

**CITY OF NEWARK
DELAWARE
CONSERVATION ADVISORY COMMISSION
MINUTES**

January 12, 2021

MEETING CONVENED: 7:01 p.m. GoToMeeting

MEMBERS PRESENT: Chair Sheila Smith, George Irvine, Beth Chajes, MaryClare Matsumoto, Helga Huntley, Robyn O'Halloran, Bob McDowell

STAFF: Tom Coleman, City Manager
Nichol Scheld, Administrative Professional I

Ms. Smith called the meeting to order at 7:01 p.m.

1. APPROVAL OF MINUTES FROM DECEMBER 8, 2020:

MOTION BY MS. MATSUMOTO, SECONDED BY MR. MCDOWELL: TO APPROVE THE DECEMBER 8, 2020 MINUTES.

MOTION PASSED: 7 – 0.

AYE: Smith, Irvine, Matsumoto, Huntley, Chajes, O'Halloran, McDowell.

NAY: 0.

2. PUBLIC COMMENT:

Andrew O'Donnell, District 3, addressed the 100% Renewable Program Update from Mr. Coleman, and wanted Mr. Coleman to explain the math because Mr. Coleman estimated 1 cent per kilowatt hour (kWh) which Mr. O'Donnell estimated would translate to roughly \$8 per month. Mr. O'Donnell wanted clarification on whether the purchase of Renewable Energy Credits (RECs) meant the entire electricity supply plus the \$8 went towards RECs and was pulled from the electrical supplier or if customers were purchasing \$8 worth of RECs per month so only a small signal went to the electrical supplier. Ms. Smith informed Mr. O'Donnell that Mr. Coleman would be late for the meeting but would be able to address the question. Dr. Huntley asked that Mr. O'Donnell pose the question to Mr. Coleman after the presentation.

3. 100% RENEWABLE PROGRAM UPDATE – TOM COLEMAN (arrived at 7:52)

Mr. Coleman stated the bill would establish a 100% renewable energy fee and explained that non-DEMEC communities had options available to choose from different suppliers and energy mixes that met a resident's personal goals. He continued that DEMEC communities did not have those options, so staff listened to resident requests about the unmet demand for an increased amount of renewable energy. During the 2020 Budget, Finance Director Del Grande and Mr. Coleman initially proposed taking the entire City to 100% renewable but received feedback that there was interest in an incremental approach. He noted that staff was simultaneously working on the Sustainability Plan which included Mr. O'Donnell's suggestion of an opt-out program for 100% renewable energy. Staff preferred the idea of an opt-out

program versus opt-in and decided to pursue the opt-out course. He explained the program would automatically opt-in newly created accounts and incur a new rate. The new rate would include the cost of the City's regular retail rate plus RECs purchased either from the City or City-owned assets to the environmental attribute associated with power to cover the demand of all of the accounts in the program. Mr. Coleman explained that staff created the fee and the various fee categories (residential, commercial, large commercial, industrial) and repeated all new accounts would be automatically opted in and existing accounts could opt-in. He clarified that UD was opt-in only because the City was contractually obligated to UD and could not impose a restriction without renegotiating the contract. He explained UD already instructed the City on what power to purchase and staff would comply if UD requested to go 100% renewable.

Mr. Coleman continued that the program was self-sustaining and would generate enough revenue to cover the costs of the purchasing the RECs and administering the program which would include minimal staff time. Staff would only include the costs associated with covering the differential between customers who did not opt-in to the program. He gave the example that if the Renewable Portfolio Standards (RPS) for Delaware were 18%, there would be an 82% renewable gap between the baseline and 100%. In this year, staff would only include the cost of the 82% differential and the bottom percentage would be covered by the current base rate for which customers already paid.

Mr. Coleman explained that for the quality of the REC, there were different options available for staff to use to purchase environmental attributes and he felt some were more valuable than others. Staff chose to follow the definition included in the State's RPS legislation which, according to DEMEC, were the highest quality and provided the best environmental attributes. He included an order of preference for REC purchases in the presentation which, absent a recommendation from CAC, would be the hierarchy used to purchase RECs:

1. Items built by the City and located in Newark to avoid transmission costs and would utilize the electrons and the attribute, not just the attribute itself
2. Generation from other DEMEC communities which would also sidestep transmission costs and was an attempt to provide a revenue stream to build new assets in Newark and other DEMEC communities
3. Look to other municipalities within the State
4. State as a whole, including coastal waters for offshore wind.
5. Surrounding states and their coastal waters to capture offshore wind generation
6. PGI Marketplace with the interconnected grid
7. Other sources

Mr. Coleman clarified that the seventh option was a decrease in quality where it was possible that RECs could come from outdated hydro dams. He continued that staff wanted to allow the Finance Director and City Manager to set the rate without having to craft an ordinance each year because they needed the flexibility to purchase RECs when costs were low and have the rates reflect the costs but would realistically set the rates once a year. He explained that RPS RECs were good for several years and could be retired at the end of the year once it was determined how much was used.

