CITY OF NEWARK
DELAWARE
CONSERVATION ADVISORY COMMISSION
MINUTES

July 9, 2019

MEETING CONVENED: 7:03 p.m. Council Chambers

MEMBERS PRESENT: George Irvine (presiding), Beth Chajes, Helga Huntley, Mary Clare Matsumoto, Bob McDowell, Sheila Smith, John Wessells

ABSENT: Kismet Hazelwood, Kass Sheedy

STAFF: Danielle S. Mapp-Purcell, Administrative Professional, Paralegal

Mr. Irvine called the meeting to order at 7:04 p.m.

1. APPROVAL OF MINUTES FROM MEETING HELD ON JUNE 11, 2019

Mr. McDowell asked for a correction on page two paragraph two should read "Mr. O'Donnell" not "Mr. McDowell" would have a 20-minute presentation.

MOTION BY MR. MCDOWELL, SECONDED BY MS. MATSUMOTO: THAT THE MINUTES FROM THE JUNE 11, 2019 MEETING BE APPROVED AS RECEIVED.

MOTION PASSED. VOTE: 7 to 0.

AYE – CHAJES, HUNTLEY, IRVINE, MATSUMOTO, MCDOWELL, SMITH, WESSELLS
NAY– 0.
ABSENT– HAZELWOOD, SHEEDY

2. PUBLIC COMMENT

Andrew O'Donnell, District 3, requested to present a visual ad pertaining to the Mayors Climate by using his personal computer. Ms. Mapp-Purcell announced that external devices were not allowed to be connected to City devices. Ms. Smith asked if Mr. O'Donnell could email the presentation. Ms. Mapp-Purcell stated yes, however, this presentation was not advertised as an item for this agenda so it cannot be shown at this time. Ms. Mapp-Purcell was aware that there was a discussion advertised under Old and New Business but not a presentation.

Ms. Huntley suggested that if Mr. O'Donnell wanted to speak about a specific item then he would provide comments when the topic was being discussed. Mr. Irvine stated that Mr. O'Donnell could make a public comment, or he could hold it. Ms. Huntley asked if Mr. O'Donnell could show the presentation on his computer and have it face the dais. Mr. Irvine explained that the presentation could not be shown because it was not advertised to members of the public that there would be a presentation

Mr. O'Donnell provided an update on the EV status. He stated Jeff Martindale, Assistant to the City Manager, was in the process of researching and comparing various companies to provide charging stations. The Newark

Post recently recognized the City's efforts. Electrification Coalition and Coltura have reached out to Mr. O'Donnell to discuss how the City has been successful. Mr. O'Donnell stated that a site called www.fossilfreefunds.org can show a person how to reduce their carbon foot print through their 401k allocations. Mr. O'Donnell added that bamboo toothbrushes, eco-friendly shoes and other products made of natural materials which are decomposable on Amazon.

Ms. Huntley asked if the Board should collect all of suggestions given about how to personally reduce someone's carbon footprint to put in one of the published columns. Ms. Smith stated they are in the minutes.

3. <u>STEERING COMMITTEE/SUSTAINABILITY PLAN UPDATE – Mike Fortner, Planning and Development; Sheila Smith</u>

Ms. Smith stated they have finished a review of the first most complete draft and are on the next iteration. AECOM is working on something to be reviewed by the City, staff, CAC and anyone who would care to comment. The different participates expect to receive it through email on or around July 15 for comment. She was not sure if there was a step in-between.

Ms. Huntley stated that eventually a more finalized draft would be sent to the CAC, the Planning Commission and City Council with be a public workshop. Ms. Smith added that it would also be sent to different departments such as Utilities and Electric to review for cooperation. Ms. Smith urged everyone to read the next draft and to be prepared to make comments on what they feel might not work.

Ms. Matsumoto asked if there was a date for the public comment workshop. Ms. Smith said that there was a calendar, but she did not have it with her. Ms. Huntley advised that there was not a specific date because they do not know long will take for AECOM to produce the drafts and then how long staff would need to review those drafts.

Ms. Smith thought it may be in the Fall. Mr. Irvine asked if the CAC had a formal approval process in this process or would the CAC just provide comments. Ms. Smith was not sure because the question has not been asked. She knew they had discussed City Council approval and assumed that the CAC could comment on certain aspects. Ms. Smith added that everyone has a draft from April which could give them a basic idea before the next draft is released.

