

CONSERVATION ADVISORY COMMISSION
MINUTES

April 11, 2023

MEETING CONVENED: 7:02 p.m. Council Chambers/Microsoft Teams Hybrid

MEMBERS PRESENT: Sheila Smith (Presiding), Helga Huntley, John Mateyko, Lauren O'Connor, Andrew O'Donnell, Mahi Palanisami, Mikayla Rypkema, Savannah Sipes

STAFF: Herb White, Parks & Recreation Superintendent
Jeffrey Martindale, Chief Purchasing & Personnel Officer
Nichol Scheld, Deputy City Secretary

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

1. APPROVAL OF MINUTES FROM MARCH 14, 2023:

Postponed until May.

2. PUBLIC COMMENT:

Charles Putnam, Quail Lane in District 1, announced that he had a tulip poplar in his backyard that measured 11 feet, 11 inches at six feet from the ground. Ms. Smith informed that there was a record of all the trees that had been found and measured at <https://delawaretrees.com/bigtrees/>. She explained that the measurements included the circumference, spread of the crown, and height which were then added together to determine a point ranking, if Mr. Putnam's tree was comparable to other large trees, a forester would professionally measure his tree.

Sandy Schriever had wondered if the issue of big trees was a true concern and recalled Ms. Smith's article from the Newark Post that declared a minimum tree growth stage was 20 years. She continued that she moved to Newark from Dallas, Texas, where old growth trees were ripped out and replaced with new, smaller trees as a mitigative action; she did not want Newark to continue with the same philosophy that if the count was the same then the quality was the same. She emphasized that a fifty-year-old tree could not be compared with a six-week-old tree. She informed that she had written a letter to Ms. Smith, Mayor Markham, Dennis Assanis, and Jeff Lang and declared that she moved from Dallas to Newark because she did not want to continue living in a place that did not respect the process of nature. In her letter, she stated that there was significant development on Elkton Road where extremely large sycamore trees had been cut down and replaced with less substantial "lollipop" cherry trees that could never adequately replace the sycamores.

Ms. Schriever continued that she was unfamiliar with Tree City, USA, and needed to research the program more to determine what the City had done. She became acquainted with the Big Tree Trail through the Delaware Nature Society and thought it was extremely important to identify resources and educate the public. She noted that not everyone felt the same about preservation and might not feel the need to protect resources. She learned that larger cities, such as Washington, D.C., had ordinances in place to protect large trees and believed that Newark should follow suit. She intended to conduct further research and pursue further actions. She maintained that she loved White Clay Creek State Park and moved to the area because of it. She did not want the City to abandon its large trees.

Dr. Huntley asked for more information on Washington's ordinance and informed that Ms. Smith was a staunch tree advocate. She noted that the City had rules for which and how many trees could be removed for developments but pointed out that once the property was developed and sold, the new owner could do whatever they wanted. Ms. Smith corrected that the City had a Tree Committee changed the plans so that developers had to plant and maintain a certain number of native trees. She explained that the trees had to be replaced if something happened to the trees within the two-year period. She indicated the issue was with private property and emphasized that the Tree Committee plan needed to go further; the final plan was geared towards wooded annexed properties. She noted that many bigger cities protected large trees and the Tree Committee rewrote the Code to define value trees as 18 inches in diameter or greater. She admitted that removing trees was a complex problem because a single tree was an important habitat to numerous organisms.

Ms. Schriever explained that her letter drew attention to the City's stormwater charge at the bottom of the utility bill and declared that the City had gone through trouble by classifying houses because she paid a lower rate than her husband because his home had more impervious area. She emphasized that the City cared about impervious surfaces and trees and recognized resources. She noted that the shade of an old tree was 15 degrees cooler than a non-shaded area. She informed that she was a master naturalist and reiterated that she moved to the City because Newark was doing a much better job with its natural resources than her previous area.

Ms. Smith explained that Tree City USA was a budgetary item and confirmed that the City looked after its tree canopy. As a Tree City, Newark was required to spend a portion of its budget to maintain its tree canopy and emphasized that the Parks Superintendents had been and were arborists. Ms. Schriever asked if the Tree Committee was an ongoing affair and Ms. Smith explained that the Committee had been organized to rewrite the Code to address a property requesting annexation with the removal of 1,500 trees. Dr. Huntley confirmed that the Committee had been ad hoc and met to specifically address the section of Code and one of its key improvements was considering a collection of trees versus a tree as an individual item.

Jeffrey Summerhays, UD's new Director of Sustainable Operations, was invited to attend the meeting by Dr. Chris Williams to learn more about the City and the Commission. Dr. Huntley continued that UD was putting together a concerted effort towards sustainability and suggested that Mr. Summerhays participate in a future meeting to have a more in-depth conversation.

3. GREENFEST PREPARATION FOR MAY 6TH EVENT – HELGA HUNTLEY

Dr. Huntley reminded that the Commission decided to sponsor the Newark Center for Creative Learning (NCCL) Kids' Greenfest which was geared towards children and families but also open to the public. NCCL invited environmentally minded groups to have a presence and offer activities or booths and Dr. Huntley's intent was to discuss the Commission's participation to be ready for the event. Ms. Smith reminded that the Commission hosted an activity to instruct children on how to sort items for recycling and Mr. O'Donnell and the City both provided electric vehicles (EVs) for inspection. She asked which Commissioners wanted to participate and asked for educational ideas.

Mr. O'Donnell offered to bring his car and Mr. Martindale confirmed that the City could also have a car at the event. Dr. Huntley offered to coordinate the event but was not able to staff the table for the entire day. Mr. O'Donnell offered to assist. Dr. Huntley reminded that the event was on Saturday, May 6th, and asked if any other Commissioners would participate. Ms. Smith noted that the rules for recycling changed often and suggested that the information for the sorting activity be updated before the event.

Ms. Scheld interjected that all event coordination needed to be planned that evening as the next meeting would take place after the Greenfest. Ms. Rypkema suggested that she could assist in the afternoon and would reach out. Dr. Huntley reminded that the Commission needed to set the general guidelines at the public meeting and explained that she would coordinate with Ms. Smith, Mr. O'Donnell, and Ms. Rypkema to ensure that a member was at the event.

4. DEPARTMENTAL UPDATES – DIMMING CAPABILITIES – JEFF MARTINDALE

Mr. Martindale informed the City was keeping streetlights on main roadways set at 100%, the standard for roadways, and the residential areas were set at 65% capacity. Dr. Huntley asked if the side streets were always dimmer than main roads and Mr. Martindale clarified that there were some areas that were toggled up or down depending on police recommendations and resident requests. He noted that the lights gave off about 10,000 lumens and the 35% dimming provided a 3,000 to 4,000 lumen reduction. Ms. Smith asked if 10,000 lumens was a State Code and shared that a resident was concerned that the City was over lighting. She continued that the IPCC published data on the negative impacts that lumens had on human and environmental health, and habitat; she would investigate further. She asked if the City was able to dim the lights further. Mr. Martindale confirmed and explained that 65% level was the dimmed capacity.