Staff wanted to establish an operating reserve in case there was a spike and the City needed a cushion. Mr. Coleman indicated staff would follow the City's financial policy of a 61-day operating reserve to cover REC costs for program participants. He said the account would be roughly 1/6th of the annual cost of the program and would be built up over a few years. He mentioned that staff would not include any

costs associated with compliance for the Municipal Renewable Portfolio Standards (MRPS) and would look to make purchases for long-term price stability. He explained that if staff purchased RECs from municipal assets the City owned, the prices would be locked in for as long as the assets were there which provided stability. He reiterated staff would make contractual purchases versus annual purchases on the market that would fluctuate but would have a blend of long term versus market purchases so the City could take advantage when rates went down. He emphasized that if the program generated excess revenue, staff would reduce the cost in the future year and return the revenue to the program participants. He noted the bill allowed staff to skip steps in the hierarchy category if costs were too high in order to keep prices stable. He pointed that most customers set up their accounts through the web so staff was determining how to present the opt-out in the account portal but would have digital or paper forms for customers who wanted to opt-in or out. He explained that the process was manual and if a customer submitted a form and staff was able to process it prior to the next bill cycle, the bill would be backdated from the date of submission. He explained that an annual report would be issued to provide a breakdown of REC sources, percentages, et cetera, and the deadline for the program was no later than June 1, 2020. Staff wanted to have the program active before student move in/move out to capture an estimated 1,000 accounts and assumed that students would most likely support the program. He revealed the bill had its first reading but there was still an opportunity to make minor corrections.

Dr. Irvine congratulated Mr. Coleman and shared that his son had calculated the City's carbon footprint and was extremely enthusiastic about the bill and its possibility to change the footprint. Dr. Irvine commended Mr. Coleman and staff on creating a valuable model for other municipalities to follow and wanted the CAC to promote the program once it was running. He referred to Item E of the bill and asked what would happen if there was no non-REC energy to buy in the future and asked if the bill needed to foreshadow the possibility. Mr. Coleman pointed that the bill referenced the MRPS but shared the City's Sustainability Plan exceeded the current MRPS so the intent was that it would be the differential from the City's baseline. He would speak to City Solicitor Bilodeau about how to add a caveat but thought the breakdown was 65/35 and reiterated the intent was to pay the differential between whatever the rest of the customers were paying and the 100% opt-in. Dr. Irvine understood the calculations but could imagine a time when only sustainable energy was available so there would be no reason to opt-out. Mr. Coleman believed the program would then sunset and anticipated it would be less expensive every year because RECs would decrease in price and the City would increase its baseline. Dr. Irvine was pleased to know that the City chose to exceed the MRPS and was ahead of the State's goals. Mr. Coleman shared staff recently finished the strategic planning process with DEMEC and its historical goal was to provide lowest cost power which meant meeting the minimum MRPS and lowering the cost as much as possible. Staff added language to indicate the lowest cost power while meeting the goals of the member community so if a member community wanted to be part of something that was not the lowest cost power, DEMEC would establish a baseline for all communities and then work with each member to build out their specific portfolio. Dr. Irvine believed the language change would allow the City to move ahead, regardless of other member actions. He asked Mr. Coleman if staff considered a progressive fee for lower income households or a discount based on household income. Mr. Coleman replied that the City set aside \$25,000 a year for electric bill support which was given to Catholic Charities to administer the funds on the City's behalf and the 2021 budget included an additional \$5,000 for water and \$5,000 for sewer. He admitted staff had not considered the suggestion and said it was a bigger issue. He noted the City's rates were slightly higher than Delmarva for residential rates but agreed it was good point to consider. Dr. Irvine suggested using a progressing scale using the previous year's taxes and Mr. Coleman assumed it could be an application process, so staff did not have to audit every year. Dr. Irvine did not want to preclude lower income households from making renewable energy purchases and contributing to stopping climate change. Dr. Irvine asked if the CAC should make an endorsement and Mr. Coleman confirmed.

Ms. Smith suggested to nominate the City for the CAC's Sustainability Award.

Mr. McDowell referred to title 26 and asked if landfill gas was a renewable REC. Mr. Coleman replied that the CAC could provide an order of preference so if landfill gas was not a viable option then the City would follow suit. Mr. McDowell appreciated that the first priority was local and was enthusiastic about putting the funds back into the City's own capability. Mr. Coleman confirmed that the City was building over a megawatt of solar on rooftops on the McKee's extension and the field near the reservoir and noted that DEMEC did not have room in its portfolio so the City would sell its RECs on the marketplace. He continued it would no longer be an environmental attribute so he wanted to include language that would allow the City to finance its own projects. Mr. McDowell asked if staff could breakdown the source of renewable energy by year for the CAC to use on the dashboard to demonstrate how the City was moving from lower priority sources to cleaner sources. Mr. Coleman added that there was debate on whether Bloom Box was actually renewable, and Mr. McDowell agreed.

