

CONSERVATION ADVISORY COMMISSION
MINUTES

October 12, 2021

MEETING CONVENED: 7:02 p.m. GoToMeeting

MEMBERS PRESENT: Chair Sheila Smith, Beth Chajes, Helga Huntley, Andrew O'Donnell, John Mateyko, MaryClare Matsumoto

ABSENT: Jean Hedrich

STAFF: Jayme Gravell, Chief Communications Officer
Jeff Martindale, Chief Purchasing & Personnel Officer
Nichol Scheld, Administrative Professional I

Ms. Smith called the meeting to order at 7:02 p.m.

1. APPROVAL OF MINUTES FROM SEPTEMBER 14, 2021:

MOTION BY DR. HUNTLEY, SECONDED BY MR. MATEYKO: TO APPROVE THE SEPTEMBER 14, 2021 MINUTES AS AMENDED.

MOTION PASSED. VOTE 6 TO 0.

AYE: HUNTLEY, CHAJES, MATEYKO, O'DONNELL, SMITH, MATSUMOTO.
NAY: 0.
ABSENT: HEDRICH.

2. PUBLIC COMMENT:

There was no public comment.

3. DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE VOTE ON REMAINING CAC FUNDING OPTIONS

Ms. Smith reminded that at the end of the previous month's meeting, she encouraged members to consider options and make proposals on how to spend the remaining \$22,000 in the CAC's budget.

Mr. O'Donnell sent Ms. Scheld a presentation earlier in the day regarding Energize Delaware and explained that the organization was centered on improving housing for lower-income families with insulation. He spoke with Jim Purcell of Energize Delaware and learned that the group was starting the Energy Equity Fund where any organization could send available funding with stipulations on how the money should be spent. Mr. O'Donnell asked if it was possible to earmark potential donations for City residents given that it was a State program and the group confirmed. He believed the program was suitable for the CAC's intent because it was simple, easy, effective, and equitable and addressed climate change and carbon emissions by improving insulation. He presented various outcomes for different communities on how the money was spent for appliances and insulation.

Mr. O'Donnell pointed that energy efficiency was part of the Delaware Climate Action Plan, which had started the previous month, created healthier homes, reduced medical costs, and reduced the energy burden on Delaware because the more insulation and weatherproofing a home had, the less energy it needed. He displayed a slide depicting how the different socio-economic levels had different needs and another on how energy efficiency maximized the CAC's impact. He maintained that the CAC wanted to consider the most effective program for its budget and believed that his suggestion would help to empower, inform, and justify by targeting on low- to moderate-income families, small businesses, non-profits, municipalities, and faith organizations. He then presented a diagram of comprehensive interventions and emphasized that the program was simple in that the CAC would transfer funds directly to the group for dispersion to aid City residents. He believed that every penny would be effective, and the program fell into the CAC's charter because it helped to improve the environment and assist City residents.

Ms. Smith asked if Energize Delaware provided specifics on fund allocation or if it would be spread out over numerous options. Mr. O'Donnell confirmed it would be spread out but specifically targeted for the City; he was not aware of specific projects.

Dr. Huntley asked if the program shared with Mr. O'Donnell about what was specifically being done in Newark and he confessed that he did not ask but would follow up. He informed that an individual household could apply for project funds to insulate their attic.

Mr. Mateyko had no questions.

Ms. Chajes acknowledged the convenience of another entity administering the funds but wanted to understand who would reach out to Newark residents to inform that there was a program. Mr. O'Donnell explained that the group had a website and believed that Ms. Gravell and Mr. Martindale could provide insight on how to distribute awareness. Mr. Martindale explained that the City had the Efficiency Smart Program which had some of the same objectives but believed that if the CAC chose to give the money to Energize Delaware, then no outreach should come from the City at that point. He continued that if the funding stayed in-house then the City would spearhead the information efforts but confirmed that the City would share Energize Delaware's information. Ms. Chajes asked what a typical efficiency upgrade cost and how many families could be served with \$22,000. Mr. O'Donnell replied that the answer depended on who applied and how Energize Delaware distributed the money.

Ms. Matsumoto was curious to learn how much outreach Energize Delaware did to reach residents. She thought that struggling families did not have the energy to search for eligible programs. She was interested to learn about the group's previous projects, how residents accessed the funds, and who the group helped. Mr. O'Donnell pointed that all of the information was available on the website but admitted he had never heard of the group until he was researching Electric Vehicle (EV) support. He believed that no matter what option the CAC chose, they would likely discuss how to advertise on the City's social media.