Ms. Huntley believed that the CAC should vote on whether they like the plan or not. The vote and recommendations would accompany the plan to City Council. Mr. Irvine asked who set the target because the target determines the resource allocation. Ms. Smith stated the City departments and other knowledgeable people on the committee helped formulate some of the targets.

Mr. Irvine believed that there was the possibility for a grant for implementation and asked if that was discussed. There are some funds in the Green Energy Fund, but it would not cover all the expenses. Ms. Smith stated the plan would probably be prioritized because it would not be able to be done all at once. Ms. Huntley added that they asked AECOM to put in potential funding sources and cost estimates. She has not seen those number in any of the drafts yet.

Ms. Smith stated that there are a few City department leads on the Steering Committee: Mary Ellen Gray (Director of Planning and Development), Tim Filasky (Director of Public Works and Water Resources), Paula Martin (Deputy Director of Parks and Recreation) and Mike Fortner (Planning and Development, Planner).

4. <u>Zoning Code Requirements for Parking, Land-Use & Sustainability – Mike Fortner, Planning and</u>

Development

Tabled.

5. REVIEW AND APPROVE THE ANNUAL REPORT

Mr. Irvine sent the finalized copy to Ms. Mapp-Purcell for distribution. Ms. Smith stated she had one edit regarding the statement that articles were submitted to the Newark Post. Articles were submitted to the City to be put into the newsletter that went out with the electric bill. Only one article has be put into the electric bill because of the vacancy for a communications person with the City. Ms. Mapp-Purcell believed that position had been filled but was not aware of their current training. Ms. Smith believed that there was a backlog of two articles for the newsletter. She has not called the Newark Post, but would like to have the articles be in two places. Ms. Smith has another article to submit, Mr. McDowell was to do an article on reforestation and Ms. Hazelwood was to submit an article regarding community gardens.

Ms. Chajes believed that she had worked with the person now in the communications role and could serve as a conduit for somethings.

Ms. Huntley requested to have a list of topics that had already been covered. Ms. Smith stated some topics covered bicycle safety, solar, anti-idling and invasive species. Mr. McDowell asked how long the articles needed to be, Ms. Smith stated 250 words. Since the article for anti-idling has already been published, Mr. McDowell agreed to do an article on reforestation and Ms. Chajes agreed to write an article about EB's.

The contact for the Newark Post is Josh Shannon. Mr. Irvine thought that it would give the articles more content if they were to be shared with the Newark Post. The topics of the plan could be divided amongst the Committee.

Ms. Huntley hoped that the City's new communications person would write a press release about the Sustainability Plan once finalized and that the Newark Post would write a story as well. Then that article could be used to occasionally remind people about the things the Committee would like to do. Ms. Chajes added that Kevin Liedel was the communicator for the Delaware Energy Institute at University of Delaware.

Ms. Chajes pointed out in the Annual report at the end of page 6 there is an apostrophe where a period should be. Mr. Irvine stated that she was correct, it should be a period.

MOTION BY MR. WESSELLS, SECONDED BY MS. SMITH: THAT THE 2018 ANNUAL REPORT BE APPROVED.

MOTION PASSED. VOTE: 7 to 0.

AYE – CHAJES, HUNTLEY, IRVINE, MATSUMOTO, MCDOWELL, SMITH, WESSELLS.
NAY – 0.
ABSENT – HAZELWOOD, SHEEDY.

6. OLD/NEW BUSINESS

- **Research the cost of supplies to protect seedlings**

Mr. McDowell still needs to speak with the head of Parks and Recreation.

- **Research the cost to purchase larger seedlings/trees**

Mr. McDowell still needs to speak with the head of Parks and Recreation. Ms. Matsumoto did a tally of the trees planted last year. Roughly 17 out of 51 lived. Mr. McDowell suggested to get a group together to collect the protective supplies from the seedlings that did not survive to reuse the supplies versus ordering more. Mr. McDowell stated that he would request more trees than they had from last year. Ms. Smith asked Ms. Matsumoto if she noticed one area having a higher success rate than another. Ms. Matsumoto explained that she had followed the path and picked one area to observe.