Andrew O'Donnell, District 3, was passionate about the program and was pleased it emphasized local sources first to cut down on distribution and kept a more distributed energy system. He offered to serve as a test subject for billing exchanges. He asked if there was any resistance at the first reading and Mr. Coleman replied that first reading was advertised on the agenda so residents were aware of the bill but there was no discussion as a rule. Mr. O'Donnell asked if Mr. Coleman foresaw any issues and Mr. Coleman had not heard any resistance and reiterated the program was optional. Mr. O'Donnell thought there would more acceptance because it was voluntary. He asked if there would be a discount for local sources because there were less distribution costs. Mr. Coleman referred to Dr. Irvine's comments on exceeding the MRPS and thought DEMEC would likely make power contract purchases for the electrons and the RECs for the City's differential between the baseline and the top but suggested they could also purchase RECs. He clarified that if the City only purchased RECs, the transmission costs were not a factor because the purchase was solely for the environmental attribute. With the current projects of the McKees expansion, the reservoir field, and the rooftops, the City was purchasing the electrons and the RECs but there were no transmission costs because the projects were behind the City's meters. If the City were to enter into a contract with a solar developer, it would include electrons and RECs and the developer would contract with DEMEC as the City's supplier. The City would have to purchase all of the electrons via DEMEC who would make purchases as directed by the City. He did not believe transmission costs would factor into the program and only environmental attribute costs would. Mr. O'Donnell noted the local solar panels had little distributing costs but was a small plot which meant a higher cost for installation versus a large-scale windfarm in Pennsylvania that had low supply costs but additional distribution costs. Mr. Coleman explained the City's solar generation facilities behind the DEMEC meter would reduce the cost of power for everyone in the City because they reduced how much the City needed to buy externally.

Mr. O'Donnell reviewed his bill for 800 kWh of power. He estimated a fee of \$8 and assumed \$50 of the bill went to supply and asked if the City was purchasing \$8 worth of RECs or \$58 worth of RECs. Mr. Coleman replied that the \$8 in RECs would cover the \$58 of supply. He simplified that one REC was 1,000 kWh and confirmed that the RECs the City purchased would be enough to cover all of the kilowatts that Mr. O'Donnell used. He continued that the purchase would be the \$6 and the \$52 would be the base power purchase. Mr. O'Donnell asked if PJM would be aware of the price signal to trigger a reduction in fossil fuels. Mr. Coleman revealed that DEMEC committed to not purchasing coal power as an item in the sustainability plan and the City focused on decarbonization in the strategic plan, not just renewable. He explained that DEMEC made purchases and the City purchased contractually in advance. The City also had a hedging policy which meant that at three or four years out, the City entered into contracts with

generation facilities for roughly 50% of its power needs. At one month out, the City was around 90-95% hedged and would go to the market to purchase or sell if there was an overage. He continued that staff was able to estimate the power needed on any given day, minus uncertainty of weather. He explained the last percentages were either sold or purchased on the market depending on over- or under-hedging and was the only part of the program that staff did not have total control over what type of power was purchased. He explained that City had control, as DEMEC, to set up long-term contracts determining from which sources the community desired. Regarding price signals, Mr. Coleman explained that if more people purchased RECs, the price of the REC increased which meant that the power would be sold for less and would increase demand for building more renewable sources. Mr. O'Donnell supported the program and looked forward to participating.