Dr. Huntley agreed with Mr. Martindale that the City had a very similar program that essentially offered the same kind of benefits for residents who wanted to insulate their homes. She noted there was also a tax rebate from the State, and she was concerned whether the CAC would really make a big impact when it funded another program that supported the same kind of actions that were already supported by multiple other programs that were currently accessible to residents. Mr. O'Donnell agreed and admitted there were several programs available but understood that the City program was more focused on rebates

for specific appliances whereas the Energy Equity Fund would be focused more on insulation. He reiterated that the program was easy, effective, and directly targeted low-income families who would not have to wait for a tax credit. Dr. Huntley asked how it was different from the tax credit. Mr. O'Donnell replied that the residents would apply, and workers would come directly to the house for installation; the residents were not required to have any technical expertise. Dr. Huntley understood that the residents who pursued the tax credit were ineligible if the work was done themselves. Mr. O'Donnell confirmed for the State's Energy Star program. Dr. Huntley was concerned for a few reasons, including outreach, because of the potential overload. She supported streamlining the program and if the City wanted to fund energy efficiency, the CAC should commit to a single program and, if the CAC wanted to encourage energy efficiency, it should choose the program already selected by the City. Mr. O'Donnell would support Dr. Huntley's suggestion if it was a proposal and agreed that the discussion was larger to determine redundancies, but the immediate concern was spending the remaining \$22,000. He suggested evaluating the suggestions for next year's budget.

Ms. Smith felt that another attractive feature of the program was that it addressed equity but agreed with previous points concerning how residents would discover the program. She wanted to know if the City had a component of equity in energy that reached out to local qualifying communities. Mr. Martindale confirmed that the City had programs that were aimed towards assisting low- to moderate-income communities but he could not speak to the programs themselves because Mr. Fortner was the liaison. He acknowledged that the City had been involved in similar initiatives and had coordinated with the Newark-area welfare committee. Ms. Smith pointed to Mr. O'Donnell's presentation where Energize Delaware's efforts down-State were highlighted and believed the cost was high per installation. She wanted to know if a network was already in place to reach residents in need.

Mr. Martindale interjected the City had met with roadblocks in working with some groups because Newark was its own electric utility. He assumed that per Mr. O'Donnell's conversation with Energize Delaware, they were open to the fact that the money would be specifically directed to Newark residents; he asked if Energize Delaware was aware that the City was DEMEC supplied, not Delmarva. Mr. O'Donnell confirmed that he specifically asked if the funds could be earmarked for Delaware-specific things but shared that he did not ask about Delmarva versus DEMEC. He assumed it would not be an issue.

Ms. Smith asked what would happen if the CAC came to a decision at the November meeting. Mr. Martindale replied that staff could not allocate any additional funds after the week following Thanksgiving. He did not think there would be an issue getting the funds to Energize Delaware by the year end but did not necessarily recommend giving money to groups in the current year that would not be spent in the current year as an accounting rule. Ms. Smith asked if Mr. Martindale was suggesting that if the CAC voted on the 9th, then the funds could be allocated within the timeframe for the group to use in the current year. Mr. Martindale assumed that Energize Delaware would forward an invoice to the City if the CAC voted to send the funds and assumed Mr. O'Donnell could help move it forward the next month. Dr. Huntley assumed that Energize Delaware would not have time to spend the money between Thanksgiving and Christmas. Mr. Martindale confirmed and said that if the CAC was looking to use its 2021 funds, then every month's delay would put the group further behind. Ms. Smith asked if the CAC was able to donate the funds if Energize Delaware laid the groundwork in anticipation to receive money in December. Mr. Martindale confirmed but admitted that he was not a CPA and was not the best person to address the concern. He believed that it Energize Delaware invoiced the City, and the CAC paid the invoice in the current year. He thought it could be unethical that the CAC was paying for something in November that would not be expended until later.

Mr. Mateyko noted that a police car could breakdown unexpectedly and the City could purchase a new vehicle in November but not receive the delivery until the next year. Mr. Martindale explained that the next City agenda included a vehicle replacement for the Electric Department that the City would not receive until 2022 but staff made the funds available in 2021 to prove accounting housekeeping even though the City would not pay until it took ownership of the vehicle. He clarified that although the order would be in 2021, the expense would be 2022. Ms. Smith asked if non-profits fell in the same category as retailers and Mr. Martindale replied that once the City handed over the funds, it was no longer the City's concern. He questioned whether the act was ethical because the CAC was, in a roundabout way, funding a program for 2022 with 2021 funds. He thought it was possible that Energize Delaware had a list of projects to rush through for the year.

