

13:20:26 From Paul Haggard to Everyone:  
Denial is to be human.

13:36:38 From Michel Cordier (GP Climat) to Everyone:  
C: Hi from Belgium (Grand-parents for the climate)

13:42:43 From Peter MacKinnon CACOR to Everyone:  
Q: If an economy is in "steady state" how does it handle innovation on the one hand and removing what it replaces without growth or shrinkage on the other hand? Thanks.

13:48:16 From Peter MacKinnon CACOR to Everyone:  
C: If an economy is growing at 2% annually, or any other fixed amount, it is linear growth and not exponential.

13:48:43 From Ken Panton (interested Cdn) to Everyone:  
That 2% changes each year.

13:49:06 From Ken Panton (interested Cdn) to Everyone:  
Year 2 = year 1 x 1.02

13:49:10 From Dave Dougherty CACOR to Everyone:  
C: This is one version my favourite alternative model--the layer cake with the environment being the foundation of everything.  
<https://www.stockholmresilience.org/research/research-news/2016-06-14-the-sdgs-wedding-cake.html>

13:50:39 From Michel Cordier (GP Climat) to Everyone:  
C:  $1.02 \times 1.02 \times 1.02 \times 1.02 \dots$  is exponential and not linear growth.

13:51:04 From Peter MacKinnon CACOR to Everyone:  
C: I gave a CACOR webinar on Planetary Limits: Coming Future Threats about a year ago. The Stockholm diagrams were part of the presentation.

13:53:39 From Raymond Leury - CACOR to Everyone:  
Q: What is the title of the book that was shown earlier?

13:54:26 From Art Hunter CACOR to Everyone:

Q: There is growth that never makes it to the official GDP. Bartering, micro agriculture, working under the taxation scan, microgrids and more. This is growth that needs to be included. How can this be managed?

13:55:17 From Brian Czech - CASSE to Everyone:

C: Answer for Raymond Leury--Better Not Bigger (by Eben Fodor)

13:56:40 From Raymond Leury - CACOR to Everyone:

C: Replying to "Better Not Bigger (b..."

Tx

13:56:50 From Dave Dougherty CACOR to Everyone:

C: Better NOT Bigger | New Society Publishers  
<https://newsociety.com/book/better-not-bigger/>

13:57:35 From Ken Panton (interested Cdn) to Everyone:

C: In Canada, towns and cities are children of the province. Local governments are restricted in what they can do by the powers delegated by the province. What the province giveth, the province can taketh away! Hence, developers insinuate themselves in municipal elections and provincial elections.

14:03:25 From Kevin Brown CASSE to Everyone:

C: In reply to Ken Panton--Yes! We in British Columbia are dealing with that right now—the provincial government has overridden ability of municipalities to control growth in the name of solving the housing crisis. Local zoning over-riden with impacts on protecting biodiversity on private property. Very frustrating to have just worked for 3 years on new biodiversity conservation and urban forest strategies and an environmental policy framework in Saanich (Capital Region) and had recommendations upended by fiat from the province.

14:07:58 From Ken Panton (interested Cdn) to Everyone:

Some months ago, there was an article in the Steady State Herald written by someone active within one particular community in LA County. The basic message was that the community was able to limit growth within its boundaries and was therefore successful. Of course, that view ignores two things: first, what was needed (water projects and ecological change)

to make the SW deserts habitable (if only temporarily, apparently) in the first case; and, second, that LA County's population and area expanded to a huge degree since that sustainable community was founded. So, the lens I look through, when people refer to keep their communities as they are, includes a look at the broader geography.

14:12:37 From Richard van der Jagt to Everyone:

Q: Is conversion to renewable energy part of the plan?

14:17:15 From Michel Cordier (GP Climat) to Everyone:

C: A plan with which type of energy mix (nuclear, fossil fuel and natural gas, renewable)?

14:17:16 From David Shreve to Everyone:

C: To Ken's point about LA County, while any village, town, or city, sprawling or not, is an efficient way of organizing people (from the standpoint of providing public services, broadly defined), it also must--without exception--depend on places that aren't villages, towns, or cities to sustain itself.

14:19:35 From Tom Olivier to Everyone:

C: I live in Albemarle County, VA, which used to be strongly committed to environmental protection and movement to a sustainable state. However, after the Great Recession and other disturbances of the local political structure, we now have a board of supervisors and senior staff who are in love with growth and economic development. Drafts of our new comprehensive plan call for economic growth. The difficulty is that economic development proposals promise short term economic returns (jobs for residents, tax windfalls for local governments), with costs and negative consequences arriving frequently later (ideally when other politicians are in office). Unless elected officials have a deep appreciation of the supporting role of nature, they are easily seduced by economic development proposals.

