

**CITY OF NEWARK  
DELAWARE**

**NEWARK COMMUNITY SUSTAINABILITY PLAN  
STEERING COMMITTEE  
MEETING MINUTES**

**NOVEMBER 5, 2018**

**WILMAPCO MAIN OFFICE  
850 LIBRARY AVENUE, SUITE 100  
NEWARK, DELAWARE 19711  
4:00 P.M.**

Present at the 4:00 p.m. meeting were:

**Committee Members Present:** Michelle Bennett  
Jeremy Firestone  
Mike Fortner  
Helga Huntley  
Sheila Smith  
Bill Swiatek  
Bahareh van Boekhold

**Committee Members Absent:** Mark Brainard  
Paula Ennis  
Tim Filasky  
Susan Grasso

**AECOM Staff Present:** Dave Athey  
Scott Anderson  
Jenn Keller

Ms. Bahareh van Boekhold opened the meeting at 4:12 p.m.

**1. INTRODUCTIONS**

Ms. van Boekhold: I think we can start with the first part of the agenda which is pretty light. So, I'm Bahareh, I'm the resident representative on the Committee.

Ms. Helga Huntley: I'm Helga. I'm also a resident.

Mr. Jeremy Firestone: Do we have a quorum?

Mr. Mike Fortner: We do have a quorum.

Mr. Firestone: Jeremy Firestone, I guess citizen.

Ms. van Boekhold: You were Planning Commission.

Mr. Firestone: I am former Planning Commission Chair but no longer serving on the Planning Commission.

Mr. Dave Athey: Oh, I didn't know that.

Mr. Firestone: I'm now just a citizen and University of Delaware professor and I work on energy and planet issues.

Ms. Jenn Keller: I'm Jenn Keller, AECOM.

Mr. Scott Anderson: Scott Anderson, AECOM.

Mr. Athey: Dave Athey, AECOM.

Ms. Sheila Smith: Sheila Smith. I'm on the Conservation Advisory Commission.

Mr. Bill Swiatek: Bill Swiatek, WILMAPCO. Welcome everyone.

Mr. Fortner: Mike Fortner, City of Newark Planning. And we have someone on the phone. Michelle?

Ms. Michelle Bennett: Michelle Bennett, University of Delaware Sustainability Manager.

Ms. van Boekhold: Thank you for hosting.

## **2. REVIEW AND APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES FROM OCTOBER 4, 2018**

Ms. van Boekhold: So, the first item on the agenda is review and approval of minutes from October 4. I will just look at the first page of the verbatim. It's crazy, but I will move to approve it. It's just very interesting actually that everything gets, I don't know, maybe people are more serious when things are recorded.

Mr. Fortner: It's easier for Michelle to write them out. She didn't do a summary that was turned in but.

Ms. Huntley: Second.

Ms. van Boekhold: Okay, so we move on.

**VOTE BY ACCLAMATION THAT THE MINUTES OF THE OCTOBER 4, 2018 NEWARK COMMUNITY SUSTAINABILITY PLAN STEERING COMMITTEE MEETINGS BE APPROVED.**

Ms. van Boekhold: I actually wanted, Jeremy, since you were the representation for the Planning Commission, do you think we can have another person from that Commission kind of, or can you be the proxy for them? Is there, I don't know, because actually that's an important . . .

Mr. Firestone: I can't speak on behalf of the Commission. I'm not a member.

Mr. Fortner: Well, I think we saw you as sort of a proxy for them. We wanted you to stay on the Committee. I could look into putting a Planning Commissioner on there.

Mr. Athey: Just kind of point of order, what did the resolution that created this committee say? Did it say Jeremy, or did it say a member of the Planning Commission? If it said member of the Planning Commission, then we need to . . .

Ms. Smith: It specified people by name.

Mr. Athey: By name?

Mr. Fortner: Yeah, but we wanted to have a Planning Commissioner on there, and so we'd have to go to Council again and we might be kind of far along by the time we got that on. But maybe we'd have someone by December. Or we just ask the Planning Commissioners to send someone. Like last time, Will Hurd came and maybe Will Hurd will just come and participate.

Mr. Firestone: He and I will probably coordinate pretty closely because I'm also on the LEED Commission which he chairs.

Ms. van Boekhold: Sure, so that will be an item to follow up to kind of add, because we think actually as the plan moves forward, the feedback from Planning Commission and buy-in and kind of that connection is really important. So, yes, I think it will be helpful. It's very valuable to have Jeremy, but then adding one more member from Planning Commission.

Mr. Fortner: Okay.

### **3. LESSONS LEARNED FROM THE LANCASTER SUSTAINABILITY EFFORT**

Ms. van Boekhold: So, with that we jump to one small item that I put there, lessons learned from the City of Lancaster sustainability effort. About a month-and-a-half ago, I had a conversation with a person, Douglas, who is leading the effort in their city, but I'm just asking what was their process? Mike was on the phone, too, and we were very interested where they started, how they started, where it came to be. And I thought it would be helpful to just take a couple of minutes for me to share what we learned.

Basically, they had a local group very focused on green infrastructure and kind of Chesapeake Bay abatement group and they got a grant and with the city they started collaborating. So, they kind of have this very robust GI program, Green Infrastructure program, and from the success of that Green Infrastructure program, they basically built onto that and moved on to kind of add different elements. So, they kind of, that was the core and they kind of make it a success and added more elements and different [inaudible] who was in charge of green infrastructure moved to a different department that could be better in charge.

So, I just thought it was interesting that how the City of Lancaster used what were they really good at, made a success story and expanded to other areas of sustainability. And when we talked to him, he also asked us what do you do? Kind of what is the baseline of the City and what you do right now is really important to develop a path and plan to make your City more sustainable for a sustainability plan. So, that was the item I thought it would be helpful just to share with you guys as the closest neighbor. I mean, Philadelphia has a sustainability plan but they are in a different scale. But Lancaster was a good example.

### **4. SUSTAINABILITY THEMES (VISIONS) AND PUBLIC FEEDBACK FROM THE "DROP IN" WORKSHOP**

- **AECOM AND BAHAREH PRESENT – SC ENGAGEMENT**
- **TWO APPROACHES: BOLD STATEMENT VERSUS BITE SIZE APPROACH – PRACTICALITY VERSUS FORMALITY**
- **QUICK DISCUSSION OF IMPLEMENTATION/ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES**
- **CITY'S VISION/GOAL STATEMENT – DRAFT AECOM AND TEAM**
- **DESIRED OUTCOME: CONSENSUS ON A STARMAN VISION FRAMEWORK FOR THE CITY**

Ms. van Boekhold: And after that, the biggest portion of our meeting, I thought it would be helpful to look at the document that AECOM put together so far for our sustainability vision. There are also some other components that includes the potential vision and values but I thought what would be helpful for us, as a team, I was really hoping there would be more representation from different departments in the City because we are going to kind of have a feedback process from the community from our Steering Committee to kind of see where we are. So, we, if you remember back in October we had a "drop in" session for all the residents to ask them what they think about this thing. But we never actually asked the Steering Committee what you think about these things or kind of grow that feedback process through the Steering Committee. At the previous meeting, we [inaudible] have a community meeting to get ready and then we had the drop-in meeting to get ready, so this is the first one that we are really going to dig in and look at them and kind of basically refine them, approve them, and move on.

So, that's the vision. I actually have a little headache today, so I want Mike and Helga to jump in and help me, or anybody else, so like just kind of having partially functional. Hopefully we can manage between Mike and I.

So, with that, I would like to, we have a couple of components that would be helpful to review. We want to review public feedback, what we heard, look at what AECOM put together for us. But before that, I want the Steering Committee to take the time and I go through the three questions that I posed to the public, and we take the time and write that and kind of, without actually looking at what was prepared, we say. The first question I have is, in your opinion, what are the one or two most important themes, goals, actions, objectives that need to be in the sustainability plan. So, I will, there is some blue there, I will give some blue here. If you can take, you want to write one or two things that, as a Steering Committee . . . because we never got to actually kind of really bring that feedback process . . . one or two things that you think should absolutely be in the sustainability plan. And it could be a theme, it could be a vision, it could be goal, or it could be an objective. Michelle, and if you can write it and then we get your feedback and write it up here, too.

Ms. Bennett: Okay.

Ms. van Boekhold: Thank you.

Mr. Athey: Just toss it, Mike. There needs to be a conveyor system here.

Mr. Firestone: I'm a little unclear because you're talking about a whole bunch of different things between goals and objectives and visions.

Ms. van Boekhold: I want us to have . . .

Mr. Firestone: But you want us to talk to it but they're things that are sort of on different planes.

Ms. van Boekhold: Sure. When I say the most two important things that should be in the sustainability plan, the first two that comes to your mind, or one, that you think absolutely the sustainability plan should include. You know, we want to gauge collectively what we think is really important. You know, because we have different points of data collection, but we never actually did that for our Committee. So what comes to mind? Is it clearer?

Ms. Bennett: I don't mind jumping in and if there's one like big, kind of overarching issue that I think that sustainability is going to find itself wrestling with that ties into every aspect of this community, whether its health and education to, you know, public safety, to natural resources, its climate change and how climate change is going to affect the community as a whole. Whether it's, you know, more extremely hot dates that endanger public health. Whether it's extreme weather events and the infrastructure that's going to need to withstand that. Or, if it's economic development that is resilient in the world where, you know, climate change can disrupt a major economic system. So, if I wanted to put kind of a big, overarching idea or theme out there, that would be my first thing.

Ms. Smith: So, should one of us write that down for her?

Ms. van Boekhold: I wrote that down.

Mr. Fortner: You got that?

Ms. van Boekhold: Yeah. We can actually do stickies so we can sort it. I wrote that one. So that's climate change. Did I get it correctly? Would it be mitigation and resilience?

Ms. Bennett: Yeah, mitigation, resilience, but also sustainability as a function to [inaudible] climate change. Adapt and mitigate [inaudible] resilience.

Mr. Fortner: I certainly agree with that word. At the American Planning Association conference, I was listening to session and they really emphasized adapting to climate change. And I think that might be something we should really look at is keeping that word.

Ms. van Boekhold: So, I'm hoping that we can get the notes and we put it out there so we do our own kind of process.

Ms. Bennett: Yeah, I mean you could say like climate change adaption, mitigation, and resiliency. And part of the reason I want to put that in there is that if we want our sustainability plan to maintain community support over time, you know, it has to offer the community things. So, it all has to protect the community from things. And every time there is a major storm, you're going to renew interest in the sustainability plan in the way that it protects the community from, frankly, climate change impacts we're already seeing. It can also be lens through which you can see an opportunity for innovation and economic development. You know, that would be renewable energy and some other stuff.

Ms. van Boekhold: Let me know when you are ready. Are we ready? Jeremy, can you go?

Mr. Firestone: My two are, first, objective measure criteria of progress. And the second is more substantive, the other is more procedural, carbon neutrality in electricity and building heat.

Ms. van Boekhold: Let me actually just, so your one and two, the only challenge I have here is they're two different categories. But I'm going to put these and create one for the carbon neutrality in electricity and building heat, correct? So, that's carbon neutrality on buildings?

Mr. Firestone: So, basically electricity and heat. Versus transportation.

Mr. Anderson: Right.

Mr. Firestone: And basically we said transportation. I mean I think it's important, but I would put these two as more . . .

Ms. Smith: How about if we make a graph? We can actually make a graph.

Ms. van Boekhold: I'm going to sort them and then we are going to count them.

Ms. Huntley: But sort them under . . .

Ms. Smith: We can sort them over here.

Ms. Huntley: On the flip chart.

Ms. Smith: We can put them in their respective categories in this .

Mr. Anderson: Did you say and building heat or building . . .

Mr. Firestone: Building heat. So, electricity and heat. I think most of the cooling is going to be done by electricity but, you know . . .

Mr. Anderson: Right, right. So, fossil fuel heat.