Mr. O'Donnell offered to follow up with Mr. Purcell to confirm and noted that Energize Delaware had been active for years with an ongoing list of funding and projects.

Ms. Smith believed the CAC might have to postpone the vote but would make presentations that evening.

Dr. Huntley did not want the CAC to feel pressure that they had to spend \$22,000 because it would revert to worthwhile projects in the City. She suggested that the CAC could also approach City Council to reallocate the funds on top of what was normally allocated to the Commission for the next year. Doing so would allow the CAC more flexibility to fund larger projects in 2022. She continued that she had a conversation with Parks and Recreation Director Joe Spadafino regarding the trees dying in City parks. Mr. Spadafino confirmed that staff were trying to save the trees but the expense to treat Emerald Ash borer was great. He informed that the Department was always faced with a lack of funding for tree maintenance. She suggested that the Commission could give money directly to the Parks Department to treat City trees but was not sure of the appropriate season to treat the trees. Another suggestion was to support multiple smaller projects. She shared that Newark High School was looking for funding to install a bike rack and suggested that the CAC could fund bike racks for all schools inside City limits. She added that the Newark Charter School was getting connected to the multi-use trail and could also use some bike racks.

Mr. Martindale explained that it was a common misconception that yearly funding could be carried over into the next year because that was not the City's practice. He welcomed the CAC to request a budget amendment from Council for 2022 but cautioned against believing the money would be rolled over. He reminded that in the past, the Commission did not spend its full funding and did not have a rollover. He supported Dr. Huntley's proposal of multiple small projects and reminded that the CAC could front the money for an additional charging station in another lot. Dr. Huntley thought it would be possible to approach Council before the budget was passed and request that the remainder of the Commission's funds be allocated to a project. Ms. Scheld interjected that it would be extremely unlikely to get on a Council agenda prior to the budget hearings. Mr. Martindale added that Dr. Huntley's suggestion could also be a distinct conversation if the Commission wanted to support a City project, it could seek a budget amendment through Council to increase the CAC funding or use other City funds to help support the cause.

Ms. Matsumoto supported the idea of bike racks and tree maintenance so the funds would stay within the City and be spend during the fiscal year. She also supported another charging station and was also fine with not spending the entire amount in the current year. She asked if the Commission would receive another \$100,000 for 2022 and Mr. Martindale noted that the budget was not yet approved. Ms.

Scheld confirmed that the first budget hearing was on November 1st and the second, if needed, would be on November 15th.

Ms. Chajes appreciated all of Dr. Huntley's suggestions and would support them.

Mr. O'Donnell appreciated the healthy discussion and was always in favor of planting trees because it addressed climate change. He continued that as representatives of their Districts, he wanted to consider residents' desires and maintained that his neighbors would be interested in either trees or lowering electric bills. He would side on helping people over trees because lowering the electric bills would also help address climate change and air pollution. He thought it was risky to make a proposal to Council for 2022 because many things could change in a year. He wanted the money to be put into the world to do some good and wanted to flesh out the smaller projects early next year. Ms. Smith agreed. Mr. O'Donnell said that if the Commission chose to give the \$22,000 to the Energy Equity fund, it could be considered as a trial for a bigger project next year.

Mr. Mateyko had no questions.

Ms. Smith loved both Dr. Huntley's and Mr. O'Donnell's ideas. She informed that she rode her bike downtown and there were few bike racks. She emphasized that bikes were locked onto parking meters or trees. She informed that the best time to plant trees to replace the diseased ash trees was a fall project because it was much easier regarding watering. She reiterated that not all of the money had to go to the Energy Equity fund and could be dividing among initiatives.