Dr. Huntley thanked Mr. Coleman for the presentation. She referred to the MRPS listed as excluded and understood that the City did not have a requirement that DEMEC agreed to follow without being forced by the State. Mr. Coleman explained that Delmarva had to follow the Renewable Portfolio Standards (RPS) which differed from the MRPS. He continued that the City had to have a comparable program and DEMEC members were permitted to design the program but the end points had to be the same so by 2025, the City was required to be comparable to the RPS and was also required to meet and submit annual reports. Dr. Huntley supported replacing the language in Amendment 8, Section 11-22 (d)(3) that stated "no cost is associated with the MRPS compliance should be included in the program" and replace it with language that there was "no cost associated with City's baseline renewable portfolio should be included in the program" because if the City began to exceed DEMEC's renewable levels then the entire percentage should be excluded from the program. Mr. Coleman agreed that was the City's intent but the language in the bill was an oversight. Dr. Huntley assumed the cost of the program could change monthly, but the consumer could only opt-out with a 30-day notice; she preferred if the cost fluctuation was not monthly. Mr. Coleman confirmed the fluctuation was not monthly and staff had the ability to change if necessary. He reiterated that expectations were that the first year would be the rockiest and then result in a yearly change. Staff estimated the need for the first year and would make a bulk purchase so the price would be fixed until the RECs were used. He emphasized that staff needed the ability to change in order to avoid using reserves. Dr. Huntley suggested including language to allow customers to have a two-month warning about a price increase to provide a chance to opt-out. Mr. Coleman explained that when a customer wanted to opt-out, staff would use the date requested but could take 30-days to enter the information in the program so the bill would back-date and be credited appropriately. Dr. Huntley wanted a lag between the announcement of the price and the customer needing to pay the bill. Mr. Coleman replied that staff provided advance notice for water bills because the rates were usually set in November and effective on January 1st. Dr. Huntley wanted more advanced warning to allow customers to make fiscal decisions. Mr. Coleman agreed and noted the City had reserves to use as buffers.

Ms. Smith interjected she assumed staff would not want customers repeatedly opting in and out. Mr. Coleman agreed and noted the bill specified that "REC Purchases should be made in a way to provide long-term rate stability and predictability for program participants." He emphasized that staff wanted to have the rate change as infrequently as possible.

Dr. Huntley pointed that the Sustainability Plan set goals on what percentage of electricity should come from renewable sources and she asked if the renewable energy sold to the customers in the program would count towards the goals. Mr. Coleman understood the plan recommended 100% as soon as practical but noted that staff made it very clear to DEMEC that any RECs the City purchased, either to meet sustainability goals or through the program, should not count towards DEMEC's goals. He wanted

to avoid that Middletown purchased fewer RECs because Newark purchased more. He would speak to Council about how to handle the suggestion. He added that the Sustainability Plan was an aspiration and not a regulatory requirement. Dr. Huntley hoped that staff would advertise the program to encourage opt-in and Mr. Coleman confirmed. Dr. Huntley pointed that Delaware State Law still considered landfill gas a renewable energy source and the bill stated the CAC could make a recommendation about the priority of the geographic location but not of the fuel source. She suggested to expand the CAC's ability to make recommendations to also cover the source. Mr. Coleman said the language in the bill was broader and he only listed geographic in the baseline and confirmed the CAC could direct the City on which source preference to follow. Dr. Huntley had a conversation with Dr. Jeremy Firestone who pointed out that the list under Amendment 8, Section 11-22 (c) could be too restrictive because coastal waters excluded estuarian waters. Dr. Firestone recommended that the language include the entire Exclusive Economic Zone (EEZ) attached to each state for Delaware, Maryland, and New Jersey. Mr. Coleman said he would defer to Dr. Firestone's expertise. Dr. Huntley said that Dr. Firestone also suggested that "other grid-interconnected sources" should be more specific with "located within the Eastern interconnection" so it would be more local. Mr. Coleman agreed and wanted to avoid purchasing RECs from distant locations. Dr. Huntley believed some residents could be priced out of participation and wanted to expand the program to include options less than 100%. Mr. Coleman explained staff had considered allowing 50% and 75% but there were concerns over the administrative burden and whether the system could handle multiple rates with different lines on the bills. He wanted to get the bill in place first and then include different thresholds later. He expected to receive feedback when the program went live. Dr. Huntley asked for progress on establishing the Newark Energy Transition Advisory Team and Mr. Coleman reported there was no progress. Dr. Huntley was enthusiastic about the program.

Ms. Chajes was excited about the program, appreciated the leadership, and believed Newark could serve as a model to other communities. She offered the CAC's assistance on the education process and asked when the bill was next before Council and Mr. Coleman replied January 25th. Ms. Chajes revealed the goals in the Sustainability Plan were 30% by 2025, 65% by 2035, and 100% as soon as practical but no later than 2045. She thanked Mr. Coleman for the effort.

Ms. O'Halloran shared that her father learned of the program before she had and wanted to have his town to follow suit. She asked the anticipated start date and Mr. Coleman assumed there would be a soft-launch and asked for volunteers for one billing cycle. He confirmed the start would be before June but said a soft launch could be as soon as April. Ms. O'Halloran agreed June 1st was appropriate to capture students and suggested a specific outreach to students to explain the cost breakdown. Mr. Coleman agreed.

Ms. Matsumoto thought the program was excellent and would opt-in. She offered to be part of the soft launch. She suggested that staff include ways to decrease electricity usage in order to encourage residents to opt-in.

