic and Asian Populations in 50 Years: Non Hispanic Whites May Drop to Half of Total Population*. Washington, D.C.: Bureau of the Census.
- Wang, XiaoHu, Christopher V. Hawkins and Nick Lebrede. 2012. "Capacity to Sustain Sustainability: A Study of U.S. Cities." *Public Administration Review* 72(6): 841-853.
- WCED (World Commission on Environment and Development). 1987. *Our Common Future: Report of the World Commission on Environment and Development*, chaired by Gro Harlem Brundtland. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Women Driving Excellence. 2012. "Karen Weigert [BIO]." *Women Driving Excellence*, Dec. 1. <http://womendrivingleadership.com/karen-weigert-bio/> (Mar. 6, 2015).
- Zanoni, Patrizia and Maddy Janssens. 2009. "Sustainable DiverCities." In *Sustainable Cities: Diversity, Economic Growth and Social Cohesion*. eds. Maddy Janssens, Dino Pinelli, Dafne C. Reymen and Sandra Wallman. Northampton, MA: Edward Elgar Publishing, 3-25
- Zeemering, Eric S. 2009. "What Does Sustainability Mean to City Officials?" *Urban Affairs Review* 45(2): 247-273

## VITA

Zachary A. Brown was born and raised in St. Paul, Minnesota. Zachary spent the first two and a half years of his undergraduate education studying Political Science and Leadership Studies at the University of Richmond, before transferring to Loyola University Chicago where he would earn a Bachelor of Arts in Political Science, with Honors, in 2014. Brown then went on to receive his Master of Arts in Political Science from Loyola University Chicago in May of 2015

While studying for his Bachelor of Arts Brown was published in the Roosevelt Institute Campus Network 10 Ideas Series on Economic Development in 2014 for his article entitled, "Subsidizing Youth Employment on Chicago Farms". The article was selected as the best policy on Economic Development in the journal and was nominated for Policy of the Year.

His policy interests are in urban politics and specifically urban sustainability and the role of underserved communities within cities. He lives in the Rogers Park Community of Chicago, Illinois. Brown is currently pursuing a career in urban environmental policy in the Chicagoland region.