Dr. Huntley requested clarification of the topic and Ms. Smith explained that City Manager Tom Coleman and Electric Director Bhadresh Patel indicated that the City would have the capability to dim the lights for the Lights Out Initiative. She reminded that Mr. Patel indicated that capabilities were still not possible at his last departmental update over a year earlier. Dr. Huntley asked what Ms. Smith was requesting from the City and Ms. Smith reiterated that she was requesting the City reduce the amount of light that was produced and shown onto the streets of the City. She reminded that birds were hitting windows because of lighting during the migration periods and the Commission wanted light pollution to be reduced from midnight to 6 am because birds were pulled off course during migration because of city lights and White Clay Creek was a designation for spring migration. She reminded that the initiative began three years earlier when the Commission requested the City reduce the amount of light.

Mr. O'Donnell asked if the lights could be reduced further. Mr. Martindale confirmed the lights now had the capacity for reduction and had been reduced. He suggested the Commission submit another resolution to request further dimming but noted that the City streetlights made up a fraction of the total light pollution in Newark and the bulk was from private property, including the University of Delaware. He was unsure of the regulations for roadways and reminded that the City maintained a fractional portion of the streets in Newark and DelDOT was responsible for the rest. Ms. Smith explained that Lights Out was a hugely complex initiative; she informed Mr. Summerhays that the Commission began the Initiative with Dr. Williams and Dr. Buler and hoped that UD would dim its lights and close shades in the laboratories during the night. She was concerned about STAR Campus. Dr. Huntley asked if the current dimming was permanent and not specific for the migratory periods and Mr. Martindale confirmed that the current light output was based on resident feedback and public safety concerns from the Newark Police Department (NPD).

Mr. Mateyko asked if the control was on each lamp fixture or if the lighting was controlled by the voltage. Mr. Martindale explained that the output was controlled remotely through a website hosted by Verizon. Mr. Mateyko asked if Orchard was considered a full or reduced illumination and Mr. Martindale understood that the area was mostly residential, but UD had lights on the street for which the City was not responsible.

Ms. Palanisami was pleased that the light had been reduced by 35%. Ms. Smith intended to further investigate Code to determine whether further dimming was possible and discern the recommendations for lumens and health. Dr. Huntley suggested that the Commission needed to consider what the Code required but also what the residents requested for personal safety. Ms. Smith agreed, and Mr. Martindale reminded that some streets might be more well-lit throughout the evening for public safety.

Dr. Huntley asked if the City had reviewed the compromise between with what residents and NPD were comfortable and reduced the lighting as low as possible given the constraints. Mr. Martindale confirmed and stated that the City met the intent behind the dimming capabilities and if there was additional interest from the Commission to further investigate the initiative, concentration should be given to private property and encouraging residents to decrease lighting.

5. NEWARK ENERGY TRANSITION COMMISSION RESOLUTION – HELGA HUNTLEY

Dr. Huntley reminded that the Sustainability Plan was passed three years earlier and intended for City Council to form the Newark Energy Transition (NET) task force because the writers of the Plan felt that the Commission lacked the expertise to advise the City appropriately on how to make the transition from the current energy supply to 100% renewable within the timeframe available. She emphasized the importance of compiling the expertise so that the City could proceed with NET’s formation; she considered the organization a Task Force because there had been debate as to whether Commission was the correct term.

MOTION BY DR. HUNTLEY, SECONDED BY MR. O’DONNELL: THAT THE CONSERVATION ADVISORY COMMISSION (CAC) RECOMMEND THAT CITY COUNCIL PRIORITIZE APPOINTING MEMBERS TO THE NEWARK ENERGY TRANSITION (NET) TASK FORCE, AS ENVISIONED BY THE SUSTAINABLE NEWARK PLAN, ADOPTED IN NOVEMBER 2019. THE NET TASK FORCE SHALL WORK WITH THE CAC TO ADVISE CITY COUNCIL ON PATHWAYS TO ACHIEVE THE TRANSITION FROM FOSSIL-FUEL-BASED TO RENEWABLE ENERGY THAT IS REQUIRED IN THE NEXT 10 TO 20 YEARS IN ORDER TO MAINTAIN LIVABLE CONDITIONS ON EARTH. SUCH A SEPARATE TASK FORCE WILL BRING THE NECESSARY EXPERTISE IN RENEWABLE ENERGY GENERATION, DISTRIBUTION SYSTEMS, ENERGY MARKETS, AND ENERGY JUSTICE. THE CAC RECOMMENDS THAT MEMBERSHIP OF THE NET TASK FORCE NOT BE RESTRICTED TO VOLUNTEERS RESIDING IN THE CITY OF NEWARK LIMITS IN ORDER TO BENEFIT FROM THE BEST EXPERTISE AVAILABLE IN THE REGION. TO MAXIMIZE THE TIME AVAILABLE TO ACHIEVE THE CLEAN ENERGY TRANSITION, THE CAC RECOMMENDS THAT THE NET TASK FORCE BE ESTABLISHED NO LATER THAN SEPTEMBER 2023. THE CAC WILL PROVIDE SUGGESTIONS FOR THE NET TASK FORCE MEMBERSHIP UPON COUNCIL DIRECTION.

MOTION PASSED. VOTE 7 TO 0.

AYE: SIPES, O’CONNOR, O’DONNELL, SMITH, HUNTLEY, MATEYKO, RYPKEMA.

NAY: 0.

ABSTAIN: PALANISAMI.

Mr. Mateyko informed that the latest iteration from the IPCC broke down the total greenhouse gas pollution level to 25% from energy production, 25% from land use and land cover, 25% from mobility, and 25% from food.

Ms. Smith asked that all members review their contacts and suggest experts.