Ms. Huntley suggested to research obtaining larger trees for a better survival rate. Ms. Smith stated it would be a tradeoff and Mr. McDowell then explained that the labor portion would increase significantly. Bare root seedlings just need a small hole, where with a "ball" root tree, the hole would need to be larger which would take more time. Ms. Matsumoto felt the smaller trees were best for the area and not disturb the forest floor by digging larger holes. Mr. McDowell added that Tom Zaleski, Parks Superintendent with the Parks and Recreation Department, choses trees that are part of the natural habitat for the area. Trees are provided by the National Wildlife Federation.

Mr. Irvine suggested to have some seedlings and trees at the next Community Day for display at the CAC's booth. Mr. McDowell stated they would not be able to obtain the bare root seedling in time as the trees would not yet be dormant.

The next planting will be on Saturday, November 9th, 2019.

- **Discuss fees for small and large businesses for the use of paper and plastic bags**

Ms. Smith stated Ms. Hazelwood and Ms. Sheedy were to gather information. Mr. Irvine stated Ms. Sheedy has resigned.

Mr. Irvine stated the bill which passed both Houses to ban plastic bags in Delaware still needs to be signed by the Governor. It would be in place around 2021, until then there is a clause in the bill that allows municipalities to impose a fee.

Ms. Smith said that plastic bags are being banned, paper would still be available. She asked if they needed to find out what the City's stores have planned for the change. Mr. Irvine stated it was discussed in a previous conversation, that the City could move further than the State law or wait until 2021. Ms. Huntley added that single use bags were not to be completely banned, there are a number of exceptions. If the City wanted to make a large impact on the use of single use plastic bags, it could ask stores or mandate stores to impose a fee.

Mr. Irvine asked to have this topic tabled and placed on the next agenda.

- **Discuss installation of solar panels on roofs of select City of Newark Buildings**

There was a presentation last month by Dr. Byrne and his team that included a PowerPoint provided to the Committee as well as the full plan. Mr. Irvine would like for the Committee to make a recommendation to Council as a stage 2 part to place solar panels on up to 11 City buildings per the recommendation of Dr. Byrne's research in one of two ways:

- Pay using Green Energy Fund rather than borrowing or a using a PPA (Purchase Power Agreement)
- Complete the plan in its entirety by using a PPA

The advantage of the PPA is that an investor, not the City, would pay for the project a Federal tax credit.

However, the City would not receive the Federal tax credit. The investor would partner with an operating company that would install, operate and sell the electricity for the City at a fixed negotiated rate or a fixed amount of time.

Ms. Smith asked if there would be an advantage to the City financing the project in two parts as in placing solar panels on some of the 8 buildings and then at a later date add the additional solar panels. Mr. Irvine stated it could be done that way, however, capital markets like to invest in these types of projects and generally do not like to do them in parts.

Ms. Huntley believed it that McKees Park has paid for itself. Mr. Irvine stated to initially finance the program it was a higher cost at that time. The price of solar has dropped.

Ms. Huntley added that she was disappointed in the recommendation that was presented last month, and as she believed that it would double the cost of electricity. She was more inclined to suggest following the same plan as the McKees project. Mr. Irvine questioned how Ms. Huntley came to the idea that the proposed plan would double the cost of electricity to the City. Ms. Huntley stated that the recommendation presented stated that the cost of energy was \$0.14/KWh and recalled that Mr. Markham stated the current cost for energy was \$0.07/KWh as a wholesale cost. She thought it was a great idea to build on McKees Park, but she felt that since it was such a successful experience, she did not know why they would want to go with a different plan.

Mr. Irvine stated the disadvantage of the McKees Park model, was that when most of the Green Energy Fund was used, it took an estimated 2 years to rebuild the fund. Mr. McDowell suggested until the true cost has been investigated, he was inclined to recommend the PPA. Mainly because then all 11 buildings could be done at one time. It would be an advantage to have all 11 done with a shorter payback because they would all be generating. If they were to go the McKees model the Green Energy Fund would not have funds for a few years. The PPA model allows the Green Energy Funds to be used for other projects in addition to the solar panels. Ms. Huntley was interested in reducing the City's carbon footprint in a cost-effective way. She believed that wind energy would be best direction to move towards as wind energy could be purchased. Mr. McDowell added that part of the portfolio from DEMEC is supposed to be green energy. Ms. Huntley believed that if the City wanted to make a larger impact on its fossil fuel footprint, a lot of money cannot be invested in a small reduction on an energy footprint that would raise the cost of the electricity. She suggested to consider investing the funds into a different way to reduce the City's carbon footprint at a smaller cost to electricity.