Mr. Firestone: Yeah.

Ms. van Boekhold: Okay, Helga, go ahead.

Ms. Huntley: I had renewable energy and sustainable financing of City infrastructure.

Ms. van Boekhold: So, renewable energy, we have, I'm going to grab mine and then we do . . .

Ms. Smith: Okay.

Ms. van Boekhold: Okay, so I put renewable energy close to carbon neutrality because it's energy, and sustainable financing for City infrastructure is over here. And then, let me see, let me go grab mine and I will ask Mike to give me his two. So, I have energy, which I include renewable energy conservation and energy reduction, and also greenhouse gas emission. Meaning all of that. That could be in transportation and sectors, so it wasn't like . . . and my second one was reducing environmental footprint to include waste, water and, again, greenhouse gas emission could be part of the environmental footprint. So, I'm going to put my energy one close to carbon neutrality and very close to Helga's renewable. And environmental footprint, I'm just going to put here.

Mr. Fortner: Alright, so my two included, maybe these aren't two, but of course green planning and infrastructure about how we use land efficiently that would help transit, bicycle, walkability, promote clean transportation, but also just to live a little more economically, but also with the building code, too. I know we paired that in the thing, but maybe that's a separate one. Okay, so maybe I'll make a new one, so it would be building code. So, since adapting to climate change is my other one but Michelle already brought that one . . .

Ms. van Boekhold: But that's good because we have . . .

Ms. Huntley: Building code is your second one?

Mr. Fortner: Yeah, doing some sort of green building code. There's LEED but what was, I can't remember what Reid was talking about.

Mr. Athey: Oh, the passive house.

Mr. Fortner: Passive house.

Mr. Bennett: Are we thinking this, as well . . .

Mr. Fortner: I could do a new one for green planning or something.

Ms. Smith: Hold on.

Ms. Bennett: Are you thinking about this one . . .

Mr. Fortner: Green planning. You're going to use that? Okay.

Ms. Bennett: So, LEED is really good on like commercial buildings, but that includes buildings on the University campus or everything from retail to offices, etc., but LEED is a little harder, a little tougher on the residential side. That program is not quite as well rounded out. It's not super accessible for contractors that aren't used to it. Passive house works really well in the residential sector. It's very clear on what is required and how to achieve those standards, and it also ensures a comfortable, you know, lower [inaudible] home for whoever occupies it.

Ms. Smith: So, Michelle, I was just going to say don't both of those, though, come under just reduction of fossil fuel use or energy efficiency?

Mr. Athey: Energy efficiency.

Ms. Bennett: Yes and no, because, I mean they certainly have energy impacts but they also have standards related to things like water consumption or . . .

Mr. Anderson: Waste.

Ms. Bennett: They have other ways that you can get points. But the point I wanted to make was that I loved the idea of having kind of green building standards and goals in the City, but I don't want to tie the City to one specific standard because different standards have different strengths and weaknesses. And as long as they have rigid criteria, they're all going to achieve energy reduction, they're all going to have impacts on water consumption, etc. God forbid people [inaudible] plants in their yard . . .

Ms. Huntley: Michelle, how about we continue with the broad themes first and then we dig into them in greater detail later.

Ms. Bennett: Okay.

Ms. van Boekhold: Yeah, I'm in agreement with you, too, but I think it's a different level of granularity, so I put the green . . . so there is a planning one. So, it's a different one. It's kind of close to the environmental, but it's actually very focused on planning, so I put it here. And then we are having two climate change sections so I'm putting climate change here. And building energy code is close to this carbon neutrality because it, so it is between reducing the, so I will put it here, because it has connection both here and also to this planning.

Mr. Swiatek: So, the three I had were reducing greenhouse gas emissions, which I think is something that we get to do and keep track of it, and you can decide where you want to put them, and then . . .

Ms. van Boekhold: Greenhouse gas emission, it's actually I think in [inaudible] because it's mitigating but also all of these energy reductions. So, it is actually belonging to both groups, greenhouse gas reduction.

Mr. Swiatek: And I just had adapting to climate, which gets at the flooding, it gets at the heat, you know whatever the impacts are projected to be in the Newark area. And then the third one was economic opportunities because I think, especially when thinking about other groups that maybe aren't thinking about sustainability, having it in here is going to really make that so it connects with everyone, I think. Even more strongly than sustainability might do. So, having that as part of the plan, I think, is important.

Ms. van Boekhold: It's a new category because it's a little bit different process than sustainable financing of city infrastructure. I don't know, or maybe I'll put it close to that.

Ms. Smith: And then my three, I had reducing fossil fuel consumption. That's energy conservation, transportation, climate change, all of those. Mine are kind of broad. Preservation and restoration of natural areas. That is related to clear air, clean water.

Ms. van Boekhold: I have a feeling that this is close to green planning and reducing environmental [inaudible].

Ms. Smith: And then reduction of consumption waste.

Ms. van Boekhold: Okay, would that include the energy or anything? Or waste?

Ms. Smith: I'm talking about trash.

Ms. Huntley: Put it to the footprint.

Ms. van Boekhold: Environmental footprint? Okay. So, this was the first because we never actually talked about this as it came up or we never actually looked at it. I was really hoping to have different City departments involved because then we could hear actually what Parks and

Recreation think is the most important thing? Or what Mark from the City Manager's Office, or Tim from the Public Works think is the most important. I think it is really important. Maybe we should ask them after we do this exercise.

Mr. Fortner: Well, yeah, how about . . . I can help with that.

Ms. van Boekhold: Yeah because their parts are really important and we want to hear from them. And then the next question is, again, it would be really important to hear from them, but I want everybody to name . . . go ahead.

Ms. Huntley: Before we move on, for those of you who were more active or had more time at the public forum than I did, were there any themes that came out from the public feedback that we didn't capture that we should add?

Ms. van Boekhold: So, I thought as we are looking at it, we can add that. I think food was one that came up. Like there was a lot of feedback on renewable energy, like energy efficiency and whatever making existing more efficient renewable energy was of interest. Recycling, when we asked people what they thought about sustainability, and a lot of transportation as for trails and walking and alternative modes of transportation. So, they were the three things that came up. The one that we don't have here . . .

Ms. Huntley: Do you want to add it to our . . .

Ms. van Boekhold: Transportation, I think we should add. Waste is there. Food was the thing that, I mean we had a food one and I think that was something that created some interest as they talk about, I don't know, like being able to have your beehives or chicken or promoting growing your own food in your backyard. So, when I would ask people what would you do as a person, one or two people said grow our own food in our backyard. Other answers would they would try to bike more, walk more, or recycle more. One or two said they would put LED lights. So, these were the kind of things that were coming to mind when I would talk to them.

Ms. Huntley: Do you want to choose where to put them?

Mr. Firestone: On food, I'm an advocate for front yard gardens.

Ms. Smith: Wherever the sun is. You have to put it wherever the sun is.

Mr. Firestone: Well, you have to put it wherever the sun is, but if you could have a choice, you should always put it in your front yard.

Ms. Smith: And what's the reason for that?

Mr. Fortner: And why is that?

Mr. Firestone: Because then other people see your garden.

Ms. van Boekhold: And I think as we can get to that, I'm hoping that from there we look and see, I'm looking, but we see where is the most interest and that's the one we go focus on, so AECOM actually knows which one we think, that one that we have the most interest, that's the one that we want you to go and kind of take it over and field the area. So, that was the intention also, to kind of based on what we heard from public and what we collectively think, we kind of identify the ones that are jumping out and going and kind of carrying it through.

The other question that I have, and if we can do that faster, that would be really good, because then we can have more time for conversation, is can we name one or two things that the City is already doing to support sustainability. Repeatedly, I heard from people, and I also talked to the person who was in charge of the City of Philadelphia, what we do good is really important.



To build on our successes is really important. And so I want to, and again it's really important for Mark, Tim, and Paula to also provide this one from their perspective that what are the one or two things that the City is already doing good that supports sustainability? And, Michelle, I can ask you after everybody is done to tell us what you think they are doing well.

Ms. Bennett: Can you say that again?

Ms. van Boekhold: I will ask you after everybody get a chance to write down, I will ask what is your point, so we can write it and capture it. Okay?

Ms. Bennett: Okay.

Ms. van Boekhold: Thank you.

Ms. Smith: So, Bahareh, you're asking what do they do now or what are they doing really well?

Ms. van Boekhold: What are they doing that supports sustainability? Not necessarily very well. What is it that we already do in the City that helps us in that direction? Michelle, would you mind sharing with us what you think we are doing good? Or what . . .

Ms. Bennett: I thought I was going last.

Ms. van Boekhold: I want to write it down. I think everybody wrote their comments down. Everybody wrote their comments on a sticky note here.

Ms. Bennett: Oh, okay.

Ms. van Boekhold: So, Jeremy, I have yours already. Green space. What is yours, Helga?

Ms. Huntley: I have McKees solar park and bicycle plan.

Ms. van Boekhold: Solar park and bicycle plain. I have trails, which are the bicycle trails, and recycling. What do you have?

Mr. Fortner: I have compact mixed-use development, bicycle and walkable-friendly.

Ms. van Boekhold: That is hard but it's very close to hear. And recycling . . .

Mr. Fortner: Recycling program.

Ms. Smith: What do you call those lights they put in?

Mr. Fortner: LEDs on the streets.

Ms. van Boekhold: I have green space and then inserted bicycle trails and McKees solar park, energy solar.

Mr. Swiatek: And the bike-friendliness. Also, public transit. We have a train station here and three different bus services. And the strong downtown, I think, helps support sustainability.

Ms. Smith: Public transportation comes under energy conservation?

Ms. van Boekhold: It depends. It has a planning aspect and actually there are sometimes you see transportation, the way you design so you can actually have walkable, it's a planning. And then the fuel you use, if you are going with natural gas or electric, it comes under the energy reduction or greenhouse gas reduction.

Ms. Smith: Recycling, energy conservation, McKees, LED lighting, and public transportation, and bike-friendly.

Ms. van Boekhold: So, we see, actually, this is really important because as we are developing a plan, these are some of the themes that jump out. Like these are the things that we already have in the base. You are already doing something to go about it. So, I will capture those ones. We take a picture.

Ms. Smith: We didn't get Michelle's.

Ms. van Boekhold: Michelle, go ahead.

Ms. Bennett: So I have recycling infrastructure, walkability and access to green space, and then access to public transit.

Ms. Huntley: And then I would . . . I'm sorry, may I start with the discussion? Several people brought up public transit, and I think public transit in this area is very poor. So, I was wondering if those of you who think that is one of our strengths, do you actually use public transit?

Ms. van Boekhold: I actually used it, Helga. So, for two periods of two-months, we had only one car and I used the bus to go to downtown Wilmington. And I find it actually it was faster. I mean there is the option to bike there but I think in downtown Wilmington we had great public transit. Like no other area, I guess, they have, we have, what is it, the express?

Mr. Swiatek: The express bus.

Ms. van Boekhold: The express one which is pretty amazing because I'm sitting there with four other people but every 30 minutes I could go and decide, I have many options in the morning to go to downtown Wilmington and come back. So, I used it for one . . .

Ms. Huntley: My needs are just different.

Ms. van Boekhold: I know . . .

Ms. Huntley: It's just my perspective, but my needs are different.

Ms. van Boekhold: For me, it worked out very well that I worked there and actually anybody who didn't want to park in the downtown, it was good. So that part was good. I mean, I understand that there are other parts . . .

Mr. Fortner: Just to build off of what Helga was saying there, so I emailed this a little bit from our resident survey and so we had a couple of questions about the ease of bicycle travel, ease of walking, ease of driving. So, the ease of bus travel, for example, 9% said it was excellent, 22% said it was good, 12% fair, 6% poor, but then 51% didn't know or didn't answer. They basically haven't used it. Walking gets probably one of our highest ones. 29% said it's excellent to bicycle. I'm sorry, it's walking. Walking here is excellent. 47% say it's good, and 15% say it's fair and only 3% say it's poor. There were about 6% that didn't know or gave no answer. And bicycling, 11% excellent, 34% good. Excuse me, so that's just kind of a city-wide, what people are kind of thinking. And I have it broken out by district, too, so that's in your email if you want to look at that further.