6. NEW FOSSIL FUEL INFRASTRUCTURE BAN – ANDREW O'DONNELL

Mr. O'Donnell explained that the Commission hired a third-party consultant to conduct a greenhouse gas (GHG) inventory which resulted in a detailed report that pinpointed many sources of GHGs in the City, including transportation, home heating costs, and electricity costs. He continued that the other cities had begun banning fossil fuels and presented his draft for a recommendation:

Whereas the City of Newark is committed to mitigating its contributions to global climate change and has therefore set a goal of net-zero greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions by 2060 in its Sustainability Plan,

Whereas the state of Delaware's Climate Action Plan and Governor John Carney have committed to a 25% reduction of GHG emissions by 2025,

Whereas the United States has pledged to reduce its GHG emissions substantially to limit global temperature increases to 2 C by 2100 as part of the Paris Agreement,

Whereas stationary fuels, including natural gas, fuel oil, and propane, constitute the second largest source of GHG emissions (according to the City's GHG Inventory Report for 2019),

Whereas requiring new construction to be all-electric is a common GHG reduction strategy cited in the City's GHG Inventory Report,

Whereas reductions in the use of fossil fuels also leads to cleaner air (supporting the City's Sustainability Plan Goal 4.7), reduced explosion hazards, reduced exposure to volatile fuel prices, and simplified home appliance options,

Whereas the City is committed to moving its electricity supply toward renewable sources, thereby ensuring a smaller GHG emissions footprint for electric infrastructure over fossil fuel-based alternatives,

Whereas many other cities across the US have already banned new fossil fuel infrastructure construction, therefore, the Conservation Advisory Commission recommends that City Council ban all new fossil fuel infrastructure construction within the city limits.

Examples of new fossil fuel infrastructure include:

- New underground natural gas pipeline extensions
- New natural gas hardware in new building construction
- The installation of new natural gas furnaces, natural gas water heaters, and fuel oil boilers
- Construction or installation of new gasoline and diesel fueling stations, tanks, and pumps
- The installation of new propane tanks and burners; and further recommends that at this time the replacement of existing fossil fuel infrastructure with similar items remain permitted, but that the City implement an incentive program for residents, businesses, and industry to replace fossil fuel-based HVAC and water heating systems with electric versions

Mr. O'Donnell noted that Delmarva owned all the gas pipes and a substantial part of the electricity, and the City did not have the ability to stop them from building new ones. He pointed out that the City had to provide permits to build gas stations, new construction, or the infrastructure for the new construction. He suggested that the City not permit gas pipes in new construction. He continued that the first step in stopping emissions was to stop the hemorrhaging and building more. He admitted that his proposal was aggressive and controversial but necessary. He hoped to solicit specific feedback from Council so that the Commission could formally address them and adjust the language. He investigated online resources used by other cities such as Palo Tuma, CA, Louisville, KY, Los Angeles, CA, and several cities in Colorado and Massachusetts.

Ms. Sipes asked when the measure would go into effect and Mr. O'Donnell wanted the resolution to go before Council immediately. He explained that the City's direction on building gas stations was that there was a planning schedule, and the use was allowable. He explained that the Planning Commission took direction from Council, but the CAC was not permitted to instruct the Planning Commission. He intended to get before Council to suggest that no more gas stations be allowed so no further permits would be issued.

Dr. Huntley clarified that the CAC was recommending that Council prohibit fossil fuel infrastructure and the recommendation was not legal text. She continued that if City Council took the CAC recommendations, City staff would draft the language for an ordinance, including effective date and exceptions. She explained that the resolution was an idea to trigger Council to allocate staff time to work on the project. Ms. Smith reiterated that the resolution was related to the goals in the Sustainability Plan.

Mr. Mateyko interjected that money was currently available for converting heating systems, including a local component and federal programs. He suggested that the City might be able to qualify through a special program from Dover.

Dr. Huntley clarified that the resolution was not about conversion and was specifically targeted towards new construction, as stated at the end of Mr. O'Donnell's draft language. Mr. O'Donnell confirmed and explained that he added the language to assuage rash reactions from residents worried that their appliances would not be permitted.

Mr. Mateyko remarked that it was written well, but he did not see clear evidence that, at a specific level of residential units, whether it makes sense or not to change the equipment. He did not think it was clear if this was currently the correct decision to make. He thought the important thing was to change the momentum completely so advanced notice was and so that everyone could be on the same page that the City of Newark read the science that suggested this process.

Mr. O'Donnell clarified this part was not addressing the sunk cost and was instead addressing the point to stop building more. The sunk cost would be the effect of, when there would be a lot of gas infrastructure not in use, what would need to be done with it. These were investments that would be expected to last a while but were going to be cut short, a negative side to sticking to the current path the City was on. He asked for any input on changes made to the document.

Dr. Huntley commented that she liked the way the document was structured as many good reasons were cited to support the recommendation. However, she thought there was frequent hesitation on City Council to be first in anything, hence noting that at the end of the document the statement that other cities had already banned new fossil fuel infrastructure construction. She suggested mentioning a few examples to support this claim, and if possible, including cities the same size as Newark; that way, Council would be less intimidated by this idea.

Mr. Mateyko proposed looking at online groups to see if they had a list of cities that were already implementing this ban to add as an appendix sheet; it would be very informative for future discussion.

Ms. Smith suggested sending this to Ms. Chajes' climate lobby, as she would possibly have access to such information.

Ms. Palanisami noted that when she lived in Denver, the city attempted a similar feat, but there were always groups of people (notably of working or lower class) that were left behind from the plan, and asked if there was a way to make sure that did not happen. She thought there would be a gas station needed for these groups until a full transition could be made; this would result in an initial spike, but then a drop in those five years as more would transition. Mr. O'Donnell asked for clarification if she meant how this would affect those in the low and middle-income demographics, to which she confirmed. He explained that of a new three or seven story building being built with gas infrastructure, to which she specified she was specifically talking about gas stations. As he believed Newark was not lacking in gas stations, he did not think there would be a need to build any more.

Dr. Huntley emphasized this was not about taking out existing infrastructure, it was about stopping the increase of gasoline usage where it is right now. However, this was still not entirely correct, as existing gas stations' business could continue to increase, and that would not be stopped. The idea behind plan was that the CAC did not want more sunk costs as they could not afford for that infrastructure to be used as long as it was intended to.

Ms. Smith likened it to the asbestos ban; it was still out there, but it could not be made or used to build. The purpose would be to prevent it from coming into the City and instead transition to the alternatives.

Mr. O'Donnell explained this would get past the short-sightedness of those looking for the most affordable option and selecting gas, as ultimately while the alternative of electric was a higher cost upfront, it would be cheaper in the long run, with a crossover point in the middle between the costs of the two options. The point was to get past the short-sightedness and avoid future sunk costs by preventing the construction of new infrastructure that would not last its intended lifespan.

Ms. Smith explained that the proposal was written and would be sent to Council after a motion was made.

Ms. Scheld asked if the edits had been made, to which Mr. O'Donnell specified they did not and asked if a motion could be made to move forward with the edits or if they had to be seen before doing so. Dr. Huntley asked if a list of five smaller cities could quickly be added now, to which Mr. O'Donnell confirmed so. When Ms. Smith asked if this did not include details, Dr. Huntley clarified that she was asking if Mr. O'Donnell was prepared to make that amendment now. Mr. O'Donnell commented he could not at the exact moment but could at the end of the meeting. Ms. Scheld responded this meant a motion could not be made until they were added. Dr. Huntley asked if the vote could be postponed until the end of the meeting, to which Ms. Scheld confirmed.