14:22:18 From Claude Buettner to Everyone:

C: Replying to "I live in Albemarle"!

So, they need to receive a link to this presentation with an explanation from you about why it is worth watching completely. Good luck in planting of seeds.

14:22:45 From Matthew Thomson to Everyone:

C: The red lines are being drawn by Paul Haggard on Dave's slides.

14:23:13 From Samrat Bharadwaj CACOR to Everyone:

Strange red lines appearing all over the screen. Is that intentional?  
[No. Ed.]

14:23:41 From David Shreve to Everyone:

C: Thanks, Tom. Do recall, however, that the short term "economic benefits" are not real--in Albemarle County and in most other places too--but only seem to be when officials ignore an actual cost/benefit analysis.

14:25:29 From George Karpat to Everyone:

C: Replying to "I live in Albemarle ..."

When putting various limits on growth, what conflicts develop with citizens, property owners, businesses, other levels of government?

14:25:59 From Maxine Leichter CASSE to Everyone:

C: Our community in British Columbia is already doing much of what you suggest. However, our rural areas are zoned for huge amounts of subdivision and there is huge political pressure not to withdraw that subdivision potential. It seems hopeless.

14:27:51 From Tom Olivier to Everyone:

C: Replying to "I live in Albemarle ..."

Thanks for the comment. The difficulty is that current decision-makers are all-in on creating an expanded economy and view the preceding conservation policies as quaint. Our best hope is the fact that residents don't appreciate how anti-conservation the current decision-makers are and when residents do understand planning goal changes, we may get a regime change and return to sustainability-oriented planning. BTW, the pro-growth decision-makers all are Democrats, which makes them difficult to remove in a now mainly Democratic community. Cheers! - Tom

14:28:37 From Samrat Bharadwaj CACOR to Everyone:

C: If one has money, one can immigrate to Canada. Is a simple deal.

14:29:06 From Anitra Thorhaug USACOR to Everyone:

Q: The question of what is well managed and organized a has something to do with inputs toward management. The difference between Bayfield and Miami-Dade is a question of desirability and inflow of people, material and thus development. What sustainability becomes in the midst of high influx of residents? It is far more difficult and what is your solution?

14:29:30 From David Shreve to Everyone:

C: Renewable energy is a must, but mostly as a "buying time" tool, for unless it can be generated more cheaply than our traditional carbon-heavy fuels, to be a significant part of solving the bigger "Overshoot" problem, it would require--*ceteris paribus*--more output overall in order to provide necessary subsidy or offset to recessionary cost effects.

14:29:40 From Claude Buettner to Everyone:

C: Replying to "Our community in"

Success could be to prevent plans for new ones. Unfortunately, this will lead to densification of existing subdivisions (which might require changes in zoning ordinances).

14:30:32 From Tom Olivier to Everyone:

C: Concerning Dave's comment that short term economic benefits are not real--true, but they don't have to be real to affect decisions.

14:31:44 From David Shreve to Everyone:

C: That is 100% correct, Tom, hence, it remains one of our biggest local political challenges presents itself.

14:31:54 From Matthew Thomson to Everyone:

C: Global average fertility rate has halved from around 5 in the 1960s to around 2.4 in 2021. In the US it is now 1.9 (2.1 required for steady state). [That raises the question of whether a steady state is possible with ~350 million people in USA. Ed.]

14:33:38 From Matthew Thomson to Everyone:

Q: Corollary question to Richard's is the question of planned depopulation. Presumably some places need to have fewer people? Does CASSE have any models or proposals for that?

14:34:04 From David Shreve to Everyone:

C: A trend, Matthew, that should be encouraged, and not fretted over (alas, the prevalent and quite popular response/reaction).

14:34:48 From PENELOPE BORCHERS to Everyone:

C: Replying to "Our community in Bri..."

Growth is a religion. It implies prosperity & a validation of economic policy carried out in the name of economic development (ED), but ED is not the same as business development. This distinction needs to be understood going forward.

14:35:33 From David Shreve to Everyone:

C: Replying to "Our community in Bri..."

Nor, Penelope, is it the same as "broad prosperity," which should be the true goal.

14:35:33 From Tom Olivier to Everyone:

C: Yes, Dave. Growth-based economic development proposals are like crack for politicians. That's why growth-based planning is so hard to vanquish.