Mr. Firestone: You know, in Newark we're starting from such a low comparative level compared to places that actually have good biking, we're poor. And so it's really what your baseline is. You know, if your baseline is the rest of New Castle County, we're rock stars. But if your base is compared to something that's actually good, we're poor.

Ms. Smith: But we're working on it. That's one thing that's basically happening in the City, so I think that's the difference.

Mr. Firestone: Yeah.

Ms. van Boekhold: I wanted to bring as we, so there are a couple of things, again, transportation and energy and I see some recycling here that jumps out as things that are important and I hope that we can actually cover those two areas of the themes that are developed so that we can move forward. One of the things is . . . we'll get there. So I just wanted to add to it, so censoring myself, I have third question that I really wanted to hear from Mark and Mary Ellen and Paula that, my third question was what can the group you represent do to promote sustainability. And now Jeremy is not on the Planning Commission anymore and we don't have three of the departments, so I think there is not much value to add with that question. I think I will send that different people and I want them to kind of give me their first impression. Because I want to know from the mayor's office, what do they think they can do? I mean we don't want to kind of create this thing that is not connected to reality. So, it is a good prompt for them. But, Susan, you are, sorry, Sheila, you are . . . hopefully I will get that correctly . . . but, Sheila, you are a very important component of this effort because Conservation Advisory Commission is a structure that's already there in the City. So, the question three will be something for you and Conservation Advisory Committee, I think, to think about and also different departments.

Mr. Firestone: Two ideas vis-à-vis the Planning Commission. So, one would be to have what they refer to as a joint workshop with the Planning Commission. So, it's not part of their regular meeting. It would be like a separate meeting as a workshop format . . .

Ms. van Boekhold: And get their feedback?

Mr. Firestone: And we have, basically, an opportunity to engage with all the Planning Commissioners. So that's one item. And the other thing is, the more simple thing would be just to get it as an agenda item and to make a presentation, which can be arranged and then it would be an informational thing and the Commissioners would then sort of discuss . . .

Ms. van Boekhold: As we go forward, I think we are . . .

Mr. Firestone: So those are a couple of options and I can help make one of those two happen.

Ms. van Boekhold: And the purpose of this exercise was kind of as they're coming [inaudible], so I think then what they think they can do to basically understand their vision. Like kind of hearing from Public Works, what do they see as they can do? That's what they can actually start. That can be their, what is it, jumping off point. So that was kind of the purpose of this question. But in absence of their representation, I don't see the value of doing that.

Mr. Firestone: And just sort of the way they operate is, they implement existing rules and then they can work on promoting rules which would then go to the City Council for potential consideration and adoption. So, absent, you know, presumably once we put forward a plan, then Mary Ellen could then work with them on rules to help implement the plan. Then, those become the binding rules that they consider when they get applications.

Mr. Athey: Let's go down this path for a minute, because I hadn't really thought this through a whole lot. I guess I'm thinking of it from a process standpoint. You know, we want to have the plan done by, I think we're still looking at Earth Day, so let's say about six months. It seems to me it's almost like a chicken and the egg, do we seek input from, you know, mostly Public Works and Water Resources, but definitely Parks and Mary Ellen, and I guess also the City Manager's Office. But we are, you know, then flipping it the opposite way, we've already got multiple potential action items kind of scattered through this document already that, quite

frankly, the City is going to have to really sign off on before the plan goes to City Council, so I'm not really sure how that's going to play out.

Ms. van Boekhold: This feedback process . . . go ahead.

Ms. Smith: As soon as you started talking, I started to think is it possible for your team to meet with the Public Works and talk about it? What are you doing? You know, they have certain things they have to do. Certain things by federal law, by state law, and so on and so forth, and by City ordinance or whatever. So, isn't that the place to start with them? To sit down and what are they already doing and how does it align with what we've talked about? Can you guys make a meeting with each department so that you get . . . I mean sitting at the Steering Committee, the Steering Committee is two hours and a lot of conversation that goes a lot of ways, but you really want something substantive to go with, with them. So, Planning and Public Works, clearly they're working on flooding and sustainability and reducing costs that often [inaudible] sustainability. So, if you talk to those departments, those key ones – Public Works, Planning, and . . .

Mr. Athey: I would put Parks in that category.

Ms. Smith: And not the Commission so much, though we should have a Commission representative there, but what are they actually doing? Because I went to that, what was that called, the City Futures, and Mary Ellen made a really, quite a substantial presentation on what the City is doing in terms of density and planning. And that was all news to me, and all of a sudden I went, oh, now I get why all those buildings are popping up here and here.

Mr. Anderson: it's related.

Ms. van Boekhold: That's exactly right.

Ms. Smith: And it's related, yes.

Mr. Anderson: It's definitely related.

Ms. van Boekhold: Susan, Sheila, my brain . . .

Ms. Smith: Sheila.

Ms. van Boekhold: Sheila, that's exactly what we are going to do. So, as you are going to fill up for energy efficiency and transportation or environmental, you know, whatever we call it, what AECOM will be doing is kind of exactly talking to different groups in the City and identifying what they are doing, what are the data, kind of put this here, what will be the next area. We will be kind of really identifying what is happening right now in the City. Filling up the empty bullets, researching what the City's baseline is. What are they doing? What are their practices? What is the available data? Do we have ridership on these things? Do we have all of this data and will fill up all those, because those things are not abstract. Those things are going to be connected to this is what we are doing, this is our baseline, these are the practices, and this is how we want to be. And these are the actions to get from this baseline to this thing that we want. So, exactly what Sheila is saying is going to be part of, I would like, actually, to make a transition, I want to make a motion we transition to one of those themes that we see actually are important. And in that context, that was exactly what I was going to say, how much . . .

Ms. Huntley: I would like to follow-up on your [inaudible] as to what groups are doing and get some input from Sheila with what Conservation Advisory Committee is focusing on.

Ms. Smith: Finish what you were saying and then . . .

Ms. van Boekhold: So I wanted to, that was exactly the conversation I was going to say. Under that theme, I believe now we have to go see what is the City doing. Kind of reaching out to different departments. Do we know how much energy we use? Do we know how much greenhouse gas emission we have? Do we know how much recycling . . . you know, all of these things? And where do we want to go? Because you don't want to kind of have abstract we use 30% or whatever. You know, we want to know where we are, what is actually we are using, what is going to go there with our target, and how can we get there. So, that was exactly where we were going. Because I believe these things need to now go get really connected to what is on the ground and what people are doing and what is happening in the City.

Ms. Smith: And like you said, with Lancaster, they started with something . . .

Ms. van Boekhold: Yes.

Ms. Smith: That they could wrap their brains around, developed it, and then obviously so many things are connected. It's clear and as with those things.

Mr. Anderson: I just want to say the conversation ended up where it needs to be in this regard. There was an absolute sense when you were discussing in the Planning Commission and the themes that we have here, there was a sense that we're developing it and then we're going to give it to them and say, see, you have to do this now. Versus talk to them . . .

Ms. van Boekhold: See where they are.

Mr. Anderson: See where they are, what they . . .

Ms. Smith: And where they're going.

Mr. Anderson: Yes, yes, a very visionary statement. What would you see in the future in the best circumstance. A visionary question and try to get them thinking I'm in a future state of sustainability, now I'm looking back. What do I need to do to get here and can I do it with the framework that that group has and what are, like you said, the important things that must get done and is their prime mission? But then, okay, how can we adapt to this future-thinking way and pull along with the rest of the City instead of saying, you won't believe what they came up with over there at the Steering Committee. You know, you get a lot more buy-in and movement together if they're involved in the brainstorming.

Ms. Huntley: Exactly.

Ms. van Boekhold: And we kind of help them see that future because right now if all they're doing is here and everybody has so much responsibility, you can bring those kind of comparison of how other cities are going after it and how they can get it. Some of them are practical, are do-able. You just need to have a plan. You know, how many LED did you replace? How many non-LED are left on the roads? That kind of gives you what is the next step and how much saving is that? And what are the other areas of low-hanging fruit that you want to catch in the next three years? So, you give them the path and show them how to get there and so it is very much connected to what they are doing. Ask them what you are doing and base it on that, again. But the example of how many LEDs were replaced and how many are left, that's like the low-hanging fruit.

Ms. Smith: We probably have it written down in here somewhere.

Ms. van Boekhold: I know but that's exactly why it helps to have it on the plan because as you want to achieve this, if it's a 5% reduction in three years or is it a big goal that we have, what is it? How are we going to do it? Is it LED reduction? Is it a benchmarking thing? How are we going to get there? And that comes pretty much from talking to Public Works and looking at

what they have done, what is in their wish list. What has Conservation Advisory Committee been looking at in the last couple of years?

Ms. Smith: So, I can answer that. Are you interested? I mean I would probably say more if I had spent more time preparing, but the LED lights was a big, big project. That was tens of thousands of dollars. And that has been a big focus for the last three years, I would say. What do you think, Mike?

Mr. Fortner: I didn't know it was a focus of the CAC, so . . .

Ms. Smith: That was their funds that we used to do that. It was someone's idea on the Planning Commission, so that's been a big . . . and related to that, to be able to answer those questions about how much energy are we saving and how much do we still need to save, they have been trying but it's been a year-and-a-half trying to put someone in place looking for a graduate student who would develop an energy dashboard that would answer those questions. But they had interviews and hired somebody and then he took a different job. But anyway, that is still on the docket to keep going with that. Then, recently, working on the connector trail, I saw somebody, the connector trail from New London Road to Creek Road, that's CAC funds also going into paving and lighting that trail. I know Helga is familiar with that trail. And so that is a transportation thing for a lot of people. So, from right at across from Fairfield, there's an area that comes down to a really rugged dirt road that kind of . . .

Mr. Athey: Oh, that runs into the park? Okay, I know where you mean now.

Ms. Smith: Yeah, right. So, they're paving it and lighting it. And people seem to think that will become a good new connection for bike paths in the City. More recently, we brought to Planning and then Planning brought back to us the question of a very large tract, well, acres of land with a lot of trees and the issue of can we really, is our future plan for conservation of natural areas and density being well-served by this project here. And when we took a look at a City ordinance and found that we weren't going to be able to do that project unless we changed the ordinance, but then the ordinance was looked at and thought no, we just need to re-do this ordinance but not in a way that just accommodates the felling of 215 large trees. So, right now that project is on hold and we are rewriting the Code, but the Code will take . . . we took it to Council, I mean Council brought it to us, we took it to Council, Council is going to take it to Planning, and we are going to rewrite the Code to give trees the position they deserve in consideration of development. In other words, a tree is not a stick with a bunch of leaves at the top. A tree in a forest is not an empty lot. It's a habitat. It is an ecosystem, and when you start removing the trees, you destroy the ecosystem and you reduce the canopy. And the other question was, can anybody in the world afford to cut down 215 large trees at this point in our history with climate change heavily breathing down on us.

Ms. Huntley: So is there currently a law in place . . .

Ms. Smith: There is a law in place that said, an ordinance that says for every tree of a certain size that you remove, you must replace it with smaller trees, obviously, so 18 inches, 24 inches gives you four 1.5-2.0 inch caliper trees that must be planted before, and this is the tricky part of the ordinance, it must be planted before the certificate of occupancy can be given to the developer. Is that . . .

Mr. Fortner: I can't tell you for sure.

Ms. Smith: So, the City said we can't, so 215 trees of the size, and most of them, well about half of them are between 18 and 40 inches in diameter . . . they're big trees . . . so that would generate a bank of 566 trees and the Parks Department said we don't have any place to put them, so how about can we create a fund? And the decision was, no, that's not the spirit of this ordinance and that's not the way these things should go.