Ms. Smith announced that the vote would be postponed, and it would be saved for the end of the meeting if they had the recommendation that could be sent forward with the suggested edits. Dr. Huntley interjected with a suggestion from Mr. Mateyko that the CAC adopt the recommendation as written and request that Mr. O'Donnell add an addendum containing the list of cities that already adopted this ban. Ms. Smith thanked her for this.

MOTION BY MR. O'DONNELL, SECONDED BY DR. HUNTLEY: THAT THE CONSERVATION ADVISORY COMMISSION (CAC) ENDORSE THE NEW FOSSIL INFRASTRUCTURE BAN RESOLUTION AS WRITTEN WITH THE REQUEST OF CLEAN CITIES THAT ARE THE SIZE OF NEWARK TO BE ADDED AS AN ADDENDUM.

AYE: SIPES, O'CONNOR, O'DONNELL, SMITH, HUNTLEY, MATEYKO, RYPKEMA, PALANISAMI.

NAY: 0.

ABSTAIN: 0

Mr. Mateyko commended Mr. O'Donnell for his work.

7. **VOTE FOR CHAIR AND VICE-CHAIR**

Ms. Smith remarked that she signed on initially to chair for one year, and now she had been chairing for three. Dr. Huntley thought that the by-laws stated that the CAC were supposed to have this vote in December, but they were quite behind. She commended Ms. Smith for doing a great job in the first third of the year already and proposed that she serve out the rest of the year, then the CAC would revisit this in December. Ms. Smith agreed if the vote was put on the December agenda.

Mr. Mateyko commented that he agreed. He went on to reflect that in his experience, many of the boards had two people, but not a chair and a vice-chair as that was a static snapshot. It was instead a dynamic, and at the same time they elected a president or chair and then a president elect or chair elect. The advantage was that the person who would take over had to watch the agenda and how things were handled as they would eventually be in the spot soon, as well as to be the person who would fill in the spot if the president or chair was unavailable. This would be practice, as well. He found this process helpful.

Ms. Smith responded that she heard of the same thing, where the chair was elected as well as the vice-chair, and then the vice-chair was preparing to take the chair if they wanted. She noted that the CAC had never done that before. She mentioned as well that Dr. Huntley had made a good point as she was not ready to step down due to things she wanted to complete before the end of her term.

There were no other nominations for chair.

MOTION BY MS. SMITH, SECONDED BY MR. O'DONNELL: THAT THE CONSERVATION ADVISORY COMMISSION (CAC) NOMINATE SHEILA SMITH FOR CHAIR OF THE CAC UNTIL THE END OF DECEMBER 2023.

AYE: SIPES, O'CONNOR, O'DONNELL, SMITH, HUNTLEY, MATEYKO, RYPKEMA, PALANISAMI.

NAY: 0.

ABSTAIN: 0.

Ms. Smith proceeded to move onto the nomination for vice-chair, then asked if the CAC wished to turn it to the position of co-chair. Ms. Scheld pointed out that she did not know if there was anything in the by-laws that specified what the CAC referred to their positions as and looked online to see if there was anything in Code, and while she did not see anything, that did not mean it did not exist. Dr. Huntley did not think it was in Code, but it was in their by-laws, and she thought it was supposed to be a co-chair. Ms. Smith noted that it used to be the chair and then the secretary, and the secretary would take over when the chair was absent.

Ms. Scheld found the correct nomenclature in the by-law, which was co-chair.

MOTION BY MR. O'DONNELL, SECONDED BY DR. HUNTLEY: THAT THE CONSERVATION ADVISORY COMMISSION (CAC) NOMINATE MS. HELGA HUNTLEY FOR VICE-CHAIR OF THE CAC.

AYE: SIPES, O'CONNOR, O'DONNELL, SMITH, HUNTLEY, MATEYKO, RYPKEMA, PALANISAMI.

NAY: 0.

ABSTAIN: 0.

Before moving onto the annual report, Ms. Smith took a moment to introduce Ms. Sipes as the newest member of the CAC. She said that it was great to have her on board and she was very glad to see her here. Ms. Sipes responded that she was glad to be here, as well.

8. ANNUAL REPORT

Ms. Smith began by clarifying she did the initial rough draft, Dr. Huntley made edits, and then Ms. Scheld proofread and edited as well, so it was already finished in April.

Mr. Mateyko asked if the reference to 7756 was the founding directive as he remembered such, but these instances were just examples, and anything logically related to such should be included in the report. Dr. Huntley clarified that this was a direct quote from City Code. Mr. Mateyko asked if this was clarified at the bottom, Ms. Smith responding that was the City ordinance creating the CAC, giving specific examples of the many things that the Committee did and that would be considered. The CAC would decide whether certain items were in their purview. She mentioned that the sustainability plan, for example, was their main purview and they were considering how other items and goals related to that. Ms. Smith pointed out the quote, to which Mr. Mateyko repeated it for clarification. Ms. Smith mentioned that this was a very different CAC than the Committee she joined back in the 90's.

MOTION BY DR. HUNTLEY, SECONDED BY MR. O'DONNELL: THAT THE CONSERVATION ADVISORY APPROVE THE ANNUAL REPORT AS PRESENTED.

AYE: SIPES, O'CONNOR, O'DONNELL, SMITH, HUNTLEY, MATEYKO, RYPKEMA, PALANISAMI.

NAY: 0.

ABSTAIN: 0.

Ms. Smith thanked everyone who contributed to completing the report. She advised completing it sooner but was pleased with the volunteer group putting the document together nicely. She then mentioned the welcome packet and asked Ms. Sipes if she had received it. Ms. Sipes denied. When Ms. Smith did not think she possessed an up-to-date copy to give to her, Dr. Huntley stated that she would look at the welcome packet and make sure it was up to date. Once that was complete, she would notify Ms. Scheld who would send a copy to Ms. Sipes. She apologized for the lateness.

Ms. Smith asked for clarification that the annual report was shared with the rest of the CAC, and Ms. Scheld explained it was the hyperlink in the agenda. She asked that the new members read over that annual report to see what the CAC accomplished within the past year. It was a big job with many discussions about different issues and topics all over the City, so this would help them get oriented with both the position and the sustainability plan.