Mr. Mateyko asked if everyone had received the summary of his proposal and the email that he had Ms. Scheld forward prior to the meeting. Ms. Chajes replied that she received the email about five minutes prior to the start of the meeting. Mr. Mateyko apologized for the late submission and said that he just learned that the remaining funds had to be allocated that year and wanted to take advantage of the upcoming news pegs. He proposed to use the funds systemically to address the Commission's broad mission. He surmised that the mission could be to fund bike racks and improve City plantings and he could have the entirely wrong idea of the Commission's objective. He noted that the Commission was contacted to approve \$76,000 for an energy audit. He shared that he and his wife relocated to Newark from Lewes because they were concerned that, at some point in the future, they would not be able to make it to their home so close to the water. He had not witnessed any serious planning from Sussex County and claimed that the Sussex County Council would not allow university PhDs to use the term "sea level rise" in a program so the term "ocean level rise" was used instead. He assumed that moving next to a university would mean that academics would be witness to the urgency; all of the reports were indicating immediate cutback in emissions and immediate action in different sectors. He proposed to use the remaining funding towards a different initiative.

Mr. Mateyko explained the first step in his proposal was approval that evening. He stated that he had contacted all of the speakers who were excited to be signed on but said that he told everyone that his proposal was hypothetical. He proposed to host three events and the first would need to be held shortly but assured that it was a definite and all the speakers were lined up. He proposed to use the funds to dive into the Commission's capacity and consider solutions at scale and with the urgency of the science. He continued that his suggestion was a trial run, a demonstration project, and a proof of concept that it could be done and that cities all over the world were the places where the solutions primarily had to be worked out. He thought Newark was the most well-advanced city in Delaware regarding decarbonization, solar parks, solar roofs, electric vehicles, charging stations, green infrastructure, reforestation, and

nature-based solutions that were discussed by the CAC. He proposed to look at nature-based solutions at scale and with the immediacy of the science. He emphasized that his proposal was science-driven and what the science was asking of society was not pleasant.

Mr. Mateyko informed that the first event would be on Friday, November 12th, and he proposed to use Council Chambers. He explained that each event was a news peg, and the day was the final day of the two-week long COP26 in Glasgow, Scotland. He assumed there would be considerable new interest in what everything meant for the residents of Delaware. He thought the Commission could offer unique answers and doubted that anyone would be in a position to offer an answer. He stated that everything was a proposal and could be fine-tuned but maintained that FOIA did not allow him to send anything earlier in the week to solicit opinions. He continued that his proposal had the event taking place as a press conference on the final day of COP26. He proposed that the Mayor would make opening remarks and the City Manager would list Newark's accomplishments in more detail. He continued that each day, a member of the Congressional Delegation would attend, and he felt the appropriate representative for the first day would be Senator Tom Carper, followed by very brief, one-page statements presented to the press from which the speakers would read. Each statement would make a particular point that might be intriguing to the media and informative to the citizens. He suggested that Ms. Smith would moderate, and he would make a statement connecting the whole program to the goals of the COP26 and the CAC's role in sponsoring nature-based solutions, which was a tiny but huge part on which the CAC should focus.

Mr. Mateyko confirmed that the City decarbonized and electrified and other people on the speakers list included:

- Kevin Wilson, a noted architect, and president of the AIA as well as the Board of Architects
- Mohammad Akhter, a prominent public health professor at Fenwick Island who would address the public health risks to Newark residents
- Carla Guerron-Montero, an anthropologist at UD to address culture and local nature-based solutions
- Rick Moore, a board member of a sustainable energy utility who was questioning how "they" managed their \$50 million in capital. Mr. Mateyko assumed that Mr. Moore would advocate that "they" would shift some of their money towards culture and nature-based solutions in the local communities

Mr. Mateyko remarked that funding for decarbonization could come from Washington and go towards technology issues but maintained that working with nature-based solutions required the local, intimate fine-grained knowledge of the ecology and socio-economic culture. He considered the points were the stuff of elected officials and needed to be democratic and local and would be the place for putting the money into local solutions. He continued that Rick Grier-Reynolds could speak to the changes taking place in the State in education.

Mr. Mateyko continued that the second event would take place on Monday, February 21st, either at City Hall or at Townsend Hall at the University of Delaware. He informed that the key speaker would be Doug Tallamy, who agreed to speak to nature-based solutions at the backyard scale.