Ms. Huntley: So, that's like urban forest preservation?

Ms. Smith: It's not urban forest preservation, it's because it doesn't have anything to do with large tracts of land and lots of trees coming down. It has to do with if your neighbor takes down five trees, buys a plot of land and takes down five trees, he's got to plan, you know, ten more, or something like that.

Ms. van Boekhold: Can I ask you kind of . . .

Ms. Smith: Sure, I can stop.

Ms. van Boekhold: No, that's okay. It's an important one but it's kind of a little bit . . .

Ms. Smith: I'm just saying that she asked what we were doing and we're taking that on.

Ms. van Boekhold: Yeah, yeah.

Mr. Anderson: But that's the [inaudible] of sustainability.

Ms. van Boekhold: Exactly.

Ms. Smith: Yeah. We're taking it on and we're going to help to rewrite the ordinance so that it takes into account the importance of trees. We just had [inaudible] preservation of natural areas. And that's where we are. I mean there's plenty more, but . . .

Ms. van Boekhold: So, it's pretty much when [inaudible] looking at what you have done on LEED or other areas for LED lights, tree conservation and to kind of connect it to the plan.

Ms. Smith: And we do have two members that are joining the LEED team that we'll put together. So, that's another thing they're going to be looking at, too.

Ms. van Boekhold: That sounds good. I would like to actually move on to review the document, at least one or two of the categories so we can actually discuss that, so AECOM can move on with those areas.

As I look at what we have on the boards, I want feedback from the group, but it seems like energy is a big one. We have a lot there. And energy as it relates to greenhouse. So there is this cluster is energy, different kind of energy reduction and renewable energy. Carbon neutrality is here. Reduce [inaudible] which can be viewed as reduction of energy. And then there is a whole bunch of climate.

Ms. Smith: I have transportation as one.

Ms. van Boekhold: We have in planning . . .

Ms. Smith: Green infrastructure.

Ms. van Boekhold: Alternative transportation, preservation and restoration of natural resources. I had like reduce environmental [inaudible]. That could be reduce waste and conservation and green building. So, there is that category that could be, like right now that is a category which is sustainable planning, green building, you remember there kind of a whole bunch of things. So, that could kind of by proxy be there, although transportation is here, too. And what I see there that's important to kind of look at again as a category is recycling and waste reduction that is not here. Is there anything else that I'm missing? Because I want to kind of look at these three categories as the big ones. And greenhouse gas emission, actually.

Ms. Huntley: So, what, summarize again, what are the three categories?

Ms. van Boekhold: I think the energy jumps out as the one that we want to focus on now. The energy one that they have . . .

Ms. Huntley: What's the second one?

Ms. van Boekhold: The second one can be, if I look at this, this is kind of like a different category. This is sustainability planning, which can be reduction of waste and consumption, reducing environmental footprint, preservation and restoration of natural areas, green planning, alternative transportation. It's the planning part of sustainability. It's the sustainable planning that includes like transportation . . .

Ms. Huntley: Okay, so, to me those are on completely different levels. You could have a category of climate change mitigation and then one subcomponent of that would be energy, and one subcomponent of that would be alternative transportation, etc. Whereas the second group that you have is much broader to me than just energy.

Ms. van Boekhold: You mean this group?

Ms. Huntley: Yeah.

Ms. van Boekhold: It's a different group. It's group two. So, this is group one and this is group two.

Ms. Smith: I came up with three different groups.

Ms. van Boekhold: Okay, go ahead.

Ms. Smith: I came up with energy efficiency and reducing fossil fuels, then I came up with green infrastructure, and then transportation, when I was just looking at that quickly, trying to find the big themes that were there. And some of them do express themselves in more, as you said, a granular . . .

Ms. van Boekhold: So, the only thing is green infrastructure only relates to the infrastructure that is managing water differently. So, if we mean the green infrastructure as it . . .

Ms. Smith: Oh, I thought it also had to do with . . .

Mr. Athey: It's a terminology thing. It means different things to different people, so we ought to be clear.

Mr. Anderson: And the things do interlink, so that's why it gets unclear.

Ms. Smith: That's why it's all a jumble.

Ms. van Boekhold: We all agree that there is an energy one. That can be energy reduction.

Mr. Anderson: Energy reduction and greenhouse gases are sort of the same.

Ms. Huntley: Yeah, so I think if I had to pick one theme off of our first exercise, it's climate change energy. Or whatever other terms we want to throw in.

Ms. Smith: Yes.

Ms. Huntley: And then from the second one, I think the big group over there is all transportation.

Ms. van Boekhold: And I think the transportation by proxy is here, too. So, I just said recycling, because recycling didn't get captured. So, there is a transportation. I will put in transportation.



Ms. Huntley: So, why don't we take those as the themes to discuss today? Energy, transportation, and waste.

Mr. Fortner: Energy, transportation, and waste.

Ms. van Boekhold: Waste or environmental [inaudible]? Let's table that one. So, let's do the energy and transportation for today so we can . . . go ahead, Scott.

Mr. Anderson: Transportation, I just sort of want to point out there's, so we're clear, there's transportation planning, like the modes of transport and public transit, highway design, and things like that, like the infrastructure of transportation. And then there's alternative transportation, using alternative energies to drive the transport. So, they're kind of different so they shouldn't be linked together. What is the design and planning of your mobility infrastructure? Another one is what are the vehicles using in terms of energy to move people and things.

Mr. Firestone: Although obviously there's infrastructure elements to that as far as EV charging and . . .

Mr. Anderson: Yes.

Ms. Bennett: So, all of these issues are going to have some overlap, but I agree that as vehicle transition from, you know, fossil fuel to more electric sources, you're going to have to plan both of those things completely differently. So, you have your infrastructure and that would include charging stations and how people can get from point A to point B, but then you also have all of the impacts that come from internal combustion engines running around everywhere and people having access to alternative transportation, whether it's bike or buses, etc.

Ms. van Boekhold: I want to also add that it's different and we can dice and slice it different ways. I look at Philadelphia's first green plan that categorized like, for example, energy for fuel change of their diesel fleet to natural gas or electric. It was part of their energy category and all of the other things about mobility and having access to like transportation was part of something that, it kind of was planning but they kind of put it under, so they put the planning parts under environment and equity. So, part of the equity they called it's everybody's right to have option to transport, public transportation, to biking and pedestrians. So, kind of they put it on the planning part of it. And as they kind of broke it down and said whose responsibility it is and how you're going to achieve it, some of those goals would achieve two, like they would say if you go with EV, for example, for LEED, you will actually achieve both energy and this other category. So, it is different ways to dice and slice it, and we can have a separate transportation. You know, we can have everything transportation in one category as it is right now, or we can actually have the fuel part of the energy part of transportation under energy, as you were talking. Especially if we put it there, if we talk greenhouse gas emission in the energy part, it really helps because transportation is a big part of our greenhouse gas.

Ms. Smith: Yes, the biggest.

Ms. van Boekhold: Yes.

Ms. Huntley: Okay, why don't you pick one of our preferred themes and let's start.

Ms. van Boekhold: Energy. I think energy, so AECOM actually can move forward with the energy part and carry that one through. So, if everybody has it in front of them, then maybe we don't need a screen. I really wanted everybody kind of to look at the same document but . . .

Mr. Athey: Well, actually I do . . .

Mr. Fortner: He can do it on the screen.

Ms. van Boekhold: Yeah, let's do the energy one.

Mr. Athey: I think it would probably be easier if we get it up on a screen. Sheila, can I ask you, on the projector there's a little switch right in front of the . . . if you could just pull that lever towards you. No, to the very, very, very front.

Mr. Swiatek: You can just grab the remote, too.

Ms. Smith: What do you want me to do here?

Mr. Firestone: It went off. You're going to have to turn it back on.

Ms. van Boekhold: Yeah, because they're such a big energy hog.

Ms. Smith: I got it.

Ms. van Boekhold: Actually, that's conveniently our first theme, the City if committed to clean energy and reducing fossil fuel dependence. Do they use diesel for any of the . . .

Ms. Smith: Did we undo something?

Mr. Athey: How come . . . there it is. It's coming up.

Mr. Fortner: Diesel for any of the City vehicles? I don't know what some of the big City vehicles use. We do do some hybrids for the normal City cars but the big, like, tanker trucks just use . . .

Ms. van Boekhold: For the trash? What do they use?

Mr. Swiatek: School buses are diesel.

Ms. van Boekhold: What about the Newark bus? Is that diesel?

Mr. Swiatek: The Unicity bus?

Mr. Fortner: The Unicity bus?

Mr. Swiatek: I would think it's diesel.

Ms. van Boekhold: Okay. So, the first one, I thought actually let's table that part because that will kind of create, the division one . . .

Mr. Athey: Okay.

Ms. van Boekhold: Do you want to talk about it?

Mr. Athey: Let's at least . . .

Ms. Huntley: Yes, Dave was like no.

Mr. Athey: Well, no, I . . .

Ms. van Boekhold: We have time. We have still an hour.

Mr. Athey: Basically, I'm not sure how closely people are following the document here, but essentially we had eight, we called them themes, we called them all sorts of things, and one of the things we heard from the last meeting that we should have an overarching vision to the whole plan. And in talking it over a little bit with Bahareh and, of course, internally, we kind of came up, you know, the whole adapt to climate change more or less encompasses all the other

themes, where all the other themes were kind of a component of adapt to climate change. And the other thing . . . we all kind of struggled a little bit, and I know Bahareh actually kind of tried to get a subcommittee pulled together which didn't quite work out . . . was the whole economic sustainability. I think we all kind of struggled with that one a little bit. And so, what we've done at this point is to kind of pull those two out as being specific themes and kind of rolled them into maybe overall vision statements. So, to Bahareh's point, we'll have to at some point, I mean we just kind of threw a couple of the vision statements together. We found we were also asked to maybe find what some others are doing. We have kind of some sub-statements here, so I would agree that now is probably not the time to get too far into the weeds on that. But I wanted . . .

Ms. van Boekhold: People should look at it and react.

Mr. Athey: To at least introduce why, you know, the . . .

Ms. van Boekhold: The Steering Committee should look at that.

Mr. Athey: Evolution of how this is happening.

Ms. van Boekhold: Yes, it's very helpful.

Mr. Firestone: Can I make one comment?

Mr. Athey: Sure.

Mr. Firestone: I thought the vision statements were too much in the here and now. I mean they're saying this is what we are and we're clearly [inaudible]. But I mean our vision is really where we're striving to get to. So, I would just change the verb tense or say Newark strives to do some of these . . .

Mr. Anderson: Yeah, or on the Newark socially fair one, you can say we envision a Newark that is socially fair.

Mr. Firestone: Yes. Yes. So, we want to be visionary. We don't want to be descriptive of what we are.

Mr. Athey: Okay. Good comment.

Ms. Huntley: But we're not going to discuss this right now, right?

Mr. Firestone: No.

Ms. van Boekhold: No, we go to the first theme which is the City is committed to clean energy and reducing fossil fuel dependence.

Mr. Athey: Right. If I could kind of keep the floor for another couple of minutes. Is that alright?

Ms. Bennett: I mean, sorry, I hesitate, with vision statements, you know, we want to put out like where we want to be but I don't want to be specific because I think that falls really neatly under like values or goals. So, when I looked at DC's vision statements, it looked great except they're a very different city from us. It just doesn't [inaudible] as much detail as far as how we want to achieve our vision. It's more like, alright, you know, what [inaudible].

Mr. Athey: Okay. You okay, Scott? Okay. I think where Bahareh wanted to go at this point is, and maybe let me have one more kind of format . . .

Ms. van Boekhold: Go ahead.