9. DARK SKY INITIATIVE – SHEILA SMITH

Ms. Smith began by saying that she brought this up at the last meeting. She explained this and went back to the Lights Out Initiative. She was always thinking about the safety of wildlife and did much work in habitat preservation, conservation, and improvement. She had been working on improvements in Phillips Park, which is how she met Ms. Sipes, and they were currently working to remove invasive species and plant native species. There was a new park superintendent who was very interested and supportive of this initiative. She also mentioned she previously sent a Phillips Park habitat improvement plan to Joe Spadafino, Director of Parks and Recreation, which resulted in less mowing, a meadow, and a path with an abundance of native wildflowers. The park was very beautiful and was great to observe numerous native species. The park was in a well-lit part of the City right next to the maintenance facility, basketball courts, tennis courts, lighted bike path, and a large streetlight. She requested and looked forward to the light dimming. She stressed that this park and the work being done on it was very important; she had the state botanist visit to observe and identify plants, walking through the park and discovering wetlands. This was highly diverse in terms of plant material and potential wildlife (including a population of box turtles, who were stuck in that spot with nowhere else to go unless they put themselves in danger in the urban areas of Newark.)

Ms. Smith explained her concerns were with the lighting of the park, having a conversation with Herb Park, the superintendent. She explained to him that she was standing along the edge of the woods, and she could see the lights of the basketball courts all the way through to the meadow path. The light was shining off a bluebird box on the other side. She proceeded to turn on her walk-a-meter and walked as far as she could away from the park, down Bee Street and was able to see a very crisp shadow of herself 176 yards away. She asked Mr. White if something could be done about the basketball court lighting shining into the woods, as it would be counterproductive to do work for habitat preservation, protection, and improvement with the current lighting. Mr. White told her he had spoken with a Dark Sky engineer. She would like the CAC to do whatever they could to have them reduce the lighting. Mr. White had told her the basketball court attendees were important, to which she agreed but said they did not need that much light to play. This lighting was in addition to the light the park received from the nearby railroad tracks, maintenance yard, and large streetlight. Ms. Smith was interested in the CAC looking into certain areas where the lighting could be significantly reduced.

Mr. Mateyko agreed and then asked if a component could be shielding so there was a cutoff. It worked two ways depending on the shielding's material which would bounce more light back onto the desired surface. This would make it possible to turn down the lighting of the actual lamp as more light would be reflected where it was needed instead of blocks away. Ms. Smith responded that she previously mentioned the idea of shielding to keep lighting where necessary. Newark had many parks and was committed to improving habitats, as it was a habitat City as well as a tree City. The sustainability plan also included habitat improvement. She believed that transitioning to shielding could make a huge difference, and then gigantic basketball court lights were not needed. She once again pointed out that she could walk along her neighborhood and still have a shadow as well as be able to see the basketball court and streetlights from her house, which was 200 yards away.

Dr. Huntley asked if the basketball court lights were similar or managed like the streetlights. Mr. Martindale replied that they were not of the same system. She asked if they had a dimming capability. Mr. Martindale explained that there were other basketball courts at parks that had timers associated with them. Ms. Smith interjected to clarify that this specific basketball court did as well. He mentioned that he would discuss with Park and Recreation about moving that forward, but it would be tough in the summer due to sunlight lasting longer throughout the day and the parks were supposed to close at dusk. Ms. Sipes asked if there was any evidence that kids were at the park around 10p.m, and Mr. Martindale envisioned

that many were running by, turning on the sensors of the lights, and then leaving.

Ms. Smith clarified that this was year-round. She explained that a certain number of lumens were not healthy for humans, and it impacted the wildlife in the woods. She invited others to come and witness for themselves how bright the lights were.

Dr. Huntley asked why there were lights to begin with if the parks were supposed to close at dusk. Mr. Martindale responded that he would ask Parks and Recreation as he himself was not sure. It was possible this could be due to events scheduled afterwards, but this would not be the case with Phillips Park specifically.

Ms. Sipes commented that she believed the lights were way too big for only two basketball courts. Mr. Martindale believed that not much could be done for the lighting along the trails, parking lot, and maintenance yard due to public safety or security. However, if there was something the City could improve, they could certainly have a conversation about it.

Dr. Huntley stated that the issues were how long the lights needed to be on, how bright they needed to be, and if they could be focused better. Even if they needed to be that bright, maybe shading could be added to prevent the lighting from shining to outer areas, or they could be dimmed so the forest would not be as affected. Ms. Smith also pointed out that another issue was the amount of energy that the lights were using. While the basketball courts, tennis courts, and skate parks were cared for well and extremely popular, and while she did not want to take anything away from them, she did think they could find a better way to light them to save energy and reduce the impact on both the attendees and wildlife.

Mr. Martindale replied that he certainly would investigate this and if there were costs associated with any of these recommendations, he would ask the CAC for support. Ms. Smith mentioned that she did not think shielding was the solution to the basketball lights and it could be fixed by changing the bulbs. Shielding would be more appropriate in other places such as the maintenance yard. They would work with Dark Sky and Lights Out to reduce the amount of light such as on STAR Campus, the train parking lot, the maintenance yard, and this facility.

Mr. Mateyko thought this conversation was intriguing; he would like to see what other cities had done to integrate cut-off lighting to place light where it was needed, especially those with greater pedestrianization and vegetation. Newark was used to high standard lanterns due to eliminating all the tree cover. However, there was discussion of bringing the tree cover back. He suggested coming back with research on where to put the lighting in this new paradigm of urbanism; this shift was taking place all over the world. He mentioned the previous point of safety, as a huge issue was the comfort of the population and the presence of other people contributed to that comfort. Mr. Mateyko explained that a walk with lower lighting would be significantly more enjoyable and wondered if that would bring out more people on the street, therefore the increased presence would increase safety even in the dimmer lighting. He once again suggested research on this topic.

Mr. Mateyko pointed out how bright the LED lights were on his new electric car and disagreed with the idea of needing brighter lighting at night. Where lighting was needed was on roads for indication of the general direction. However, the car overwhelmed any ambient lighting due to the LED lighting's power.

Ms. Smith explained that the Dark Sky Initiative was where guidance on cities, lumens, etc. could

be found. She mentioned that a woman complained to a council person regarding preventing light pollution by regulating outdoor lighting fixtures and the brightness. New LED streetlights, parking lights, and façade lighting were too bright. The city of Wilmington was considering converting their streetlights to LEDs and the recommendation from the American Medical Association and Dark Sky groups was that LEDs did not exceed 3000 Kelvins. Mr. Martindale specified that Newark's lights were 4000K frosted lamps. He asked for the date of the article as Newark followed Wilmington's lead on the LED streetlights. Ms. Smith explained that in this statement, an article was not cited. Mr. Martindale pointed out that Newark was the second in the state to have dimmable nodes in place, after Wilmington, so this must have been a few years old.

Dr. Huntley asked if Newark's measurement of 4000K was the temperature in Kelvins. Mr. Martindale answered that he was not sure if the K stood for Kelvin, but he assumed it was, and Newark had 4000K frosted lamps. Ms. Smith said that it must have meant something else, but the woman wrote down Kelvins.

Mr. Mateyko explained that the Kelvin was more of a metric of the light's quality, warm vs. cold, whereas the lumen measured the brightness of the light.