Ms. Smith stated there has already been a presentation on solar panel installation from one organization. She wanted to know if Ms. Huntley was suggesting having another presentation or another idea from a representative on wind or someone from DEMEC to give ideas on how the City could obtain wind energy. Ms. Huntley stated yes because the proposed plan did not look cost effective even with all 11 buildings having solar panels. Ms. Matsumoto recalled that Dr. Byrne's stated that only 8 out of 11 buildings were suitable. Three were not suitable because of different reasons such as having a North facing roof. Mr. Irvine read directly from the plan that the 8 pilot buildings would serve 22% of the annual City government electricity use. Mr. Irvine added that if they were to just base the cost benefit on the cost of electricity and not the environmental cost, this would be where the cost benefit analysis is insufficient because the metrics are difficult. Such as trying to measure the cost of air pollution, asthma cost, and the heat index cost.

Ms. Huntley felt that it would be better to invest the estimated cost of the proposed plan into something that would make a larger impact on reducing the City's carbon foot print. Mr. Irvine stated that other options have been presented and it has taken the last year and half to get to this point with the research provided by Dr. Byrne's group. Mr. Irvine added that with inaction the City would spend $1.2 million on "dirty" energy so the longer they delay it will not be in the best interest of the Sustainability Plan or what he believed to possibly be the consensus of the Committee. The key point is to understand which is more important the money or the environment.

Mr. McDowell said that if hypothetically the City were to enter into a PPA, the Green Energy Fund could be used to purchase wind energy. The electricity purchased maybe incrementally more but he doubted that it would be double. The PPA is negotiable and that energy would only be a part of the City's electricity generation.

Ms. Huntley felt it would not be fiscally responsible to double the cost of electricity. Ms. Huntley believed that was what Dr. Byrne's analysis stated. Mr. McDowell did not believe Dr. Byrne's plan would double the electric cost. Ms. Smith added that Dr. Byrne did not agree with Ms. Huntley's analysis. Ms. Huntley explained that the analysis by Dr. Byrne did not compare to the whole sale rate. The comparison was done with the retail rate which includes increased costs built into the electricity rates. Ms. Smith stated it would depend on the PPA which would be negotiable. Mr. McDowell added that it would only be part of the City's electricity generation. The average rate holder would not see their electricity rate double.

Ms. Smith said that she heard what Ms. Huntley was stating and thought it was an important thing to think about. Ms. Smith asked if the Committee was at a point where they would recommend for Council to seriously consider the plan or provide another plan that might do the same in a more cost-efficient way. She asked if there has been any communication sent to Council about the Committee's feelings towards the plan. Mr. Irvine stated this report was shared with Tom Coleman by Dr. Byrne. Mr. Irvine believed that Mr. Coleman was inclined to fund the plan with a PPA based on the analysis. Ms. Smith asked if his analysis include looking at other options.

Mr. Irvine explained that other energy options had been provided by DEMEC as they have expressed an interest to be the for-profit subsidiary in the plan. Ms. Huntley asked if they could have a representative from DEMEC provide an opinion of the recommended plan, cost estimate, and the potential impact on the City's electric rates. Mr. Irvine believed conversations with DEMEC may have occurred last year with Mr. Coleman. The conversation was about DEMEC installing the solar panels and then the City would purchase it back. Ms. Smith asked if Mr. Coleman could attend the next meeting to have a conversation.

Mr. Irvine is inclined to believe that DEMEC would do whatever it takes to get the City to enter into a PPA rather than the City build its own solar panels because the City purchases electricity from them. Ms. Smith asked if it would be possible to have Mr. Coleman attend the next meeting to have a conversation about alternatives. However, Ms. Smith believes there has already been some analysis done. Mr. McDowell felt that DEMEC would lean to have the City enter into a PPA rather than build solar panels because DEMEC sells the electricity. Ms. Smith would like to compare solar to wind.

Ms. Chajes added that the goal would be to add to new compacity. Not just buy electrons already being produced by wind that cannot be told apart from landfill gas. She would like to see if the City were to buy wind power that it contributes to wind turbines being built.