The third event would be on Monday, March 28th, and feature Jose Alminana, the senior principal for Andropogon, ecological landscape architects. Mr. Mateyko explained that the firm was formed 50 years ago by Ian McCard's faculty at a time when landscape architects focused on design, not ecology. He revealed that Andropogon won firm of the year and every possible award, and he requested a multi-page

electronic summary of the firm's work. He considered the firm to be extraordinary. He then informed that the events would be videotaped by Judy Rolfe, who was a consummate professional and worked for all NGOs, corporations, and cities. Due to COVID, he suggested the events be planned for a restricted audience of 10 or 20 people. He confirmed that the University was open and the atrium at Townsend Hall was available which he assumed Mr. Tallamy could secure as a faculty member. He reiterated that everyone had signed on and everything had been thought through. He shared that he had done all-day programs 33 times in Lewes and was confident that the CAC could host the events as he outlined but welcomed suggestions from the Commission. He was flabbergasted by the money situation because it seemed to him that there were news pegs that would happen in the upcoming year, but speakers had to be lined up with several months lead time. He was confident that \$22,000 was enough to pull off the events with professionals speaking from their own profession. He noted that in nearly every case, his suggestions were on the relevant board of directors for either the state agency or a national agency. He revealed that Ms. Guerron-Montero was on the executive committee of the American Anthropological Association and would be providing a summary of their statement on communities and climate change. He repeated that everyone was a professional on the executive committee of the relevant group that controlled the conduct of their profession. He declared the message was that all of the professions understood and were changing medicine, architecture, anthropology, and energy systems, to be in step with the science. The Commission would bring the people who sat on the board of directors in one place with Tom Carper, Chris Coons, and Lisa Blount-Rochester, who would each speak, and put everyone in the context to determine what it called up on the Commission to do in terms of nature-based solutions, either at the backyard scale or the neighborhood scale. He admitted the plan was ambitious, but the vision was the vision of the science, and the ambition was the ambition that the science advised society to adopt now and there was no choice. He felt that the news pegs were historical and would allow Newark to position itself uniquely in the State.

Ms. Smith clarified that Mr. Mateyko was suggesting three press conferences with small audiences that would last up to two hours and that each event would offer honorariums to one person in each of the presentations. Mr. Mateyko corrected that there was no one in the first event but the second event was Doug Tallamy and the third was not an academic. Ms. Smith admitted that Mr. Mateyko was clear that the speakers were notable with quality content.

Ms. Smith opened the floor to questions and asked that everyone be mindful of the time; she noted the Commission might have to wait until the following month to vote. Mr. Mateyko reminded Ms. Smith of the date of the first event.

Mr. O'Donnell considered the proposal to be well-thought out and all members agreed that climate change was immediate. He did not see how the \$22,000 would be spent and asked if it would be possible to consider his suggestion alongside Mr. Mateyko's proposal. He asked if the CAC would pay the speakers and how the \$22,000 would be spent. Mr. Mateyko replied that the remaining budget would be consumed with his proposal but said some events could be amended to allow for other spending.

Dr. Huntley asked Mr. Mateyko if he had the budget available. Mr. Mateyko replied that he did not have the budget off-hand but recommended that the CAC should offer \$1,000 or \$2,000 to Mr. Tallamy who could then donate the money to a needy student. He continued that the next biggest single event would be if the CAC could get somewhere with Andropogon actually doing a serious discussion with some basis of what could be done in Lewes for nature-based solutions which would take the largest portion of funding. He shared that the videographer had a rate of \$200 an hour plus mileage and the event was only a couple of hours. He noted that the CAC would not have to pay for rooms but thought it would

be good to get a folding board to display information on hand. Dr. Huntley estimated the videographer would cost \$2,000, Mr. Tallamy would receive \$2,000, and the remaining \$16,000 would go to Andropogon. Mr. Mateyko assumed a large portion but not \$16,000, maybe \$10,000 to \$15,000.

Ms. Smith was confused on Andropogon's role. Mr. Mateyko said that Andropogon would be looking at the City's site conditions of elevation, watershed, soil conditions, and solar aspect; the type of legwork that happened behind the scenes of when a presentation was put together. He learned that there was a place in Florida that had a downpour of 29.5 inches in 24 hours which was not the end of the game, it was getting worse at accelerating rates. He noted that people lost their lives in New York City and cautioned the same could happen in Newark. He shared that flood managers suggested that flooding of that magnitude could not be managed, even with green infrastructure. He said that land had to be set aside for flooding because it was nature, but Andropogon would provide real-world analysis for the basis of what the community had to do to avoid the worst of what Tennessee, New York, and Philadelphia experienced. He suggested that it was smart to be prudent.

Ms. Smith thought the project sounded very similar to a contract where the City would pay for an analysis, provided the information was not already at hand. She understood that the City did a lot of work developing the Rodney site and she would categorize it as similar to the greenhouse gas inventory because the CAC would receive information on which it could operate in the future.