Mr. Athey: We've kind of tried to lump these, and again, this could get very unwieldy very quickly, so we're kind of trying to semi-contain it, but is essentially kind of for each one of these themes, what we're envisioning at this point to kind of tee up the conversation is what are the issues, and these you've pretty much seen before, how we got here, which I guess we'll circle back to that before the end of the meeting. You know, I have no problem, certainly, talking to Public Works separately or Parks, or the Electric Department, etc.

Mr. Anderson: Well, for example, how we got here in the energy realm, you want to say things like you already have a part of the either planning code or the land development code that requires an element of LEED. That's already an ordinance that you did that.

Ms. Huntley: So, when you say how we got here, it could really mean where we are.

Mr. Anderson: Yeah. Where we are.

Ms. van Boekhold: Where we are.

Ms. Smith: It should say where we are, not how we got here.

Ms. van Boekhold: No, it's actually where are. I think that's where we are as our baseline. And I think as I look at this one, it's like, okay, I think actually where we are is how much electricity the City uses, how much natural gas, do we have anything about our carbon emission, do we know where we are going, and do we actually know how much of those energy we use? I mean these are all the information that are important. Do we know how much of the electric we use is for our building or is it for lighting, or what is it?

Ms. Smith: So that's where that dashboard would come. It would be very useful. If it gets really comprehensive dashboard.

Ms. van Boekhold: And right now, the City pays for these things. Go ahead.

Mr. Firestone: I would say I would add, you know, percentage of developers who install solar panels. You know, percentage of developers who install any kind of electric vehicle charging. I think we would see that we . . .

Ms. van Boekhold: It would be the data on the number of, for example, charging stations, correct?

Mr. Firestone: But we have a pretty low baseline on some of these items and better on others.

Mr. Anderson: Well, how about the McKees Solar Park. That should be in that list, right?

Mr. Firestone: Yeah.

Ms. Smith: I think he just put it in. Did we break this down into individuals in the City?

Ms. van Boekhold: So, I actually, what I have seen is that as we are looking at energy targets and energy goals, there will be City targets and there will be . . . so, again, part of it is like we are looking at it saying what is DEMEC has available for the City of Newark. Can we see on average how much do we use electricity? Like do we know that? Do we know how much the City is using natural gas? What are the data available? I think one of the biggest, as you look at what would be our action for the next few years, low-hanging fruit to achieve, it would be kind of what are the areas for the City to get there and how much is energy? Do they know how much they pay for that building? Which building is it? That building, how much they're paying for it. Do we know, for example, we have a Newark housing project near McKees, like how much . . . do we have more housing project, low income housing project except McKees?

Mr. Fortner: You're talking about Alder Creek, yeah, and then the Housing Authority has a site off of Main Street, Thompson Circle, and then they have some scattered sites.

Ms. van Boekhold: So, for example, what are the energy use on those? Are they getting winterization? All of these baseline that relates to energy. Again, we can brainstorm and come up with stuff, but basically where we are on energy.

Ms. Smith: But that might be something for them to discover by talking to Public Works people and getting those answers . . .

Mr. Athey: Or the Electric Department.

Ms. Smith: Yeah, the Electric Department.

Mr. Anderson: The Electric Department does an annual report . . .

Ms. Huntley: Do they know we want to include their . . . I think that depends on what we want our goals to be, right? So, I think we shouldn't get hung up on what kind of data we should put in there as background information. I think we should focus on what parts of the energy issue we want to address and eventually how and what specific goals. I think this is one of the [inaudible] where the document that you all put together is more specific, like the energy use will be 30% less in ten years.

Mr. Anderson: It's just the straw man out there.

Ms. Huntley: Yes, absolutely.

Mr. Athey: Yeah.

Mr. Anderson: It's for you to discuss.

Ms. Huntley: I think that's what we should focus on. It's trying to find whether we want the goal like that, if we want a goal like that, whether we like this particular statement, whether it's too ambitious or not ambitious enough.

Ms. Smith: And at the end, I think you want a goal like that.

Ms. van Boekhold: I think it's good to have a goal. I actually look at that, somehow I probably didn't say many of my comments. My comment was it's good to have a 30% such a long ten years, but I really want to know for the next three years is it like 5%? Is it 3%? And then as you look at, so in technicality if we have a good plan, as you know you kind of look at the baseline and see what is the energy consumption compared to other baselines. Like, for example, is the City really using a lot of energy for their [inaudible]. Or, you know, you look at the energy at the municipality and they're using twice the energy that they should be using per square foot, and that would be like where you're going to achieve that one of those 1%. So, it comes from that data. You know, you can't just sort of throw a dart and say 3%. I think AECOM energy analysis of baseline of what the City is doing, and also what are the opportunities.

Ms. Huntley: But if we want to say our goal is the City should cut the energy usage in its City operations, then we need the data on what City operations currently use for energy. So, we need to decide what kind of goals we want. If our goal is we want to encourage residents to use solar power, we need a completely different kind of data. That's why I'm saying what kind of goals we want. They don't have to be specific. The numbers can be dependent on what data we collect.

Ms. van Boekhold: No, that's good. So, the goals, you're right. So, one could be, as you say, it could be reducing the energy . . .

Ms. Smith: For . . . go ahead.

Ms. van Boekhold: For municipal, whatever. Municipal operation, reducing their energy use. And that could be electricity, natural gas, so that could be one goal.

Ms. Smith: Increase the use of renewables.

Ms. van Boekhold: Increase use of renewables. And for the City, it would be procuring more renewables. The City of Philadelphia, who heard that, last week proposed to their City Council that they are going to actually get 22% of their electricity from the 70-megawatt solar farm, cost neutrally. So, they are going to get electricity at the same price that they would get anything else from the solar farm they are building outside the city. So, if the City of Philadelphia, I mean when they get there, they are doing it cost neutral, how we also have . . . my question is, what percentage of our electricity comes from renewable? We don't know that. But, based on that increase . . .

Mr. Firestone: We probably do. I mean DEMEC has certain benchmarks and so we have a pretty good idea.

Ms. van Boekhold: Okay, so then we need to know what is the City's right now percentage and then we want to increase that. We want to kind of have local, homegrown Newark solar generation. Or we want to kind of have the City to get through DEMEC more renewable energy. I know, my understanding is that McKees is really expensive to sign on to get electricity through them. Is that correct? It's like \$0.21 per kW if you want to sign up. No? Has anybody signed up?

Mr. Firestone: To sign up for what?

Ms. Huntley: If you want to sign up for what?

Ms. van Boekhold: If you want to get your green energy through McKees Solar?

Ms. Huntley: Okay, so the McKees energy just goes into the . . .

Mr. Firestone: You can't . . .

Ms. Huntley: You could invest in . . .

Mr. Firestone: Yeah, I own a share.

Ms. Huntley: Yeah, I own a share, too, but it's not . . . like you don't really buy the energy. You get the energy at the same cost but you are a \$0.01 reduction, right?

Mr. Firestone: We get \$1.00 off a month now.

Ms. van Boekhold: Okay. Okay, so I . . .

Mr. Firestone: We put money in upfront so now we get \$1.00 a month off.

Ms. van Boekhold: So, I'm wrong but like kind of being able to actually get the electricity. So, community solar, I saw community solar in one of those things. It means that you actually can have an arrangement to get electricity from . . .

Mr. Firestone: Right. We don't have a green energy option in Newark but . . .

Ms. Smith: Here's the opportunity. It kind of goes with it, doesn't it?

Mr. Anderson: That's something that needs to be worked out. That should be a goal.

Mr. Firestone: I mean, there's some pros and cons to that because you've socialized the energy credits. Those don't necessarily increase the overall amount of renewable energy the way they work.

Ms. Smith: Does this opportunities list make more general . . .

Mr. Athey: Well, that's where . . . let's kind of keep going down and then we can kind of re-discuss how we want to kind of present each of these things. So, the opportunities you've all seen before because they, more or less, have not changed. At least the ones in these types of bullets. What we did add with this more, you know, whatever this figure here is, are the document, Bahareh, that you prepared, that was essentially the type that you got from the workshop. And, Helga, I just kind of cut-and-pasted, you did a real nice job, we appreciate it, of diving into some of the things that you would also focus on. And what we haven't done yet is just kind of, there's some overlap on this, so really go in and try to synthesize that a little bit better. But this is actually kind of where I wanted to talk a little bit more of, you know, how much are we, is this just written to the City of Newark as an entity and then how much of it is written to the 30,000 of us who live here, of things that everybody could do, you know, the business institutions, things along those lines. So, I didn't know if this was kind of, you know, now redundant to some of these opportunities. And to just kind of tie it all back is what I still envisioned and I think I've been pretty clear about this all, is kind of that, how do we cite the benefits, leaning again to the Philadelphia plan that each one of them has these four measuring sticks, pillars, whatever want to call them, of what it means to do all this? So, that's kind of how we laid it out. I think we even, amongst ourselves, we struggled with is this really the best way to do it. So, we're certainly, you know, how do you want to present all this stuff?

Ms. Huntley: You mean the layout of the final document?

Mr. Anderson: The format, content . . .

Ms. Huntley: Okay, so what I think, some of this, to me, reads like notes or reminders as to what we want to put in it.

Mr. Athey: Sure.

Ms. Huntley: So, I think the structure is, you know, what are the issues as an introduction and then where are we currently and what are our goals?

Mr. Athey: There you go.

Ms. Huntley: Those are components that I think should end up in the plan. Then the opportunities, I don't think are important. So, instead of the opportunities, I think specific action items, and those categorized by these, you know, what are we going to do as the City? What are we going to do as residents? What are we going to do as business owners?

Mr. Athey: So, basically blend them?

Ms. Huntley: Yeah. So, the opportunities are sort of built into how we define the goals and how we define the action items.

Mr. Firestone: I mean I think we should be making recommendations for legally binding changes to the ordinances. So, we don't have to come up with the words or the exact text, but the . . . I mean if this is just a plan, it's going to take up, you know, we might as well just use the open door and prop it open. I mean unless it really leads to things that are actually legally binding, it will have some effect but it's not going to have nearly the effect that it could if it gets translated. So, you know, instead of saying place solar panels on your home, or businesses, place them on, or like any new construction, you know, there's a rebuttable presumption that you will place solar panels. I mean that would be sort of a minimal. There are some

communities that now are saying if you build something new, you will place solar panels. But I think you need to move, we ultimately need to move to be . . .

Ms. Smith: Policy.

Mr. Firestone: That kind of descriptive and saying these are the kinds of ordinances that we think the City should adopt if it wants to meet . . .

Ms. Smith: Yeah.

Mr. Firestone: I mean once we've got in our goals so much reduction by 2030 and so much reduction by 2050, then you need to have sort of a road map of how you're going to get there rather than just have these nice broad goals.

Mr. Anderson: Yes.

Ms. Smith: Can I just mention one tiny thing? I won't talk long. If the businesses and institutions placed solar panels on buildings, there is something that the Conservation Advisory Commission is looking at that was presented by Dr. Byrne and Dr. Chajes. Are you familiar with that?

Mr. Athey: Oh, yeah.

Ms. Smith: Okay so that's rolling . . .

Ms. Huntley: Can you, for the rest of us who aren't familiar with what you're talking about . . .

Ms. Smith: Just that they have a plan for assessing, something that's up here, assessing . . .

Ms. van Boekhold: Potential for solar generation.

Ms. Smith: Potential for solar, and they have a plan for shared use of that with the University and the City, which is a really nice piece, and to bring the price down. To increase the use of solar energy throughout the City. Maybe you're putting it on top of your building, but the use will be shared. So, that kind of thing.

Ms. Huntley: Yes, I think that's similar to what I heard Seattle did a few years ago. Where they rented rooftop space of other buildings like museums and the aquarium . . .

Ms. Smith: Yeah, and I guess it is . . .

Ms. Huntley: And put solar panels on there that were like McKees, owned by the city and then the green energy was shared. So, is that similar to what you're talking about?

Ms. Smith: You know, I don't have the paperwork with me here, but yes.

Ms. Huntley: Okay.