Ms. Smith read Dr. Irvine's recommendation into the record:

The Conservation Advisory Commission enthusiastically recommends that City Council accept the new, exemplary 100% Renewable Energy Program ordinance. The ordinance represents a terrific path forward for citizens to voluntarily and meaningfully contribute to the reduction of the City's carbon footprint. The ordinance aligns with and advances the City's new Sustainability Plan's goal of the City purchasing 100% renewable energy. We also like the fact that citizens could opt out of the program if they wish to do so. We have provided the City Manager with our feedback about the new ordinance. We

commend all the stakeholders who contributed to this innovative new ordinance - citizens who asked about buying 100% renewable, the City Manager's Office, the Finance Director's Office, CAC and the Council.

MOTION BY DR. HUNTLEY, SECONDED BY DR. IRVINE: THAT THE CAC MOVE FORWARD WITH THE RECOMMENDATION ON THE RENEWABLE ENERGY PROGRAM AS PROPOSED BY DR. IRVINE.

MOTION PASSED: 7 – 0.

AYE: Smith, Irvine, Matsumoto, Huntley, Chajes, O'Halloran, McDowell.
NAY: 0.

Mr. Coleman thanked the CAC for their efforts and support.

4. POSSIBLE COLLABORATION WITH THE NEWARK PARTNERSHIP AND CAC – DAN RICH

Ms. Smith introduced Dr. Dan Rich, Officer with The Newark Partnership (TNP). Dr. Rich introduced Leanne Moore and explained that TNP was a 501(c)(3) community-based organization committed to enhancing the quality of life for Newark residents and was in its second year of operation. He added that TNP was endorsed by City Council and included participants from the University and all parts of the community, including the business sector and non-profits. He noted that TNP worked on various areas of economic enhancement as well as the improvement of non-profit services and many areas of civic engagement including efforts ranging from informing residents on COVID-19 to improving public education. He emphasized that enhancing the overall environment was always a part of TNP's framework and informed that Mayor Clifton and City Manager Coleman were both members of TNP's board. He credited Dr. Irvine with being very active on the development the Partnership. He explained that TNP had many conversations about a Sustainable Newark Initiative which would be consistent with the City's own plan and discussed how to build a partnership with the CAC to support the proposals and initiatives already defined for the City and to engage other parts of the community to support the efforts. He wanted to include the broad population, non-profit and business institutions, and UD. He noted many efforts were underway but were not well-coordinated because the City had its piece and UD created its own Sustainability Council. He continued that TNP was working with Gore, Bloom Energy, non-profits and schools, and pointed that Chemours had also shown interest. Dr. Rich reiterated that TNP wanted to work together to spread the word and understanding about sustainability and its importance and declared it was TNP's mission.

Dr. Rich hoped to begin a conversation with the CAC and wanted TNP to support the CAC's charge in monitoring and facilitating implementation of the Sustainability Plan. He surmised there could be areas the TNP could facilitate and suggested there could be opportunities to connect the CAC's efforts with other institutions and the community at large. He was personally interested in the educational role regarding sustainability and helping people understand its importance for the future of the community and planet. He pointed that work needed to be done in transportation, energy, and conservation and suggested that TNP could assist in monitoring emissions and help develop a dashboard based on TNP's performance in the field. He asked if his expectation was accurate and if monitoring was a high priority for the CAC. He reiterated TNP's desire to begin discussions initiative collaboration. TNP proposed to facilitate a broad, community-based coordinating council with representatives from the CAC, UD, community institutions, and residents to determine how to connect the various efforts.

Dr. Rich shared that he and Ms. Moore had a conversation with an interested party who wanted to introduce sustainability programs in schools and determine if TNP could work with schools at all levels. He emphasized that there was much to do and thought it was important to project a flexible timeline. He wanted to ensure that TNP's and the CAC's actions were inline and stated that TNP was willing to adjust in that regard. He shared that TNP did not have many resources and worked with volunteers but was willing to generate support and wanted to work in collaboration with the CAC.

Ms. Moore recognized Dr. Huntley's name from correspondence with the Straw Initiative and explained the proposal was a way to streamline the process and create another pillar of TNP versus sporadic connection. The proposal would be reciprocal and ensure that communication was sustainable and persistent rather than when needs arose.

Dr. Rich invited Dr. Irvine to add his comments and hoped the proposal was the beginning of a longer conversation on collaboration on shared priorities. Dr. Irvine thanked Dr. Rich and Ms. Moore for the presentation and was enthusiastic about coordinating to better implement the Sustainability Plan. He explained the CAC conceptualized its work by receiving feedback from the public and Council guidance and then generated its own topics. He referred to the most recent annual report which centered on energy, anti-idling, and plastic reduction. He informed the State's plastic bag ban went into effect in January and said that the CAC was active on prompting the City to move on its own and added that the CAC was working on a plastic straw campaign for the City. He credited the Sustainability Plan for framing the challenges, opportunities, and specific goals and believed the Plan made the CAC's work easier by investing in developing the Plan. He suggested periodic meetings to determine which part of the Plan would next be appropriate to focus on given available resources. He noted that the CAC was a volunteer organization and the City had staff limitations due to the financial situation, so the CAC had big ambitions but scarce resources.