Ms. Huntley stated another concern with DEMEC being a provider of the solar energy because there may be a requirement that they have to have a certain percentage renewable energy that keeps increasing. Ms. Chajes stated DEMEC is not held to the same requirements as Delmarva Power.

Mr. Irvine explained that if the City chose to do a PPA and DEMEC was the provider then DEMEC would build or a third party could back them the solar panels and sell the electricity to the City. DEMEC or the third party, if one is involved would receive a Federal tax break. He did not know how much longer the tax break would be in effect. When it does end, the financing for project such as this will be much higher.

The PPA would work in three parts:

- The investor who pays for the project and receives the tax credit
- The operator who builds, operates and maintains for an agreed upon timeframe
- The energy would be sold back to the City at an agreed upon timeframe and rate

At the end of the timeframe agreed upon, there is usually a transfer of ownership so the City would end up owning a power plant. Ms. Matsumoto was convinced by Dr. Byrne's and thought solar would be a good way to go and has been excited to see things about wind. Her recommendation would be to present the proposal by Dr. Byrne to City Council. Ms. Huntley stated that she would be more inclined to support the recommendation to City Council to put solar panels on City owned buildings without referencing Dr. Byrne's report because she did not believe the analysis would be convincing to be financially good for the City.

Ms. Smith stated that whether or not Dr. Byrne's financial analysis was correct or not he was just recommending what CAC had asked for, which was an estimate. Mr. McDowell thought that if the City were to present DEMEC with two opposing options, the City could negotiate a lower rate. Ms. Smith added that the proposed plan would not go through if the cost of electricity would double and agreed with Ms. Matsumoto's idea to recommend for Council to review the plan. Ms. Smith also thought that Ms. Huntley and Ms. Chajes had good questions. She would like to have Mr. Coleman speak with the CAC to explain what he has already done, what point in the process are they and why should CAC recommend the plan.

Mr. Wessells added that it needed to be kept in mind that during the PPA the City would be paying for the equipment over a period of time through a slightly increased rate. It might not be doubled but it would be a higher cost for the electricity through the PPA. Mr. McDowell explained that it would just be for the electricity generated by the solar panels. Mr. Wessells said that the purchase price of the solar panels would also be in the rate of electric purchased back. Mr. McDowell said that was correct and that if the rates go up during that time, the City would be locked into the lower rate per the PPA. Mr. Irvine stated the City would have a predictable price. Mr. Irvine stated he was inclined to make a motion had have a conversation in a public forum with Council. He did not believe that Council knew the full extent of the research done and proposed plan.

Mr. Irvine thought it would be useful to have the recommendation of the CAC to be discussed publicly and have a political buy in. Ms. Huntley stated that in Council Member Wallace's last newsletter, she had a note about the City working on the possibly for people to choose 100% renewable energy. Mr. Irvine stated currently a resident can chose up to a certain percentage of renewable energy. Ms. Huntley added that if they wanted to go ahead with the recommendation her request would be to not reference the report as she was not convinced by the report. Ms. Matsumoto was agreeable to making a recommendation without referencing Dr. Byrne's report.

Mr. Irvine took a moment to word a recommendation.

Mr. Wessells had sent out samples of reusable bags and straws. He would like to get ideas about what should be distributed during Community Day. He stated some of the straws are unique in shape and material. Ms. Huntley had a stainless steel straw she purchased several years go and they have worked well. Mr. McDowell stated in the past they had always given away bags and maybe have people do a survey for the straw. The survey may ask what would be that person's most pressing issue regarding energy or recycling. Mr. Wessells would like to know how much money to spend because last year it was around $1,000.00 for giveaways. Ms. Smith asked if Mr. Wessells' had chosen the metal straws with the bend in them. Ms. Huntley stated that her children liked the curved metal straws better. Ms. Smith thought the straws would be a good idea because of the up coming ordinance. She wanted to know if the bags were made of a compostable or natural material. Mr. Wessells stated that they were a non-woven, a plastic bag durable enough to be used multiple times.

Ms. Smith asked if there were woven bags and if they were more expensive. He did not recall seeing them and Ms. Huntley added that she believed they were more expensive. Ms. Smith stated the bags from a local pharmacy had a plastic coating and would like to move away from those types of bags that breakdown into small pieces of plastic. Ms. Chajes asked Mr. Wessells if the materials used in those bags was recycled plastic, he stated the one bag is a recyclable bag. Ms. Smith stated that the bag ban rule would remove the need for the bag recycling receptacles. Ms. Matsumoto liked the idea to give people a bag that folds up into itself.