Ms. Smith: And that's through the Energy Policy Department at the University of Delaware. Dr. Byrne and Dr. Chajes. So, anyway, that's something that's . . .

Ms. van Boekhold: It's a big picture, kind of like a . . .

Mr. Anderson: Okay, well some of the opportunities we talk about, support and encourage renewable energy and storage, the first two bullets under there are evaluate all City-owned roofs and real estate for potential solar generation. And then decrease barriers for private solar generation on buildings within the City. I actually saw, there's a little bit of hard code to get through when you want to hook up your residence to the renewable energy. There's a little



bit of help that the City could offer people, I think. And that's the kind of areas, decrease barriers, if I may. And another thing, in a nicely developed city like this that has a lot of older homes and streets with trees, you're not always going to be able to use the rooftops for solar.

Ms. Smith: Right.

Mr. Anderson: So, they need to have an option to do that if they can't on their structure for some reason. They could have a bad roof, not be facing south, whatever. So, and businesses on Main Street, too. Sometimes the roof is just not structurally good enough and there's too many nearby buildings, etc. There's got to be some sort of community solar program where it's not on your property but you're investing in it, like you did at McKees. But somehow formalize that, if the City could have a program through the Electric Department. I mean they have an organizing principle because the City controls their own Electric Department.

Mr. Athey: So, I assume you mean something more like what it sounds like Jeremy was talking about with McKees where you actually become like a part owner, for lack of a better term, as opposed to just paying into a more nebulous fund.

Mr. Anderson: That's what community solar is becoming.

Ms. van Boekhold: Community solar is becoming a big one that other jurisdictions are adopting. And actually, Delaware has a, what is it, legislative [inaudible] community solar. So there is legislation that, for example, Delmarva Power or in the case of McKees, which is City-owned, but the co-op is looking into actually how to have, for example, somebody would say I want some of that electricity and you can actually get that. You know, kind of have that billing arrangement. So, what I'm hearing is, for example, community solar. So, for example, under energy, I'm looking at, as Helga said, what are the goals? What are these goals and what are the actions under that? So, I kind of considered having a pilot community solar as an action item under the improve/increase, for example, renewable energy in City by whatever percentage in the next three years. And one of the action items is like the City department and whatever Conservation Advisory Committee and Planning Department work to identify a pilot for community solar. That would be an action item under that goal. Does it make sense? Does this structure of, our goal was to kind of increase renewable solar . . .

Ms. Huntley: Renewable energy shared . . .

Ms. van Boekhold: Shared in the City by whatever percent that we think. Because we have to have something. And one of the action items there is actually let's kind of have a pilot project. These groups come together and identify where is the land, what we need to have, how can we secure funding? One of the things along this concern is funding. Because there's always funding out there, and I also get tired of saying it, but kind of having that there to say we want you to have that. Another one that Scott mentioned is review Newark Code and identify barriers to solar installation. Like, do we have, I mean, it's worth researching on AECOM's side to see are there barriers. And if there are barriers, omit those. That would be under that one. And then maybe evaluate, so we have a grant program that DEMEC run and they're wanting Delmarva probably has different rates. Kind of evaluate and see how many applications do we get in the City per capita compared to Delmarva. Are our incentives comparable? Are we doing comparable? Because there is data out there that, for example, what is per capita solar in the City of Wilmington because of all those solar farms. Are we doing comparable? Do we want to improve that? So, again, all of these things that we look and see where we are and how we can improve it? Getting those data is the first step for us to actually move toward sustainability. Because right now, if you can't compare it, you don't know where we are.

Ms. Smith: I think that's a part of the Center for Energy Policy plan. They have a calculating tool for measuring the amount of space that's available for, it's like a flyover thing.

Ms. van Boekhold: Yeah.

Ms. Smith: But they're collecting a lot of data. They really want this to happen so they're pushing daily to get this.

Ms. van Boekhold: And I'm like the Center for Energy and Environmental Policy, I actually got my second degree there, should be part of that. You know, the University of Delaware, as part of their commitment, can they have one of their project and they get actually \$100,000 from the General Assembly looking at the City of Wilmington. They look at these different projects. They go the General Assembly and get \$100,000 to do some kind of project. I mean, maybe next year that project should be the City of Newark. And then again, as part of the partnership, the University of Delaware we would like kind of write it as an action item as a collaboration between City of Newark, can they do that? Again, one thing that I want to actually say here, express, I was really disappointed that the City didn't have, except Michelle and Steve Hegedus, nobody else from the University showed up. Why Michael Chajes wasn't there? I mean, I was like oh my God, why is nobody from Public Administration there? We are trying to create this thing that they are teaching students, and nobody showed up. So, we definitely need to put more action items on the University to be there. There are funds there. They get, again the Center for Energy and Environmental Policy gets to \$100,000 to \$180,000 that they can invest on the project of their own. They just kind of need to name it. And I'm like we have an actual project and have the opportunity to be implemented. Why not putting that there?

Ms. Bennett: Does it make sense . . .

Ms. Huntley: I think one of the . . .

Ms. Bennett: I mean I don't disagree there's more the University could do. Like, hands-down, there is. But it's going to be difficult, like, it's going to depend on how you do that. So, how you pressure the University to take on more responsibility is that the City, you can't automatically require them to spend their money on something that the City likes. But there are other ways to pressure the University. One of the things I'm working on is setting up a sustainability plan for the University, hopefully, fingers cross, with research and support from the administration. But, as in any large organization, the minute [inaudible] go out the window, or research dries up if some other priority pops up. So, you know, I want our sustainability plan to reflect and echo the City of Newark's plan. I want them to coordinate and collaborate and work together. So, you know, what we put into the vision and other [inaudible] of the plan are really important. But I don't want a situation where the kind of town and gown tensions get worse instead of better. So that's why I just want to say how you go about that, how you leverage the University but also how you collaborate with them, and how you pressure them, because they could easily be doing better, is really important to cultivating that relationship instead of creating a situation where it's more adversarial and less gets done collectively.

Ms. van Boekhold: Sure. No, I agree, Michelle, nothing adversarial. But like I was at CEEP, so I was a researcher at CEEP and we do different hypothetical studies and I think actually at the City of Newark we are actually doing something that gets a high chance of being implemented. So, kind of basically marketing to the University that here is a project that your students actually are going to real-life experience. It's not hypothetical. It's not like kind of creating a research project in a vacuum. So, I mean . . .

Ms. Bennett: Sure.

Ms. van Boekhold: So, it is kind of putting it out . . .

Ms. Bennett: And we've helped, historically I mean we've helped and assigned fellowships to them so they can get [inaudible]. If we see a research opportunity or even a project trial opportunity, you know, we can absolutely do better at working together to figure out where those opportunities are. So, getting the University involved, working with the City, I think some of that is just communication. Like having better lines of communication so the City can share what they're interested in, the University can post what it's interested in or what's going on at

any given time. That would go a long way to helping the academic community, but also the students, more involved. It's notoriously difficult to get the students kind of deeply engaged. Like I've had [inaudible] that were empty because I couldn't get the students to apply for it. And, you know, that's after all the promotions, etc., and part of it might have been the job description, like nobody found it intriguing. But part of it is like it's really hard to get them to come out for anything.

Ms. van Boekhold: Yeah, I know. So, there are challenges.

Ms. Bennett: Unless you're serving food. They'll come out for free food.

Mr. Athey: So if I could extrapolate that a little bit broadly, so I'm hearing, because residents to me are really no different than, in this context, the University that, back to the point we were talking about a moment ago, you know, we could recommend the City changes its Code so you must put solar panels on homes effective 2020 or whatever, but should there not also be encourage one way or the other, incentives, to get homeowners that wouldn't fall under that to recycle more, to compost more. So, like more of an education component. I mean, should that not be part and parcel with all this? It shouldn't just be the City shall do this. It should be a much broader . . .

Ms. Smith: Public education has got to be, I mean, we took our first two stabs with it, right, but there were things that . . .

Ms. Huntley: But I think to the point that Jeremy was making, education is often not enough to actually achieve measurable improvement, right? And so, if you put in incentives or legal requirements, then you actually can make measurable progress.

Mr. Anderson: Like, for example, there's communities in Pennsylvania that take the recycling for free but charge for the non-recycling.

Ms. Huntley: The trash, right.

Mr. Athey: But that's more of a City, the City sets the rate, so the City could that, I guess. I'm still making the point that there needs to be alternate . . .

Ms. Huntley: Yeah, but this is like an enforcement, not just educating people that it's good to recycle, but you actually say and we'll make it a financial benefit because the smaller your trash can, the less you pay for the trash.

Mr. Firestone: Well, I mean, the City certainly contributes taxes and other revenue, and it can encourage and discourage certain types of behavior, as well, without formally mandating certain behaviors.

Ms. Bennett: I mean any kind of behavior change, especially at like the resident level, so you know think of somebody who has a bunch of kids, they're super busy, they come home, they're tired, and they still have a ton of chores to do to get those kids fed, cleaned up, homework and all that good stuff. What is going to really catch their attention in a behavior change program? So, that would be a financial incentive? Great idea. And those can be revenue-neutral, you just structure them appropriately so the free recycling and charge for the trash is a good example that, you know, hopefully could be structured in a way that would be revenue-neutral, but you have to have the communication component. Because without it, you're going to blindside people and you're going to get that knee-jerk reaction where they're like what is this that's irritating me right now, so we're going to have a very long conversation to get me on-board because I've just been surprised with this thing, right? So, the communication component on any kind of behavior change is going to be really important for the City and you've got to roll that out long before you actually implement anything, and then keep following up on it afterward.

As far as like requiring people to put solar panels and stuff on their house, like, I like the idea but you have to appreciate that there's going to be some negative consequences of something like that. Like, the City has to be prepared and ready to accept that. So, you know, is that going to mean there are fewer people building, updating or renovating their houses, or are people going to want to live in a different town because it's going to be cheaper to purchase a house? I mean you can make the argument that there are long-term economic incentives for the homeowner on a thing like that but if somebody is like buying their first house or upgrading to a nicer house, they're not going to have money to throw around for that one-time purchase.

Mr. Firestone: I mean I'm more referring to new construction.

Mr. Anderson: Right, new construction.

Mr. Athey: I was actually referring to . . .

Mr. Firestone: I mean there's going to be . . . I mean to replace the housing stock is . . .

Ms. Bennett: The same implications apply whether it's new construction or existing. You know, if you're the only place in the area that's requiring that, and here's the big if, if it's significantly more expensive, until the prices come down, you might find people going just over the City line to build their home. And then that has land impact as well as other impact and affects the City. Not to mention tax revenue.

Ms. van Boekhold: Can I add something here? There are, we want to create this market transformation. That's what we want to create. There are like seven different steps this guy Geller said. There are seven different steps to get there. One of them is you educate and empower, then you incentivize, then you create these case studies. And I think regulation is the last step. You know, kind of basically prime the market, you know, get the early adopter, raise the floor and then it's ready. So similar to applying standards. So, I just want, actually, AECOM to take the lead and look at it. To your question, David, yes, for resident, right now that we are starting, for example, from nothing, and again . . .

Ms. Huntley: But we're not starting from nothing. There is an incentive program for solar panels.

Ms. van Boekhold: But remember one of the tasks was look and see is it good? It is comparable? How many people are taking it on? And so it used to be really good, and then the other recommendation would be can we have, for example, some kind of incentive for people to put percentage of like their solar. So if the new development comes, they have, for example, you know that you can have actually solar [inaudible] ready. It means that already you have your buyers for your new construction. I look at solar [inaudible] ready as a builder mandate and kind of require them to put solar. Because that building, if they decide to put solar, it's there.

Mr. Anderson: Can I just say that the state has a requirement that by 2025 all residences built new after 2025 have to be zero energy capable.

Ms. Huntley: What does that mean, zero energy capable?

Mr. Anderson: That's six years from now.

Mr. Athey: What does zero energy capable mean?