Dr. Rich suggested TNP and the CAC could connect with UD's Sustainability Council and its work. He noted UD had faced the same challenges of coordinating many fragmented initiatives. He revealed his faculty colleague, Chris Williams, was the Council's chair and he hoped to involve Mr. Williams in meeting with the CAC. He thought UD could make the greenhouse gas emission inventory an ongoing student project and he wanted to explore the possibility of an on-going collaboration with the institutions. He shared that TNP was developing a new portal, How Newark Compares, to aggregate and present data about the City, its evolution, and how it compared with other communities with similar characteristics. He explained he directed the UD Community Engagement Initiative and the portal came from the initiative. The portal was being adapted to Newark, Wilmington, and Dover and would compare with itself over time and other peer communities throughout the state and nation. He asked City Council to determine Newark's peers and he would share the discussion at a later meeting. He expected that TNP would soon have a beta version for Mr. Coleman and the CAC to provide feedback and suggested indicators relating to sustainability such as greenhouse gas emissions, preservation of open space, and clean water supply. He would inform the CAC once it was available for review. He emphasized that TNP would proceed with the portal and wanted the CAC's input going forward, particularly in establishing a priority order.

Dr. Irvine agreed with Dr. Rich and revealed the CAC attempted to create a dashboard to document changes in the City's carbon emissions and green energy use. He worked with Andrea Sarzynski to find a student but encountered difficulty on determining what platform to use, who would work with the student, and funding. He suggested How Newark Compares could be a platform for the dashboard to gauge the City's progress and to convey the project's importance to the public. He expected the purchase

of 100% sustainable energy would show a decrease of emissions. He emphasized the dashboard would be a good tool for public awareness and education and envisioned the coordinating committee to have representatives from each of the key areas. Dr. Rich confirmed and explained he did not want to duplicate any actions, so he wanted members from the CAC, UD Council, the broader community, and other institutions. He believed the composition would change over time depending on the focus and reiterated that a mandate of TNP was to coordinate and facilitate collaboration among the different parts of the community.

Ms. Smith asked Ms. Scheld if the CAC members could work outside of the CAC with TNP and if the partnership would violate FOIA rules. Ms. Scheld said she would verify with the City Secretary. Ms. Smith continued that she and Dr. Huntley served on the Sustainability Plan Screening where she was an appointed member and Dr. Huntley was a community member. Dr. Huntley confirmed she was a community member but noted the group was a City committee and was subject to the same FOIA rules as the CAC but TNP would be different because it was a community committee. She understood the FOIA rules applied to when the CAC or Council met as a group but suggested that Ms. Smith keep track of email exchanges in her official capacity.

Ms. Matsumoto was enthusiastic about the effort in bringing the community together while including the CAC and asked if TNP was a result of the Sustainability Plan. Dr. Rich replied that TNP preceded the Plan and the conversations regarding Sustainable Newark went back years. He continued that the City moved forward with its Sustainability Plan and repeated that Mr. Coleman and Mayor Clifton served on TNP's governing board. Mr. Coleman and Planner Mike Fortner reviewed the proposal and provided comments on the efforts which Dr. Rich thought were beginning to take real form.

Ms. Matsumoto asked for a count of active TNP members and meeting frequency. Ms. Moore replied that TNP was a stand-alone, non-profit, membership-based entity with roughly 40 business members, 40 non-profit members, and 45 individual members. She informed that TNP was pursuing its vision regardless of membership for betterment of the Newark Community. The governing board was comprised of a variety of stakeholders from different walks of life and met monthly as a board and there were also three active committees: Economic Enhancement, Non-Profit Enhancement, and Civic Engagement. She explained the Committees also met monthly, that all meetings were open to the public, and that TNP was not subject to FOIA but did agree with the City to post agendas, minutes, and allow public comments. In addition to the normal board and committee meetings, TNP also hosted monthly community events that were virtual during the pandemic, such as the Knowing Newark Series which highlighted hidden gems and was scheduled in two weeks with 150 registrants. She explained the series was a mystery historical tour which TNP would show on Zoom with a question and answer portion with the Historical Society. She added that TNP also presented Community Conversations that centered around recent hot topics. Dr. Rich suggested reading about the programs on thenewarkpartnership.com and signing up for the newsletter which shared information on community safety, health, and opportunities within the City.