Ms. Smith went on to say that in this complaint, the writer did not mention illumination as much as the health aspects that had been recognized about cool LED lighting. She did not know if the City had been looking at this at all, but it would be another thing to consider that health-wise, the warmer light was more desirable for humans and animals. The blue lighting was especially bad for migration. Mr. Martindale explained this was why Newark did not go with the initial 5000K recommended, as it was extremely bright, and one resident stated it was like having a sun on the street.

Ms. Smith concluded this was about seeing what could be done to change the park and basketball lights, and the CAC could be talked into helping with this project. She herself would vote for it. This would also include the shielding of lights in select areas as in this resident's complaint (Ms. Smith assumed she was from Newark), when she called the City, they responded that they wouldn't address it largely unless they received many complaints. This indicated they did not receive much. Mr. Martindale pointed out they worked for residents that had those concerns.

Mr. Mateyko added that many different individuals, researchers, and organizations had different agendas. When he observed these issues, he viewed them as integral to climate adaptation and mitigation. The Code definition of a sidewalk should have included not only the width but that a proportion, such as 80%, should have had 80% density of shade so it could be useful at very high temperatures. If a mother had to go out and get food for her baby, it had to be safe even at 115 °F. It was a matter of health, safety, and welfare in the same way to preserve the nature surrounding it as a component. It was a shift that humans were more vulnerable to. He believed that humans were clobbering nature in many ways and continuing to get away with it, and now it was coming to be too much. Ms. Smith agreed that he made a very good point.

10. UD EARTH DAY, FRIDAY, APRIL 21ST – MIKAYLA RYPKEMA

Ms. Rypkema began that UD wanted the CAC to present a table from 11a.m. – 2p.m., set up starting at 10:30a.m. – 10:45a.m. depending on how much time was needed, and teardown time would follow. She asked the rest of the CAC what they wished to do for this and who could attend.

Ms. Smith explained that this was done last year with Ms. Rypkema and Katie Bird, a UD student, who brought her taxonomy. There, they presented Lights Out. Ms. Smith had already stated a few days ago to UD that the CAC wished to have a table again this year. Last year, they did not do much else except an attractive display of bird taxidermy. When Mr. O'Donnell pointed out that they also had a City Nissan Leaf there as well along the street, Ms. Smith corrected that this was about Earth Day instead of Community Day.

Ms. Rypkema followed up that the focus was on Lights Out as many wanted to do petitions, but this year UD was allowing any table to do what they wished. Dr. Huntley asked who the primary audience for this event was. Ms. Rypkema responded that the audience consisted of university students and staff. Dr. Huntley then asked if the event was held right on The Green, which Ms. Rypkema clarified was specifically on the north side of The Green between Main Street and East Delaware Avenue.

Ms. Smith commented that last year the table had a lot of traffic, and she was fine with bringing back Lights Out. She had handouts, posters, and the petition. She asked for clarification if that information went to UD. Ms. Rypkema explained it was being held onto until the Sustainability Office was made. As it was recently done, the information was sent over.

Ms. Smith confirmed they would do the table again because there was an initiative, students, and contact with UD safety and building management. They would continue to do Lights Out. Ms. Smith would bring out items from the CAC and asked if anyone else had ideas to share.

Ms. Rypkema suggested that multiple items from the CAC could be brought with the main being Lights Out, focusing on the previously mentioned dimming of City lights so UD could be encouraged to do the same. She also suggested making sure the information was up to date on how the City stands would help to inform the students.

Ms. Smith asked if anyone else wished to join her for the event. She mentioned she was in contact with the organizer from Students For The Environment and she enjoyed doing the table at the event last year.

Dr. Huntley recommended putting out a suggestion box for the students to share ideas on what the City could do. While they were already thinking about how to get the university onboard with their initiatives, she also wanted the students to think about what the City could contribute and could have good ideas for the CAC. Ms. Smith agreed that suggestions could help. Dr. Huntley advised perhaps leaving it open to suggestions for either the City or UD.

Mr. O'Donnell thought that collecting petition signatures for any topic was a great idea as UD students were a good audience. Ms. Smith explained they had a QR code also, with Ms. Rypkema adding there were 100 signatures on paper and 20 or more online. Ms. Smith expressed she did not like QR codes much as someone could look at them on their phone but then be distracted by another notification.

Ms. Smith again clarified that she would be at the table and asked if anyone else wished to join her. When she asked if Ms. Rypkema would attend as well, she responded she could help set up but had a lab assignment at 11a.m. She would try to attend afterwards.

The rest of the CAC members did not respond if they would attend.

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

- April – Green Incentives – Helga Huntley
- May – PFAS Forever Chemicals – Lauren O’Connor

Ms. Smith asked Dr. Huntley if she was well with Green Incentives. Dr. Huntley responded that she sent her the draft, which could be sent to Josh Shannon of the Newark Post. Ms. Smith pointed out that she sent back suggestions on how to shorten the document by just giving highlights. Dr. Huntley would look back at the email and shorten it as appropriate. Ms. Smith commended the document as it was very well done.

Ms. Smith asked Ms. O’Connor if she was well with PFAS Forever Chemicals. Ms. O’Connor confirmed so.

Mr. Mateyko shared his idea for June was Nature Equity Wellbeing.

Ms. Smith explained they had a few months to think about which article could be done for July, as nothing else after June was currently lined up.

Mr. Mateyko told Dr. Huntley that he would like her article sent to him when it was finished as it would relate to what he would write about for June. Ms. Palanisami asked for a copy as well. Dr. Huntley responded she would send it to the whole Committee. Ms. Smith agreed as great work was done and she was concerned that many other members wouldn’t be able to see it, and she was not even aware that previously Ms. Chajes wrote two articles.

Ms. Smith told the CAC to bring their questions and ideas for Mr. Mateyko’s discussion.

12. OLD/NEW BUSINESS

Mr. Mateyko suggested, if possible, adding to the agenda a discussion of landscaping for sustainability (including tree ordinance, tree canopy, ground cover, and leaving the leaves and water.) He believed it would take a few times to refine, as it did with the prior discussion of fossil fuels, to send to Council. This would be for the City to consider a new direction. However, Mr. Mateyko would be sensitive to sending too much to Council at once. Ms. Smith responded nothing could be overstated and there could not be enough conversations on these topics, and she suggested putting that idea into writing to get a better idea. Mr. Mateyko explained much of his idea would come out in the article, but this would be 3-5 specific metrics.