Mr. Anderson: It means that the energy use of the building, the dwelling, is 100% offset by the capacity to generate that energy onsite. So, it's solar energy and all the heating in the home is electric and you've got it, it's built so it's designed to require enough energy that you could generate it onsite solar. It has to be zero energy capable. It doesn't have to have the solar

panels but it has to have the capability, if I add solar panels, I don't require any energy from the outside world to run my house. That's six years from now. So, like you said, there's a stage of getting there, and then regulation is the last step. Well, somebody has already got the regulatory path moving, so it seems as though you may want to focus on the education and look at really how many new homes are built in Newark every year.

Mr. Athey: Compared to the number that already exist, which is kind of my point.

Mr. Anderson: So, I mean, are there big developments going in all the time? No, I think we have a different setting here. We're more infill and re-use some little areas. You don't have a massive build-out of new homes to worry about. So, after 2025, anybody that tears down a house and builds a new one is going to have to up the game. And slowly, I guess, over a period of 75-100 years, you'll have your whole building stock replaced. We need to move faster than that for climate change. So, maybe that's not the thing that does it. Maybe there's a chance to buy 100% green energy for your house. Is that a current option in Newark or not?

Ms. Huntley: No.

Mr. Firestone: No.

Mr. Anderson: Okay, that's a barrier. That is a major change that you could be focusing on to make some big changes faster.

Mr. Firestone: And we could incentivize putting in . . .

Ms. Bennett: I like that.

Mr. Firestone: High efficiency furnaces. I mean there's a bunch of things that the City can do. If you give someone a couple hundred dollars towards a high-efficiency furnace, you're going to get more people who are going to take that 20% because you get your payback in four years instead of six years. And those are the kind of . . .

Ms. van Boekhold: So, incentive, education incentive, and then eventually . . . yeah, I want to kind of say so we have under the goals, I have a feeling that you'll need to kind of break it down . . .

Mr. Athey: Yeah actually what I kind of did, and Bahareh, I think it is kind of what you're saying, is each goal will then have action items connected to it.

Ms. van Boekhold: Yes. And then one is kind of renewable and one is energy reduction. Because we talk a lot about renewable, what are different areas, and then there is an energy reduction as it gets to have more efficient furnaces. Like, for example, benchmarking, again, looking at your City operation, where is energy being used and how you can reduce that. Benchmarking . . .

Ms. Huntley: Okay, I only see two goals, correct? We've only discussed two goals. One is increasing the energy efficiency of City operations and the other one is increasing the renewable energy component of the City's electric. Are there other goals under energy that we want to add?

Ms. Smith: Public education.

Mr. Anderson: I think you want to do the same thing for the non-City . . .

Ms. Huntley: That would be an action item, right?

Mr. Firestone: Yeah.

Mr. Anderson: You want to do the same thing for the non-City buildings, which includes residences, businesses, and UD.

Ms. Huntley: So, increase energy . . .

Mr. Anderson: Decrease energy and increase renewable energy.

Mr. Firestone: Yeah, and then there's . . .

Mr. Anderson: That's just my suggestion.

Mr. Firestone: Transport, too.

Ms. van Boekhold: I think we should because action items are different.

Mr. Firestone: And that can start with City vehicles. For a couple of years in a row when we went over the annual budget at the Planning Commission, I would say, so who has considered electric vehicles? And the first year it was nobody. Not a single department had even considered electric vehicles. The second year, I think it was the police and one of the nice things about electric vehicles is they're very fast.

Ms. Huntley: But if you look at this, for example, we want people to reduce their electric consumption but then we are saying you should switch from your gasoline . . .

Mr. Firestone: Well because you're reducing your greenhouse gas consumption.

Ms. Huntley: Right, so you're not actually reducing your electric consumption by switching from gasoline to . . .

Mr. Firestone: No.

Ms. Huntley: Right, but if our goal is to reduce electric consumption . . .

Mr. Firestone: No, no . . .

Mr. Huntley: Then we can't say but it's okay if you . . .

Mr. Firestone: You have some things that you're moving towards efficiency but you still want to shift over to ways to generate the fewest greenhouse gases . . .

Ms. Smith: So, stop running fossil fuels . . .

Mr. Firestone: Yes.

Ms. Smith: Use solar to make electricity.

Mr. Firestone: We, ultimately, are going to consume more electricity than we are today because, you know, ultimately, if we're going to go to carbon-neutral, we're going to have electric building heat. I mean that's really the only way you do it. And you're going to have an electrified vehicle fleet . . .

Ms. Bennett: Don't forget renewable bio-gas

Mr. Firestone: Yeah, well, I mean, yes, there are . . .

Ms. Smith: What did she say? Renewable what?

Mr. Athey: Bio-gas.

Mr. Firestone: Yes, there are other things, but we are going to increase electricity consumption, but it's to reduce the carbon footprint and the emissions of, you know . . .

Ms. Smith: Right now, most of our electricity comes from coal burning. But if we make the switch to solar and renewable, then you're still using electricity but you're not burning coal to get it. So, electricity is where you want to go.

Ms. van Boekhold: So, there are . . .

Ms. Smith: You can still reduce your electricity consumption now, as long as you're still relying on coal sources, fossil fuel sources. So, it's a two-step process.

Ms. van Boekhold: Can I interrupt? We are talking about different things. So, you are right, but everybody is right. We are talking about what is greenhouse gas emission reduction? What is high performance building? I wanted to draw something but I can't, so like Helga is saying that it will increase the electricity. We shouldn't say decrease electricity. We can say improve energy performance of residential and commercial buildings. That can be our goal, by whatever percentage. And there will be action items under it for educating housing, like educating residents so that they use incentives that are out there. Kind of identify are they using it or not. And then looking at our low-income housing and seeing are they actually in any program that they are using. For commercial businesses, are they using our incentives out there, and can they use that. One of the education ones, education will be can we have a program every year to recognize the greenest businesses? Who did upgrade their lighting to LED? So, these are the education that comes under reducing energy for commercial businesses and residents. Other ones I think you are talking about, that's a fuel conversion. That would also come under the greenhouse gas reduction and transportation. So, fuel had like one that is a fuel source and one is the fuel in the buildings and one fuel for transportation. So, all of those, if we kind of put them in different goals, then objectives lay under that. And, again, we talk about when you talk about transportation fuel, eventually if you move to electricity that has more renewables, then it's greener but also I think we have diesel in the City. I mean isn't the transition from diesel, what is the transition fuel? Are we going to natural gas because the state may have already some incentive? I don't know, that would be kind of, again, the baseline. How many diesel buses?

Ms. Huntley: Do you want to move on to transportation?

Ms. van Boekhold: It's energy. It's the energy part of the transportation. It's the fuel part of transportation.

Ms. Bennett: I would suggest that if the City of Newark wants to encourage some kind of energy transition, you go straight to renewables. Don't worry about natural gas. And the reason for that is operating, or encouraging some kind of infrastructure, economic, whatever you want to shift toward natural gas as an energy source, is going to take a really long time. It's going to take a decade at least, if not more, and then you're going to turn around and move towards renewable anyway. So, I would say just cut to the chase and if the City wants to encourage some kind of renewable energy, whether it's procuring green energy through the utility or solar panels on houses, solar hot water is a thing and in some cases that can be more affordable than electric solar, whatever it is, just go straight to renewables. We're not going to [inaudible] climate change where we can, like, take a few transitional steps to get to the end goal. We've got to cut straight to the chase when it comes to that.

Ms. Huntley: Are you guys aware of what the potential for wind power is in our area?

Mr. Anderson: Yeah.

Mr. Firestone: I mean land-based, very little in the whole State of Delaware and none in New Castle County. Maybe . . .

Ms. Huntley: So, when we talk about renewable energy for Newark, we're talking only solar? Or are there other renewable sources? Geothermal or anything else?

Mr. Firestone: We can buy our electricity from offshore wind turbines but as far as local community, we're really pretty much talking solar.

Mr. Swiatek: Well, the challenge in transportation with going right to electric, especially with the buses, is they're just not ready for prime time. The buses, the EV buses are just, they don't operate really well on the big roads and so DNREC was working on a VW grant, trying to give money away for that . . .

Ms. van Boekhold: And it's coming in the next couple of years. You know, the grant, the money is coming.

Mr. Swiatek: They went to natural gas because they did like an analysis and found they could get more buses on that fuel and have a net less emissions by doing that versus investing that same amount of money in EV buses. So . . .

Ms. Smith: So, they went from diesel to natural gas?

Mr. Swiatek: Yes.

Ms. Smith: So, that's a big change.

Mr. Swiatek: I think they were able to do more that, you know, the City might be in that spot if you're going to have those buses for the next 20 years or whatever. Then after that's done, then, yeah, the EVs will be ready more for prime time.

Mr. Firestone: The education farm is looking at it for school buses.

Mr. Anderson: There's also fuel cells.

Mr. Firestone: You know, there's a lot of negatives towards diesel buses with kids, the air pollution . . .

Ms. Smith: It's terrible.

Mr. Firestone: And getting them [inaudible] on why you want to shift over to electric buses. And there are companies out there manufacturing them . . .

Mr. Anderson: There are two in Philly.

Mr. Firestone: The economics on this is really shifting so you've got to really take a longer-term perspective.

Ms. Huntley: So, can you explain what you mean by they don't do well on big roads? Because in Europe, electric buses are very common and they seem to be doing very well driving on big roads.

Mr. Swiatek: Well, DART actually, just for example, they have some hybrid buses that are like half electric and half diesel buses and they actually found that they didn't work very well. On long haul routes they just were eating up too much of the diesel and they assumed they would be powered more electrically. I can send you some of the research that I've seen on them.

Ms. Huntley: What you mean is that for long distance travel . . .

Mr. Swiatek: Right.



Ms. Smith: From Wilmington to Newark, for example . . .

Ms. Huntley: Is the problem.

Ms. Smith: Is that what you're saying?

Mr. Swiatek: Sure.

Ms. Smith: Or Wilmington to Middletown. So, within the City, buses that just do City routes could do the hybrids.

Ms. Huntley: Like the Unicity bus, for example.

Mr. Anderson: And electrics.

Ms. Smith: And electrics.

Mr. Swiatek: That's where they do better. If a bus isn't going a certain high speed or on a big commute or whatnot.

Ms. van Boekhold: I look at AECOM as a resource to look at what is right now in the City and what the potential. Considering that there are some funding right now out there and the VW settlement funds will be coming down in, you know, a couple years of funding coming down. So, again, there would be funding. So, there is opportunity for the City to do something because there would be funds.

Ms. Huntley: Should we add as a goal to reduce the number of diesel-powered vehicles in the City fleet?

Ms. van Boekhold: Yeah, that would be exactly . . .

Ms. Smith: That makes sense.

Ms. van Boekhold: Wouldn't that be an objective under reducing . . .

Ms. Huntley: That's a goal.

Ms. Smith: Isn't there a conversation right now, doesn't the University have, do they use diesel-powered buses? Isn't there a conversation right now like the City would like to use, let me get on a UD bus because there are more of them and aren't they less polluting?

Mr. Swiatek: Well, I'm not sure what those, the standard buses are diesel and the newer diesel buses are much cleaner than the older diesel buses, but I know UD is testing all kinds of stuff. They're testing an autonomous vehicle bus, at some point, on the STAR Campus. So, and they have a hydrogen bus, of course, so it's like they're trying but I would assume . . .

Ms. Smith: But they won't let us on.

Mr. Athey: Separate conversation.

Mr. Swiatek: And that's a problem because it's redundancy, you know. That's gets at that. The school bus issue is also an issue because I think there's a lot of kids that are using buses that maybe don't need to, so it's gets at systemic structural issues about why kids are being bused somewhere when maybe they could just walk to school, the way communities are designed. But another area too was with EV, just trying to promote multi-dwelling EV use, like for personal vehicles. So, that might be an issue, as well. Like, having so many multi-family dwellings in the City, are there barriers to folks that live there purchasing a personal EV vehicle because they don't have a place to charge it. So, maybe like an ordinance or that requirement

could be there that you retrofit that multi-family dwelling to have charging stations to open that market up.