14:37:39 From Charles Hall to Everyone:

C: Anyone who thinks a "renewable" future or the transition to it will substantially decrease our need for materials (e.g., copper or fossil fuels) lives in a dreamworld.

14:39:25 From PENELOPE BORCHERS to Everyone:

C: Replying to "Our community in Bri..."

Yes, prosperity, but in areas where needs are greatest. After all, ED is a public concept, not a private concept, therefore, the need for public accountability & transparency comes into play, but who is going to take this lead role?

14:40:19 From David Shreve to Everyone:

C: Indeed, Charles, which is why population stabilization and reduction (and its associated demand) must be a principal tool/part of the comprehensive solution.

14:42:30 From Maxine Leichter CASSE to Everyone:

Q: Are there examples communities that have conducted a carrying capacity study. We are told this isn't possible.

14:42:40 From David Shreve to Everyone:

C: Things not counted in GDP are akin to "underemployment" not reflected in official unemployment data. Like underemployment, however, the unknown or unaccounted for output does track with that accounted for.

14:45:19 From Ken Panton (interested Cdn) to Everyone:

C: Replying to "Anyone who thinks a ..."

I take your point, but if we aren't able to reduce atmospheric GHG concentrations, it seems to me that the end result will be an enormous "reduction of demand."

I think you are alluding also to the fact that climate is but one of the scythe-carrying horsemen galloping across the landscape. I wholly agree that a blinkered focus on climate and GHG emissions leaves us in peril from the other aspects of the planetary boundaries that have been crossed.

14:46:30 From Jon Legg to Everyone:

Q: Do you find that you, in Bloomington, are drawn into the effect of federal policies? We do, because we in Ottawa are in the seat of the Canadian government. We see how cynical some of our federal government's policies are. Your city's population (80,000?) may help your discussions remain more realistic; ours are probably more unreal. Your reaction?

14:46:40 From David Shreve to Everyone:

C: To be effective, however, such legal action, initiated by counties, would also have to effect not just state control of the county in question, but control over all the state policies that greatly affect the county (education funding, etc.).

14:48:49 From Tom Olivier to Everyone:

C: Replying to "Our community in Bri..."

Penelope, alas, realities can be just the opposite. In Virginia, local governments can (and often do) go to closed sessions when they discuss economic development projects.

14:49:43 From Samrat Bharadwaj CACOR to Everyone:

C: "to reduce atmospheric GHG concentrations one has to count (be actually responsible) for their personal emissions as well. Which, in the case of Canadians, is extremely (excessive) high.

14:56:07 From Ron Green to Everyone:

C: The state's intervention and community response also goes the other way, of course. Here in Oregon, we are seeing pushback at the local level to Salem's mandates to abolish single-family zoning and parking minimums. As a city Planning Commission member, I'm seeing lots of time and energy spent struggling with the boundaries between housing costs, NIMBY, the Urban Growth Boundary, car-centric living, etc., often without questioning the big issue of unquestioned assumptions that are being discussed here.

15:03:24 From PENELOPE BORCHERS to Everyone:

C: Replying to "Our community in Bri..."

As enormous amounts of public resources are allocated, this info are public record. Problem is the lack of interest.

15:06:37 From David Shreve to Everyone:

C: Ron, concerning the intervention of the state of Oregon in local zoning matters, the universal problem here is the way in which free market fundamentalism has crept silently into the discussion, forcing otherwise public-minded citizens to assume that it's all about a simple supply and demand problem. Not that "supply" is irrelevant, but it remains in most places a very marginal/minor factor, taking a back seat to developer monopolies, speculation, oscillating interest rate regimes, racist exclusion, and so on.

15:06:52 From Richard van der Jagt to Everyone:

Gotta go. Great presentation. CASSE members should join!



15:11:35 From Ron Green to Everyone:

C: Replying to "Ron, re: the interve..."

So true, and the recent ugliness of public discourse is obfuscating much of what public-minded people are trying to do. The loudness of the culture wars is hard to hear through, too.

15:16:02 From Ted Manning CACOR to Everyone:

C: Excellent presentation. Sorry have to go to another meeting.

15:24:19 From Matthew Thomson to Everyone:

C: Great to hear Dave Shreve nod towards the urgent need for more creative approaches to demand management in housing.

15:25:47 From Ron Green to Everyone:

C: Replying to "Ron, re: the interve..."

Dave, put me in your email list: [rongreen@peak.org](mailto:rongreen@peak.org)

15:29:49 From Peter MacKinnon CACOR to Everyone:

C: Thanks for this interesting presentation and discussion. Cheers.