Ms. Smith expressed that she would like to start thinking about where the CAC could do cooling in a public place that would use the concepts Mr. Mateyko proposed, such as in front of the municipal building. Dr. Huntley asked if there were already places with this concept, such as a forested area of a City park where the temperature difference in the summertime could be felt. Ms. Smith clarified that this would be a public experiment as a demonstration, where it would show the public how this could be accomplished in their own homes. She was aware one could go into the woods to feel cooler, but Mr. Mateyko suggested a system of rainwater being left in the soil, ground cover, leaves, trees, and a place to sit for the demonstration of the difference. She pointed out that Mr. Mateyko previously mentioned the walkability of Newark streets, and this would be a concept presented as an idea to make the streets more comfortable as opposed to traveling in the brutal heat to retreat to indoor air conditioning.

Mr. O'Donnell mentioned that there was a numerical amount of drain runoff on electrical bills. This number came from the number of permeable services on how many trees were on there. He thought if they could address that further and find out what that number was, they could do that math and put the results out in an article.

Dr. Huntley thought that the stormwater fee was a flat fee for residential properties independent of impervious surface, and that this was done for efficiency reasons while the impervious surface only mattered for commercial properties. She asked Mr. Martindale if she was incorrect, to which he responded he did not know. Mr. O'Donnell commented that he did not believe anyone knew and this was the first he had heard of it. However, if that information were to be released, it could be proposed that by using an alternative option a resident could cut their electric bill by a certain amount. Dr. Huntley replied that she did not think this could be done and she only thought it was for commercial properties that impervious surfaces were measured.

Mr. Martindale noted that knowing City staff level, which seemed like such a high level of detail that he would've known about if that were the case, but this was not guaranteed.

Mr. O'Donnell remarked that he knew about how willing the population would be willing to jump at the idea if they could save money on their bills when that information would be released for free, which would accomplish Mr. Mateyko's goal of getting more shade and permeation.

Ms. Smith asked if Mr. Mateyko wanted this added to May's agenda, to which he confirmed. When she asked for the topic, he replied with Parcel Landscaping for Sustainability. Mr. Martindale commented that programs could be tied in, such as the Tree Giveaway, which aimed to improve shade cover generally through programs already run by the City. Ms. Smith pointed out that there were not many shade trees on that list.

Ms. Scheld clarified that the information for the stormwater fee was online, and she was currently looking at it at #5. She explained that the stormwater fee was charged was based on the impervious area estimated for a parcel. Dr. Huntley asked if she could read down to #8. Ms. Scheld would send this to the rest of the CAC for them all to review. Mr. O'Donnell mentioned this could be a future topic.

Ms. Palanisami mentioned an employee of the Newark Historical Society and Museum that previously brought forward concerns about her housing and the train station. She asked if she was able to help her or if she needed to be a commissioner to do so. Mr. Martindale confirmed that she would be able to assist or ask if she needed volunteers, but it would not be as part of the CAC. Ms. Smith clarified that Ms. Palanisami was still a Newark resident and anything she would do as a Newark resident was her right. Dr. Huntley confirmed that as long as she was not representing the CAC with this work, it was fine as she was her own person. Ms. Smith explained that if Ms. Palanisami did not introduce CAC policy to them on behalf of anything, she could always represent herself as a resident and it was her basic right, which superseded her position at the CAC. However, if she started to introduce topics on behalf of the CAC, that was where the issue would lie. She was free to volunteer however she wanted.

Ms. Palanisami stated that the City had been very excited about the rideshare program that the Regional Transportation District (RTD) was doing in Newark, and she asked John Sisson if he could do a calculation of how many greenhouse gases would be saved if this program was used by the public. She thought this would fit in with the CAC's Greenhouse Gases Initiative. She did not know if this was

something the CAC would have time for or would be interested in over the next year, but she was very supportive and excited about the program.

Dr. Huntley asked for clarification if she would like the CAC to invite him to speak with them. Ms. Palanisami asked if they would be interested, noting that Mr. Sisson stated to her he could customize an analysis for the City of Newark along with what rideshare might do for it regarding greenhouse gases.

Ms. Smith did not know which program Ms. Palanisami was referring to. Ms. Palanisami explained the RTD was public transportation for the state of Delaware and Newark was first or second to implement it. It was a rideshare program, likened to Uber, but run by the state including taxes and City money. Downloading the app, one could use the rideshare program as opposed to their car within City limits.

Mr. Martindale clarified this was the new Ucity. Ms. Smith realized that this was the bus that would be requested, and she was familiar with it.

Dr. Huntley asked for clarification on what Ms. Palanisami was suggesting. Ms. Palanisami asked if the CAC wished for Mr. Sisson to visit for a 10–15-minute presentation on how the program could save greenhouse gases, pushing for public transportation as opposed to using a personal motorized vehicle.

Dr. Huntley replied she did not believe this was the right time for this as it was just getting off the ground. She believed it would have to be given time to find an audience and observe the reception to see how many people would use this program, and it would make more sense to conduct an analysis after the program had been implemented for a year or so.

Mr. Martindale pointed out that if RTD came in to discuss the measuring metrics with the CAC, which might allow them the opportunity to see and possibly toggle some of those metrics for future analysis. Ms. Smith asked if this would be the job of the NET to which he confirmed, and the City would receive that information anyway which could be shared. AECOM recommended the first five steps that the CAC would go into and then the NET would take the inventory, make forecast emissions, and establish greenhouse deduction targets. That would probably be a part of that calculation at some point in time when there was a calculable amount of usage. However, she mentioned this may have been done already, and hoped that buses, lawnmowers, etc. were being observed as well.

Ms. Sipes asked if this new Committee was looking for board members that were not residents of Newark, to which Ms. Smith confirmed.

Ms. Palanisami mentioned the previous discussion of the budget, explaining large amounts of money was coming out for municipal work and ownership. She did not understand this well, but asked Mr. Martindale if he was interested if she could find money that could fund the Newark Housing Authority. He mentioned that he would be happy to take that information, stating that he received about five emails from the Mayor. He was very familiar with being notified of different opportunities and invited Ms. Palanisami to forward this to him as well as Marene Jordan, Executive Director of the Newark Housing Authority, however not as a representative of the CAC. He mentioned that she could send him many invites and opportunities but he may not have time to apply for all. He acknowledged that was a lot of money coming out, and while exciting, they had no designated grant writer, so it was in between other duties.

Dr. Huntley corrected herself based on the document Ms. Scheld presented earlier, City residents paid stormwater fees relative to how many sq. ft. they had buildings on. For example, driveways were not measured, but building footprints were. Mr. Martindale asked for clarification if the number of trees would not impact that fee. Dr. Huntley said that from her understanding, which was so. Ms. Smith said this would not change the number even if there was a more pervious surface. However, that was something to consider, as there was at a point in time a restriction on the amount of surface that could be covered on a property.

Mr. O'Donnell mentioned that it was worth having a topic for that, as even if it did not matter now, it could be made so it did matter.