Ms. O'Halloran wanted students to be targeted as members because they were well-versed in social media which would benefit TNP. She referred to the greenhouse data collection and suggested including a professor through the Summer Scholars Program. She explained that as long as a professor was willing to sponsor a student for research, then students would get paid through UD to conduct research for TNP. Dr. Rich thanked Ms. O'Halloran for her suggestions and informed that the UD Student Government had a representative on TNP's governing board, and the Summer Scholars Program was actually part of the Community Engagement Initiative. He agreed with Ms. O'Halloran that there could be

a way to institutionalize some of the CAC's work and asked that she connect with TNP to help jumpstart the initiative.

Ms. Chajes reviewed her notes and shared the top three things the CAC wanted to accomplish in 2021: energy, riparian buffers and anti-flooding measures, and waste reduction. Ms. Chajes noted the CAC's significant work with reforestation and believed the efforts would continue.

Dr. Huntley thanked Dr. Rich for attending and was enthusiastic about the collaboration. She referred to Dr. Rich's comments on the importance of communication and education in the TNP's endeavors and thought it was a great component of the CAC. She noted the CAC's frequent education campaigns and admitted there were limited options in outreach such as utility bill flyers, social media, and columns in the Newark Post. She was excited to partner with TNP on some education campaigns because the audience was entirely different to the CAC's and many of the sustainability issues mentioned in the TNP's write-up were on target with the CAC's objectives. She looked forward to the collaboration and thought the Coordinating Committee was a great suggestion. She shared that the emissions dashboard was a high priority for the CAC but was not a feasible project for the Commission and should be done by City staff. She emphasized that the CAC was an advocate within the City system, but the decision makers needed to be included in the Coordinating Committee. Dr. Rich appreciated the suggestions and said that pre-COVID, TNP was organizing Community Conversations live and had a series called the Newark Futures Workshop. He believed that without the pandemic, the next series would be centered Sustainable Newark and would have over 100 people discussing the topics. He hoped to build capacity for the greenhouse gas inventory and other research related projects and to work out an alliance with the UD Sustainability Council and other City programs. He wanted the dashboard to illustrate a series of quality of life indicators, most of which would relate to sustainability. Dr. Huntley asked if Ms. Moore was the contact for future suggestions and Dr. Rich confirmed he and Ms. Moore were the appropriate contacts.

Mr. McDowell supported the carbon inventory and reminded the City had completed an inventory which led to the LED street lights. He wanted to use the prior information to determine progress. He noted the CAC already had the A Better Newark Award and suggested a Sustainable Newark Award. He wanted the accolade to specify the reason for the award so local restaurants and business could advertise their accomplishments. He stated the achievements could then be attached to the dashboard and advertised to celebrate the progress. Dr. Rich liked the idea of the awards and thought they could fit well with TNP's award program for community institutions.

Ms. Smith agreed with Dr. Huntley's assertion that TNP had a larger audience and wanted to promote the Anti-Idling Ordinance and facilitate public education. She wanted to establish a culture in Newark that showed the concern for natural resources, clean air and water, and personal health. She wondered if a member of TNP would consider writing an article for the Conservation Corner to explain TNP's Sustainability Initiative to broaden the reach. She wanted TNP to help the CAC reduce the heat island effect by adding more trees to parking lots and open spaces. She hoped public education would promote her suggestions. Dr. Rich appreciated the suggestions and wanted to make sure TNP was incorporating sustainability efforts that residents could consider.

Ms. Smith thanked Dr. Rich for the presentation and stressed that the CAC was looking forward to the collaboration.

(Secretary's note: Mr. Coleman was late to the meeting and presented after Dr. Rich.)

5. ANNUAL REPORT

Dr. Irvine received input from the members and recommended the discussion be pushed to the February agenda.

6. STRAW FLYER DISTRIBUTION PLAN – CAC MEMBERS

Ms. Chajes contacted Jayme Gravel about adapting one of the flyer designs for a bookmark and Ms. Gravel agreed. Ms. Gravel suggested concentrating on two of the bullet points instead of the four previously presented. Ms. O'Halloran read the text from the flyers into the record:

- Plastic straws are used for minutes, but last for centuries, piling up daily
- Straws and other plastics in the ocean harm sea life, including fish, turtles, sea birds, and corals
- It's easy to reduce the pollution:
 1. Drink without a straw
 2. Bring a glass, steel, or bamboo straw; or
 3. Use a paper straw
- Some people have conditions that require them to use a plastic straw. Don't judge – but if you don't need it, do your part to lessen the impact

Ms. Chajes reiterated that Ms. Gravel wanted to concentrate on the second points and pointed that some of the designs were less adaptable. She continued that the resolution was not mentioned as a bullet point and suggested adding language. Dr. Huntley believed the resolution was less important for the outreach because it was aimed at the public and agreed to focus on the middle two bullets. Ms. Chajes suggested reducing the list on the third bullet and include language for the fourth bullet. Ms. O'Halloran agreed the "don't judge" bullet would be helpful. Ms. Chajes revealed that she created a survey for businesses and asked for feedback on what additional questions would be helpful.