Mr. Irvine stated that he has already spoken to Food Lion to see if they would donate some of their reusable bags and they agreed. He stated they could go to other local food markets to make the same request. Ms. Smith asked what the budgeted amount would be and how many bags were purchased. Mr. Wessells stated it has been $1,500.00 over the last few years but they have not spent it all and they purchased about 200 to 300 bags. Mr. Irvine educated Mr. Wessells that there was a vendor out of Vermont who was used to purchase reasonable shopping bags. It was the closest source-able environmentally friendly reusable shopping bag as opposed to sourcing it out to China.

Mr. Wessells recommend putting in a budget for $1,500.00 and he would find out how much everything would cost for sure. Mr. Irvine asked Ms. Mapp-Purcell to notify Tara Schiano that the CAC has planned to spend up to $1,500.00 for reusable straws and shopping bags as giveaways at the CAC booth at Community Day in September. Ms. Huntley asked if it would be best to place an order to cover two years of giveaways to minimize shipping emissions. Mr. Wessells stated there is no place to store the extras. Mr. Irvine asked Ms. Mapp-Purcell to add a line, if appropriate to purchase enough giveaways for two years which would bring the total amount to $3,000.00. Mr. Irvine asked if there was an ordering deadline. Mr. Wessells stated he need to speak with Vicky.

Mr. Irvine read the recommendation as follows: The CAC strongly recommends that City Council install solar panels on 8 City buildings as an appropriate follow up project to the successful McKees solar park. There are three principles reasons for this. It demonstrates the City's commitment to renewable energy sources. Second it can reduce up to an estimated 250 metric tons of CO_2. It can generate up to 22% of the City's electricity consumption. We recommend that the City pay investment in one of two ways. First, negotiate a Purchase Power Agreement with a third-party investor and operator, negotiating a long-term predictable price for power. Second, pay for the project outright with Green Energy Funds in a staged project or upfront manner. The City could also explore inviting the University of Delaware and business to join the project to increase solar power production. This recommendation is informed by a feasibility study of the City scale solar power plans using public buildings by the University of Delaware Center for Energy and Environmental Policy 2019.

Ms. Huntley suggested to change the language to say, "on all appropriate City owned buildings". Ms. Matsumoto stated she would rather have the number eight language in at least. Ms. Huntley stated she did not like the number 8 because more questions could rise as to which 8 buildings. She stated one of those 8 buildings is going to be replaced next year. She felt it would be better to leave it open because the CAC does not know the life expectancy of the buildings. Ms. Smith asked if they could use the percentage number stated in the plan as 73% of City owned available rooftop area. Mr. Irvine offered language to say, "as many roofs as possible".

Mr. Irvine read part of the recommendation again with the changes: The three principle reasons for this it demonstrates the City's commitment to renewable energy sources. That can reduce up to 200 metric tons of carbon. Ms. Huntley asked if the metric tons was per year or total over a 20-year life span. Mr. McDowell believed it was per year. She also wanted to have it stated that it was an "estimated ton of carbon dioxide" rather than "up to". Ms. Huntley stated it should also state the City governments electricity consumption and wanted to change the end to read "the CAC recommend that the City Council consider the following two funding options". Ms. Huntley's thought was that if Council came up with a third option then the language would show that the CAC was not against other options.

Mr. Irvine read part of the recommendation again with the change: The CAC recommend that the City Council consider paying for the investment through the following two options. There maybe other options." Ms. Huntley asked if they should mention DEMEC as a possible third part investor. Mr. Irvine stated no.

Mr. Irvine read in full the revised recommendation as follows: The CAC strongly recommends that the City Council move forward with a plan to install solar panels on as many City buildings as feasible this would be a perfect follow up project to the successful McKees Solar Park. There are three principle reasons this. First, it demonstrates the City's commitment to renewable sources. Second, it can reduce up to an estimated 250 metric tons of CO_2 emissions per year. Third, it can generate up to an estimated 22% of the City government's annual electricity consumption. The CAC recommends that the City consider paying for this investment with the following options. First, negotiate a Purchase Power Agreement with a third-party investor and operator negotiating a long-term predictable price for power for the City. Second, pay for the project with the Green Energy Funds in a staged project or in an upfront manner with additional Capital Funding. Third, the City can also explore inviting the University of Delaware and business to join this project to increase solar power production. This recommendation is informed by a feasibility study of the City scale solar power plans using public buildings by the University of Delaware Center for Energy and Environmental Policy 2019.