Mr. Martindale confirmed that Wilmington did install 4000K lights in their city. The 3000K from before was not actually put in effect. This meant Wilmington and Newark had the same lights, which was the standard nowadays. Ms. Smith explained the 3000K was what the American Medical Association recommended for health purposes.

Mr. Mateyko recalled Mr. Martindale mentioning sending out a memo about the research he had done on the availability of funding. Mr. Martindale responded he was about to start this topic for discussion.

Mr. Martindale began to explain to Ms. Sipes that the CAC had a discretionary budget of \$100K annually and it was his job, along with its members, to find good things to spend that on. Last year, they spoke with Efficiency Smart, a contractor in the City that gave out rebates for energy efficient goods to Newark electric customers. They discussed a town in Ohio that did a super rebate program, which was a tool to amplify the rebates that would be given to electric customers from what Efficiency Smart did. He explained there was some interest to bring up a sort of super rebate plan in Newark, and when they last spoke, there was much focus on window air conditioner units because they helped target low to moderate income electric customers more than other appliances on the rebate list. However, they were not an applicable item on that list at that time, whereas now they are as of February. Mr. Martindale thought this would be a good pilot program to start in terms of amplifying the rebate for window air conditioner unit. Ms. Smith interjected to ask if these were the heat pump units, which Mr. Martindale denied. He explained the reason why he brought this up now as opposed to at an actual agenda item, and he clarified he would not ask for a vote now as it did not have its own agenda item, was that he wanted an idea of how the CAC would like to proceed with this. There would be some time needed to start this project procedurally at the City's end, so if the CAC were to wait until the next meeting to discuss this, it would probably not be implemented until July. That meant it would possibly be too late for new air conditioning unit purchases. If there was interest, he asked for some direction to bring back to the next meeting for a formal vote, while in the interim he could start this to be prepared for the super rebate program on June 1. He clarified that they allocated around \$31.5K this year so far, so there was plenty of money to work with.

Ms. Smith commented that she liked this idea, and it simplified a lot. Mr. Martindale responded that at first, he made it too broad so this would be a good way to track if there was use in the super rebate program and if there was interest for it to be expanded in the future years.

Mr. Mateyko commented that he liked this idea as well. He went onto explain that two years ago, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) announced that they wanted to get the hydrofluorocarbons (HFCs.) These were 30,000x the equivalent of carbon dioxide. HFCs were in certain

air conditioners, and the EPA were trying to get them out. He pointed out that not all air conditioners were created equally and the refrigerant in them needed to be looked at. Many were awful, and Mr. Mateyko believed it was the worst thing they could do in the City to import them. He asked if there was a way to check them out.

Mr. Martindale would look at Efficiency Smart's pre-qualified list for rebate eligibility. His assumption was that they had taken this into consideration. If not, the argument moving forward in this direction anyway is that these air conditioning units would be used regardless, but if they could get something that was Energy Star rated, it would be a better alternative to something that wasn't.

Mr. Mateyko would leave this to Mr. Martindale as the CAC's role was to discuss this, but his role would be to manage it. He especially liked limiting to two wall units; there were many of the elderly, sick, and children, and it was absolutely life-sustaining. However, that was different than comfort. Two units would cool the whole house by just leaving them on.

Dr. Huntley asked for an estimate of how expensive this would be. Mr. Martindale proposed a \$10K investment from the CAC. Efficiency Smart had 4 units per household as the maximum, while its own recommendation was 2. The super rebate would be \$100 per unit. It could 50 households to 100, depending on the number of units, with that \$10K. He would leave it at their discretion if they wished to increase or decrease that number, but it was a matter of what he thought was an appropriate amount for a pilot program.

Dr. Huntley did not think they could decide tonight but enough had expressed interest that it should be put on the next agenda if possible. Ms. Scheld responded that was fine. Mr. Martindale stated he would do work in the meantime to have materials ready to push this project forward should it be voted on and approved at the next meeting. However, he thought this conversation was enough to start at that end without assuming the CAC would provide funds.

Ms. Smith mentioned that Ms. Scheld sent that to the CAC today and she would prefer them to read it and think about it. She mentioned that he previously said the CAC had around \$65K left and he was asking for possibly \$10K for this rebate amplification. She commented that Mr. Mateyko made a good point and Mr. Martindale knew to look at Energy Star's list of what was eligible for rebate.

Ms. Palanisami asked if a house was sized for a certain tonnage, what would the air conditioner limit be for. Mr. Martindale explained this was so the rebate could be spread to as many residents as possible. Efficiency Smart's funding was specifically for rebate, so they had the availability to increase that number.

Mr. Mateyko commented he had one unit that he used two days a year. One 1500 BTU unit, about the size of a toaster, cooled the whole house while taking a day to get to that temperature. Two units would be ample for the limit.

Mr. O'Donnell offered to Ms. Smith that he could add this to their decision-making matrix and send it out. He believed it was in FOIA compliance as well. Ms. Smith responded that was a good idea and thanked him. Following this, Ms. Smith explained to Ms. Sipes that the CAC had a process for evaluating how aligned their ideas were with their mission.

Mr. Mateyko thanked both of guest speakers for their helpful comments.

13. NEXT MEETING – MAY 9, 2023

Ms. Scheld began to briefly review the agenda for next month.

This included:

- The approval of the minutes.
- Public Comment.
- The funding request from Powering Our Future.
- Mr. Markham will be speaking.
- Landscaping for Sustainability – Mr. Mateyko’s topic.
- Mr. Martindale presenting the Efficiency Smart Super Rebate for a vote.
- Conservation Articles.

Ms. Smith asked if Mr. Martindale could share anything at the next meeting regarding lights, or if he could let Ms. Scheld know. He answered that he could tentatively put himself on the agenda for that topic and if he needed to recede, he would let Ms. Scheld know. Ms. Smith remarked that she knew he was very busy every day.

Dr. Huntley suggested inviting Jeffrey Summerhays to speak about UD, and it would be nice to have him and the Mayor at the same meeting for synergy. When Ms. Smith suggested Dr. Chris Williams as well, Dr. Huntley clarified whichever person could be available to attend. She suggested Mr. Summerhays specifically as he attended this evening.

Mr. Martindale asked if there would be interest in going over the budget. Assuming the \$10K was allocated for the rebate program, that would mean about 40% was spent in the fifth month, which would be mostly on track however slightly behind. Mr. O’Donnell mentioned putting up the decision matrix at the same time he spoke about that.

Dr. Huntley asked if the budget review could take place before any monetary decisions were made at the next meeting. Mr. Martindale commented that made sense.

Ms. Smith pointed out that it was quite late and requested a better eye be kept on the clock to respect the time of everyone in the meeting, especially those who had been in the building for 12+ hours.

The meeting was adjourned at 9:21 p.m.

Nichol Scheld
Deputy City Secretary

Jordan Herring
Administrative Professional I

/ns/jh