Mr. O'Donnell recommended trying to accomplish Mr. Mateyko's events for as cheaply as possible and use the remaining funds for his own idea.

Ms. Smith was concerned with the timing of the fund allocations and thought that the first event was extremely doable. Dr. Huntley interjected that Ms. Gravel sent a note in the chat function that the November event was not doable at all if the CAC wanted any kind of staff involvement. Ms. Smith thought that Mr. Mateyko had contacted the Mayor. Mr. Mateyko said that he had not contacted the Mayor and said the first step was that evening, then the Commission would contact the Mayor. Ms. Smith noted that there was a special election because the City lost a Councilperson and read Ms. Gravel's comment that nothing could be done until December. Mr. Mateyko asked if the CAC could do something on Friday, the 12th. Ms. Gravel explained that the proposed event date was a month away and, given the scope of the project, it would be impossible to organize and present to produce the impact that the CAC wanted. She emphasized that City staff was tasked with organizing the third election of the year and it was also budget season. She said the timeline was not practical and staff would not be able to lend the necessary time to the project. She wanted to be as completely honest and transparent as possible so if the CAC wanted staff involved and the event would be using the City of Newark logo, then staff needed to make sure the event got the attention it deserved to go off as well as it should. She emphasized that November 12th was not possible.

Mr. Mateyko understood Ms. Gravel's point and acknowledged that staff was occupied. He said that his request was not major, but he did think that the event should take place in City Hall because global problems were dealt with at a local level. He informed Ms. Gravel that Council Chambers would need to be cleared out and suggested there could be a conflict. Ms. Gravel interjected that if the proposal was a media event, she was the contact at City Hall with all of the media contacts who could leverage the press and knew the press people at the elected officials' offices and the General Assembly. She said that Mr. Mateyko's statement that the event would not involve City staff was not accurate. She reiterated that the event would take a large amount of staff time during the budget season and an election; Mr. Mateyko would have the results he wanted if the event would be held so quickly. Ms. Gravel clarified that it was

her job to have the contacts as the Director of Communications and reiterated that she could not assist over the upcoming weeks in the face of the other prioritized projects. Mr. Mateyko asked if that included the 11th. Ms. Gravell explained that one did not inform people of a public event the day before, planning was necessary. She continued that from the City's perspective, staff could not help the CAC promote; the event would be in City Hall with the Mayor and City Manager so staff would need to be involved but were unable at the moment. Mr. Mateyko argued that City Hall and the Mayor also belonged to the CAC and the people involved had experience in hosting similar events. He maintained that if the CAC was able to secure the line-up, it would be very newsworthy. He told Ms. Gravell that on the day of the event or on the day before, the assignment editors would call to confirm so she would have to pick up the phone and confirm it.

Dr. Huntley interjected that the Commission needed to take Ms. Gravell for her word that there would be no staff time available to make the event happen on November 12th. She suggested moving on to discuss the fundamentals of his idea rather than the specifics of whether Ms. Gravell had time. Mr. Mateyko said that the CAC did not need the City and he was not asking for City staff to be committed. Ms. Chajes interjected that Mr. Mateyko was indeed asking for the facilities that City staff was in charge of running. Mr. Martindale clarified that while the CAC had discretionary funds for certain projects, it was an advisory committee, and the event would likely need to come at the direction of City Council and would be a City event because it was not something that the CAC could do in a vacuum. He noted that there would be an additional step in the timeline. He continued that as a City event, everything that Ms. Gravell claimed was correct; she would be the point and he would be involved on the facilities side. The CAC would not be able to run with the event and it would need to be primarily handled by the City.

Ms. Smith thanked Ms. Gravell and Mr. Martindale for the clarification.

Ms. Chajes revealed that she had spent a large part of a 30-year career organizing similar events with academics, the main questions she would want to know in forming any of the events were who is the audience that the CAC was trying to reach and how would the event contribute to reaching the goal that the CAC wanted to reach. Ms. Chajes asked how press coming together to listen to the speakers would accomplish the goal for the City to use nature-based solutions in the future to meet the climate crisis. She did not see the connection. She explained that she left her University position was because she repeatedly organized similar events, and nothing happened as a result; like-minded people came together and did not accomplish much. She thought the best part of Mr. Mateyko's proposal was the consulting group providing the City with some assessments and concrete suggestions on which future actions could be based. She could not support a press conference as a way to use the CAC's remaining funds. She continued that Mr. Mateyko had picked participants, including a videographer that she knew, but believed that the work would have to be put out to bid. She confessed that she had many issues with the way the proposal was laid out. She wanted to help people and cut emissions and she did not see how that was possible with Mr. Mateyko's proposal.