MOTION BY MS HUNTLEY, SECONDED BY MS. MATSUMOTO: TO APPROVE RECOMMENDATION AS IT CURRENTLY READS.

MOTION PASSED. VOTE: 7 to 0.

AYE – CHAJES, HUNTLEY, IRVINE, MATSUMOTO, MCDOWELL, SMITH, WESSELLS.
NAY – 0.
ABSENT – HAZELWOOD, SHEEDY.

- **Discuss the Climate Mayor Conference with Mayor Clifton**

Mr. Irvine asked Andrew O'Donnell how to have Mayor Clifton register as a Climate Mayor. Mr. O'Donnell stated it could be tabled so it can be discussed with a visual aid. Mr. Irvine requested for a topic to be added to the agenda for Mr. O'Donnell to present several different sustainable organizations that the City could partner with.

7. <u>PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT REPORTS:</u>

Ms. Smith stated she was on a tree committee and Planning is including 5 annexations including 0 Paper Mill Road. There are two other properties hoping that 0 Paper Mill is annexed with the hope they can as well.

There are possibly 6 properties that would involve the removal of a large number of trees. The plans have been submitted and they are either in the process of or at the beginning of the process. Mr. Irvine asked that as a Committee, have they shared their concerns with the Planning Commission. Ms. Smith stated the Tree Committee is in the process of rewriting the ordinance now. Ms. Huntley asked for the timing of the rewriting of the ordinance. Ms. Smith stated she did send information pertaining to what has been discussed to some of the people involved.

The ordinance would be separate to deal with properties that involve forests and to identify the definition of a forest. Hopefully by the end of the year it would be completed.

Mr. Irvine asked when would the Planning Commission look at those annexation requests and if they would push back until the reforestation regulations come out. Ms. Smith stated anything that has been submitted has been added to the Planning Commission matrix. Ms. Smith explained that the Planning Commission matrix lists all the Planning proposals and where the plans are in a step by step in the process.

Ms. Smith read the description of Article XXV Landscape Screening and Treatment. Ms. Smith requested to have Section 32-86 (a) 4 be moved up to (a) 1. There was some push back and she explained that she wanted to bring this item to the forefront of why the City has a tree ordinance to help preserve the quality to enhance local ecosystems it needs to be shown why they want to do so. The Tree Committee is also looking to add another item to address protecting mature forests.

Ms. Huntley asked if a request can be made upon Council to put an emergency stay in place to say between now and January 1 that any proposal destroying forests will not be approved until the rules are in place to do protect the forests. Ms. Matsumoto questioned if the 0 Paper Mill Road project was going to go through because signage about the project had been removed.

Mr. Irvine explained that the CAC's charter does not give oversight into development planning. The oversight belongs to the Planning Commission. The developers of 0 Paper Mill Road were invited to present to the CAC for them to provide guidance and to discuss the merits of an annexation and tree mitigation. It was determined that the action could be seen as not being part of typical review process for a developer and that the City could have been sued for the appearance of making an overburdensome process in a discriminatory way. The CAC does have the ability to argue for or against ordinance changes related to conservation.

Mr. Irvine asked Ms. Mapp-Purcell to clarify with the City Secretary about what is the proper process for the CAC to communicate or inform in a formal way with the Planning Commission. Ms. Smith believed one way would be the contribution to the tree ordinance as that is something the Planning Commission would have to follow.

Ms. Smith suggested that they recommend the creation of a City tree commission. They would have to think about would the commission entail, do and how much work would need to be done.

8. <u>NEXT MEETING – AUGUST 13, 2019</u>

Mr. Irvine will not be in attendance. Mr. McDowell will be chair.

Mr. Welles asked those of the public who attended the meeting how they felt about the proceedings. One person stated they found it fascinating and does get the notifications about City Council meetings.

9. <u>ADJOURNMENT</u>

The meeting was adjourned at 9:38 p.m.

Danielle S. Mapp-Purcell
Administrative Professional I

/dmp