Dr. Irvine suggested moving the call of action to the first line, describing the survey as short, and explaining that Council passed a resolution encouraging plastic straw reduction.

Ms. O'Halloran suggested changing "maybe" to "other" so the question "Have you engaged in actions to reduce plastic straw use" would garner more information. Dr. Huntley argued that the answer was either yes or no and left no room for interpretation. She felt that surveys worked better if they were not open ended. Ms. Chajes wanted to set a baseline to return to the restaurants to ask if they followed through with plans. Ms. Matsumoto suggested "not sure" as a response. Dr. Huntley suggested a list of potential measures that could trigger restaurants to act and include "other" so the CAC could collect more ideas. Ms. Chajes would reach out to TNP and Dr. Huntley would include Ms. Chajes on a conversation with Luanne Moore. Ms. Chajes would update in February.

Ms. Matsumoto offered to reach out to the library to provide an update.

7. FLOODING AND RIPARIAN BUFFER EDUCATION – HELGA HUNTLEY (9:32)

Dr. Huntley suggested a CAC outreach campaign to residents during the opening of the Rodney Project because of its tie to flood prevention and wanted to reach out to Director Tim Filasky and Director Joe Spadafino to determine staff's interest. She added that if staff was not interested, TNP was a potential

partner and the CAC could still submit an article for the Conservation Corner. Ms. Smith suggested the article could be published in June or July and Ms. O'Halloran offered to create social media posts for the City to circulate. Mr. McDowell wanted to use the drone footage from the Newark Post to show why flood prevention was beneficial. Ms. Smith wanted the article to concentrate on the scientific aspect.

8. ANTI-IDLING AND PUBLIC EDUCATION UPDATE – SHEILA SMITH AND ROBYN O'HALLORAN (9:16)

(Secretary's note: Ms. Smith skipped Agenda item 7)

Ms. Smith reached out to her Councilmember who contacted Mr. Filasky and the owners of Park and Shop who agreed to install Anti-Idling signage. Mr. Filasky would reach out to the owner and decide how to place the signs. Ms. Smith hope the collaboration with TNP would help the cause and wanted to keep the momentum going. She thanked Ms. O'Halloran for her work on social media.

Ms. O'Halloran created business cards for anti-idling and asked for feedback. Ms. Smith emphasized the need for the message to be positive and wanted to include language about personal health. Mr. McDowell wanted to emphasize that idling wasted more fuel than turning the car on and off. Dr. Huntley suggested declaring idling was against the law instead of citing the specific code and agreed with Ms. Smith on using positive language. Ms. Smith revealed the signs already said anti-idling was the law and Ms. O'Halloran would rework the information. Dr. Irvine suggest shortening the phrasing and asked if idling should be defined and Ms. O'Halloran confirmed.

9. MONTHLY CONSERVATION ARTICLE WITH THE NEWARK POST – SHEILA SMITH

Ms. Smith informed that Ms. O'Halloran wrote an article on the plastic ban, but she was unsure when it would be published. She shared that Josh Shannon from the Newark Post thought the articles were well-received and were viewed around 1,500 – 2,000 times per article a month. She thanked the members for their effort.

- February – Annual Report, George Irvine
- March – Spotted Lanternfly, Sheila Smith
- April – Composting, Matsumoto, Robyn O'Halloran
- May – 100% Renewable Energy, Helga Huntley
- June – Flooding and Riparian Zones – Helga Huntley, Bob McDowell

10. PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT REPORTS:

Ms. Matsumoto attended the first Plan for Planning meeting and shared that the second meeting was scheduled for the last Tuesday in January.

11. OLD/NEW BUSINESS

Dr. Irvine explained that the floods in Christiansted resulted in the City condemning the bridge supporting the sewer pipe and he asked that the CAC discuss using funds to repair the bridge to encourage bicycling and walking.

Ms. Matsumoto wanted a presenter to explain semi-permeable pavement so the CAC could make

recommendations to the City. Ms. Smith suggested it could be an article for the Conservation Corner. Dr. Irvine would reach out to a civil engineering professor at UD and gauge his interest in joining a CAC meeting. Ms. Smith wondered if semi-permeable pavement was in the Green Energy Code and Ms. Chajes and Mr. McDowell confirmed it was in the code. Ms. Smith wanted to include the pavement as part of the discussion about flooding.

12. NEXT MEETING – FEBRUARY 9, 2021

MOTION BY MS. MATSUMOTO, SECONDED BY DR. HUNTLEY TO ADJOURN THE MEETING.

The meeting adjourned at 9:41 p.m.

Nichol Scheld
Administrative Professional I

/ns