Mr. Mateyko considered the obstacles as part of the using the auspices of a City and agreed that bidding was likely a necessity. He knew of Judy Rolfe and her concerns with climate change. He said if the job had to be bid for a small some of money, he understood and that was the end of having a videographer. He thought that he would have to reinvestigate his plans in the short term because the Mayor and Council would have to be in session in order to approve and it was impossible given the short time allotted. He wanted to take advantage of the news pegs and said that it was unusual to get them out of Dr. Burns' shop and bring it to City Hall. He wanted to address who was talking about what global problems meant for Delawareans.

Ms. Matsumoto agreed with Ms. Chajes and had the same concerns. She agreed that because the CAC was part of the City, it would need the permission of Council to proceed. Mr. Mateyko said that he made the same point at the beginning of his proposal: the first step was the current discussion, and the second step was with the Mayor and Council. Ms. Matsumoto pointed that the Commission would have to get on an agenda first and acknowledged that the event would not happen on the 12th. She pointed that the other days were Mondays which were normally City Council meetings so she was unsure how it would work. She commended Mr. Mateyko for his enthusiasm but did not see how she could support the event in the timeframe and after learning about the City's constraints. Mr. Mateyko did not think that anything could be done on November 12th in the City.

Dr. Huntley agreed with Ms. Chajes on concerns with the intended audience and thought that putting so much effort into a press conference was overkill. If the Commission was going to put something similar together, she would want to target a much larger audience. She suggested that the idea could be built out with a little more time and thought that the Commission could join with The Newark Partnership (TNP) so TNP could make it part of their community engagement workshops. Doing so would include interested City residents who could hopefully glean information and also partner with UD. She would be surprised if UD did not have anything planned at all in connection with the climate change events but admitted she was not currently aware of any. Mr. Mateyko said that he checked in with the Roskill spokesperson and confirmed that there was nothing planned which was around 20 agencies that were most relevant.

Mr. Mateyko thought the discussion was far-gone and repeated that no event could take place on Friday, November 12th, in the City. Dr. Huntley suggested thinking about a different audience in future planning and added that the first event was not supposed to cost anything anyway so the discussion had nothing to do with how the Commission would spend its remaining funding. She continued that the bulk of Mr. Mateyko's spending was not to support the events, it was supposed to support a study in which case she agreed with Ms. Chajes that the Commission should investigate the best firm to conduct a study for the City versus choosing an entity with a good reputation.

Ms. Smith asked Mr. Mateyko if he wanted to respond. Mr. Mateyko said that the first event, which was not possible, would have consumed maybe \$2,000. He then focused on the second two events and addressed the issue of how the Commission would select a firm. He admitted the process was lengthy and it was too late in the evening to discuss. Ms. Smith agreed and was sure the Commission was interested in expanding the idea, but it was not a way to dispose of the Commission's remaining funding.

Mr. Mateyko interjected and proposed that someone seek a short meeting with the Mayor to discuss the proposal. He maintained that his agenda was always to first discuss the event among the Commission and then Council would be included. He reiterated that he wanted to meet with the Mayor to focus on the second two events. Ms. Smith assumed approval was necessary and Mr. Mateyko asked for clarification. Ms. Smith explained that the CAC was confined to publicly announced meetings with agendas. Dr. Huntley said that members could have a conversation with the Mayor, but she suggested that the Commission not discuss the proposal with the Mayor due to the broad disagreement about the effectiveness of the current format. She suggested fixing the problems prior to taking any proposals to the next level.

Dr. Huntley continued that since the Commission would not be spending money on the event, she proposed that she and Mr. O'Donnell meet to discuss a budget of how to allocate the \$22,000 between the different parts of their proposals and report their findings to the next CAC meeting for a vote. Ms.

Smith agreed that the Commission could take the smaller project and allocated a small part. She wanted to work out the budget but also answer the questions the group had for Mr. O'Donnell, who wanted to reach out to his contact and determine what could be done specifically for Newark residents.

MOTION BY MS. CHAJES, SECONDED BY MR. MATEYKO: THAT DR. HUNTLEY AND MR. O'DONNELL WORK IN THE INTERVENING MONTH TO COMBINE THEIR PROPOSALS AND ANSWER THE CAC'S QUESTIONS AND RETURN WITH A BUDGET ON HOW TO SPEND REMAINING 2021 FUNDING OF \$22,000.

MOTION PASSED. VOTE 6 TO 0.

AYE: HUNTLEY, CHAJES, MATEYKO, O'DONNELL, SMITH, MATSUMOTO.

NAY: 0.

ABSENT: HEDRICH.

Mr. Mateyko asked if he could meet with a smaller subcommittee to iron out the difficulties for the second two events to have them resolved for the next meeting. Ms. Chajes proposed that Mr. Mateyko meet with members of TNP, which she thought was a better venue for educational events. Mr. Mateyko suggested that he meet with Ms. Chajes first and then present the idea to TNP. Ms. Chajes confirmed that she would attend a meeting that he organized.

4. ANNUAL REPORT ASSIGNMENTS

Ms. Smith recalled that the Commission allocated money for the greenhouse gas inventory. She asked for members to call out additional achievements over 2021. Ms. Matsumoto offered to review the minutes and prepare a light summary. Ms. Smith thanked Ms. Matsumoto.

5. MONTHLY CONSERVATION ARTICLE WITH THE NEWARK POST

Mr. O'Donnell gathered the material for his article but had been unable to write it; he would try to submit it as soon as possible.

- November – GHG Emissions and Lawn Equipment – Andrew O'Donnell
- December - City Trees - Sheila Smith
- January – Carbon Pricing – Beth Chajes
- February – Stormwater Management – Helga Huntley

Ms. Smith asked for clarification on carbon pricing. Ms. Chajes explained that currently in the Budget Reconciliation Bill, there were a number of proposals put forth to cut carbon emissions in various ways, some of which had to do with putting a price on the carbon content of fossil fuels to make them more expensive. She likened the act to making cigarettes more expensive because there was an externality involved in second-hand smoke and it was privatizing the profit and socializing the cost. She explained that one way to regain some of the money was to tax fossil fuels as they came out of the ground or into the port. She admitted that a controversial point was what to do with the revenues because anything that involved fossil fuels as a feedstock or in transportation would become more expensive because the companies would pass along the prices. The question was if the revenues could be collected to help those most impacted or support workers in the fossil fuel industry to transition to other employment; there was a whole range of proposals. Ms. Smith asked if the topic was currently up for

discussion in Congress and Ms. Chajes confirmed and pointed that people needed to understand the initiative. She noted that carbon pricing could be confused with carbon offsets.

6. PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT REPORTS – DEVELOPMENT PLANT LISTS – SHEILA SMITH

Ms. Smith shared that she had a meeting with Director of Parks and Recreation Joe Spadafino to discuss various ways of reducing the City's carbon footprint by changing landscaping practices across the parks and City properties. She also had questions about some developments and their handling of the trees; she would report back to the Commission following the meeting. She confirmed that Tom Zaleski, the Parks Superintendent, attended a Penn State workshop on changing landscaping practices and was on-board.

7. OLD/NEW BUSINESS – CITY LANDSCAPING – SHEILA SMITH

Ms. Smith asked Mr. Martindale if the drainage from the parking lots was recharging in the water table or if it was being drained into the out-flow areas. She stated that for new construction for parking lots and for increased non-pervious surfaces, developers had to keep the water within the property. She asked if the water went into the ground or if it was piped out into the streams and outflow areas. Mr. Martindale asked if she was referring to a situation where a contractor was spraying water to keep dust down during construction. Ms. Smith was speaking about run-off and explained that Park & Shop redid the parking lot and planted native plantings but asked where the water was going. Mr. Martindale suggested that she asked Public Works.

Dr. Huntley asked to discuss food waste recycling on a future agenda. Ms. Smith said the upcoming agenda would include the vote for Mr. O'Donnell and Dr. Huntley's suggestion, Ms. Matsumoto's summaries, and food waste recycling. Ms. Matsumoto asked if sharing the summaries would be a FOIA violation and Ms. Scheld explained that the members could forward information but could not hold conversations off of the public record. Dr. Huntley clarified that members could comment individually without violating FOIA.

8. NEXT MEETING – NOVEMBER 9, 2021

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

The meeting adjourned at 9:14 pm.

Nichol Scheld
Administrative Professional I

/ns