Ms. Huntley: Okay, so to phrase this in terms of a goal, would our goal be to increase the infrastructure for electric vehicles in the City?

Mr. Swiatek: That sounds good.

Mr. Anderson: Absolutely.

Ms. van Boekhold: Objectives, actions under that would be kind of looking at a City ordinance that would make EV charging for multi-family dwellings. I'm thinking this will also tie into that other that, for example, the group is looking at what kind of standard for building to adopt. For example, this could be something that if they adopt, they get a point. If they put a charging station for a multi-family, it's one of the things that you get a point and maybe there's a little incentive assigned to that. So, I think as you kind of flesh these out and put the goals and action items under it, things will kind of start to pop up and there will be synergies between this one and the planning of the transportation. So, the fuel transportation and planning transportation have synergies. Green building and sustainable planning will, again, have synergies as it kind of relates to each other and we can actually identify the ones that are working together. Was this helpful? Do you think we kind of gave guidelines for you to, I think Helga wrote down actually four goals . . .

Ms. Huntley: Five.

Ms. van Boekhold: Five goals.

Ms. Huntley: And I think you have them all.

Ms. van Boekhold: And the things you have under opportunities, they come as actions.

Mr. Athey: Yeah, I think I understand and this is what I was looking at, how to be framing the themes.

Ms. van Boekhold: But the biggest part is like where we are and what do we have? Like, how many diesel buses do we have so we can say we want to reduce and we know where we are starting.

Mr. Anderson: Diesel vehicles get into things like the roads department, the whole fleet of City vehicles. It would be nice to get a City vehicle inventory to see where . . .

Ms. van Boekhold: Yeah, the City should have that.

Mr. Anderson: yes, I'm sure there's somebody somewhere in charge of that. There's a spreadsheet, right? So, when you brought up that idea of reducing the number of diesel-powered vehicles the City uses, that's including general, high-level, and we should try and get someone to give us an inventory and we can find out how many there are. Now I know there's things like fire trucks where they are highly resistant to change anything. They're expensive and it's a reliable engine and we need the reliability. But, then again, you've got the construction department, road maintenance supervisor vehicle. That could be electric. That's a hands-down, right? But they all have fuel and energy and sustainability opportunities and impacts that we just need to look at what is the best way to go. And eventually when you're at the end of things, there's going to be an electric fire engine someday, one would hope.

Ms. van Boekhold: And I think Bill would be a good source to find out actually, to look at the stream of funding that's coming down, because that would be very much helping as we are putting action items that we want to implement, knowing that the money is coming and how

we can actually tie, like objectives that we can actually, action items that we can look at the funds.

Ms. Smith: Do we want another UD person on this Steering Committee? Is there . . .

Ms. van Boekhold: I would like actually . . .

Ms. Smith: I mean Michelle is great but I'm thinking somebody . . .

Ms. van Boekhold: Yeah, Michelle is great and she's representing . . .

Ms. Smith: From CEEP. I mean that was a question I actually had, shouldn't we . . .

Ms. van Boekhold: CEEP or is it Public Administration? They always seem to help cities. They kind of teach the students about sustainability, don't they, Mike? I mean, I was like . . .

Ms. Huntley: So, Jeremy is . . .

Mr. Firestone: We're already pretty heavy on the University side. You've got me, you've got Helga, you've got Michelle . . .

Ms. Smith: Oh, I didn't know Helga was associated with the University.

Ms. Huntley: I work for the University.

Mr. Firestone: I don't know if you would want to have half of the Committee . . .

Ms. Smith: And I thought you were with Planning or a citizen, so I'm sorry. It's just nobody was identifying themselves.

Mr. Firestone: I do energy and climate for my research and teaching. That's most of my teaching.

Ms. Smith: Okay. But do you communicate, are you involved with communicating back to the University? I mean you bring knowledge. I'm sorry if I'm misunderstanding . . .

Mr. Firestone: Yeah, that's okay.

Ms. Smith: But are you bringing, are you communicating what's going on here with some element of the University?

Mr. Firestone: Yes . . .

Ms. Huntley: I think Michelle really is the point person for that.

Mr. Firestone: She communicates with the administration and the facilities side of the University. I'm the Director of the Center for Carbon Free Power Integration . . .

Ms. Smith: No, that's okay. So, what you're saying is we have enough.

Mr. Firestone: Yes. So, Michelle really gets in and up to facilities and so she . . .

Ms. Bennett: I mean I'm not limited to facilities, now.

Mr. Firestone: I was saying your staff, whereas I'm a faculty member. So, there's a different relationship.

Ms. Bennett: Well that's absolutely true. But here's the thing. My job all day every day is to try to push and pursue this stuff, and the good news for me, because this is not the case at all universities, the good news is that I'm not limited to facilities. So, I do work with the academic side a little bit, so I was involved in the committee that helped get the money for the food systems and sustainability program on south campus. I worked with researchers to get research funding and a lot of what I do is liaising between facilities and the academic community where that's appropriate.

Ms. Smith: I think that's it. You know, I think I lost track of that, Michelle.

Ms. Bennett: So, anything that has to do with communicating out, like I'll take all the help I can get but part of my job is dedicated to trying to communicate a variety of sustainability issues, including what's going on on campus and with the City, etc.

Ms. Smith: Okay.

Ms. Bennett: It's definitely an area where we can do more and we can see a lot of improvement because it's not necessarily where my skillset is. But I do have, you know, the dubious honor that that's part of my job description. So, part of my time is dedicated to it.

Ms. Smith: Okay, sorry. I just thought you were it.

Mr. Firestone: You know, there's a new student group dedicated to 100% renewable energy so they just started their carbon [inaudible].

Ms. Bennett: There's a lot going on, we just need to coordinate or collaborate better.

Ms. Smith: Well there is that Newark Futures thing, which is a good opportunity. I was really impressed with the way that that format . . . did anyone else go? Newark Futures.

Ms. Huntley: The second one.

Mr. Anderson: I read about it. I couldn't go.

Ms. Smith: Good presentations and it was Newark and the University sharing information, and it was well-attended. So, that's a good place to go for good communication, I thought. I learned a lot. I encourage everybody to go.

Mr. Anderson: So, when we get this sustainability plan done, we have to have a presentation at that. That would be . . .

Ms. Smith: Are you saying you have to or you . . .

Mr. Anderson: We have to organize that as a way to get this communicated out.

Ms. Smith: Right. And that's through the public Policy Department.

Ms. Huntley: I think it's the Community Engagement Initiative at the University that runs the Newark Futures workshop.

Ms. Smith: But that's just through the Public Policy Department, I'm pretty sure. Dr. Rich.

Mr. Fortner: Dr. Lewis.

Ms. Smith: Whatever, we'll figure it out.

Mr. Anderson: I get emails on it because I'm [inaudible].

Mr. Athey: Okay, so, I want to respect everybody's time and it's 6:00, so I guess what I'm hearing is the desire on the part of the Steering Committee is we should be getting offline with various City departments, the Electric Department, the Parks Department, obviously Public Works and Water Resources. The City Manager's Office ought to be in there somewhere. Quite honestly, WILMAPCO might be in there because I think a lot of it is certainly the transportation stuff. How we deal with food, we can deal with that a little bit later because that's not really a City thing, but . . .

Mr. Anderson: But we talked to some people and I think there's a small coalition we can get to.

Mr. Athey: I'm just saying that we may not find it at 220 South Main Street . . .

Mr. Anderson: Right.

Mr. Athey: At this point. I guess what I haven't, you know, the Council and Mayor and, I guess, Mike, I'm going to maybe put you on the spot a little bit, it dawned on me a little while ago, what is the schedule we laid out some months back, the very last stop was City Council. And is that an approval of the plan, or an acceptance of the plan, or . . .

Ms. Huntley: An adoption of the plan.

Mr. Fortner: Well, we'll have to get into what those three different things are, but yes, I guess. I want them to adopt the plan.

Mr. Athey: Okay.

Mr. Anderson: Which would mean they're buying into all the action items.

Mr. Athey: Exactly. That's where I really was going.

Mr. Anderson: Like Jeremy said, give it some teeth.

Mr. Athey: Right, and what got me started, actually, was Jeremy, earlier in the meeting about, you know, should this plan say, and your recommendation is it should and I'm not necessarily disagreeing with you, we will mandate this to occur in all new construction after a certain date. You know, there is probably going to be some pushback on that. So, I guess I'm just trying to figure out where we, you know, I don't want to go the whole nine yards down this whole plan and get to City Council and they say we can't approve this thing.

Ms. Smith: That would be a conversation with the City Solicitor maybe. What can you do? How far can you go?

Mr. Athey: No, I'm not sure it's a solicitor thing.

Ms. Keller: I just want to chime in a little bit about because I think that that points back to the reasoning behind using the opportunities language and then action items as sort of a subset of that. And correct me if I'm wrong, but when we were talking about it internally, we were looking at the goals and objectives, and the opportunities were sort of the laundry list of everything that we could do or have, and the action item were kind of like the immediate things. And so with this City Council meeting in mind, we might want to find some way to treat opportunities in the plan in a way that, you know, everything can't be an action item, right? Because we probably aren't going to get them to adopt everything in one fell swoop, but we don't want to leave out those opportunities. So, I just wanted to bring that up that I think that could be a case for including some sort of language, maybe it's not opportunities but like not everything can be an action item right now. So, how do you categorize those other things that are maybe down the line? Do you know what I'm saying? Does that make sense?

Mr. Athey: Yes.

Mr. Firestone: And I don't know that, I mean, I don't think we're ready as a City for mandatory requirements in 2020. I mean, I see 2020 when you start having rebuttable presumptions that you're going to do certain things. So, this is generally what's going to happen but if you've got a lot that's situated in such a way, it's shaded this way, then you can show that you don't have to do it. But maybe then by 2030, you can still put in your plan by 2030 it's mandatory. There's a lot less problem for these City Council members to say, you know, to be moving toward the 2030 date than there is 2020. I mean I think just like requirements can get more strict as far as percentage of electric, you can have graduated requirements as far as going to things being mandatory. I don't think we can just snap our fingers and say the City is going to be, you know, San Francisco or Seattle.

Ms. Smith: But departments can begin incorporating these things into their mission statement as kind of an idea of a way to go.

Ms. Huntley: We can define it as the path forward . . .

Mr. Anderson: The path.

Ms. Huntley: And we can say by 2020, these are the three specific things we're going to do. And by 2050, these are the bigger things that we have on our mind.

Mr. Athey: Alright, that answered by question real well.

Mr. Anderson: And there is the recent climate change statement from the UN where 2032 is the critical year. So . . .

Ms. Huntley: Why?

Mr. Anderson: Because of the model.

Ms. Smith: Because they've discovered that the oceans are warmer than they realized they were and it's brought it even closer than 2032.

Ms. Huntley: 2032 is the year when what happens?

Mr. Anderson: They're expecting 2032 to be the year when we would get to 1.5 degrees. And then if we go another half-degree, all the coral in the ocean dies. So, we really have to push to hold at 2032.

Ms. van Boekhold: And then, Dave, to your comment, we heard some of these things from the residents, so there was an interest from the residents. There was an opportunity with the grant, so we can find a way to present it the way you kind of say what are the short ones by 2020 and what are the longer ones. But as we go to present it for the City, this is something that not only there was an opportunity, there is a need and there is a desire from the community. It is kind of like presenting it again, what are the actionable items and what are we already doing that we can take credit. Again, kind of striking that balance that in the next 2-3 years, these are the success stories that we are going to make to build on that. And, hopefully, if we are lucky, we can get another grant. And, as you are writing the report in 2-3 looking at how we did, we can update it. So those opportunities would change to action items.

Mr. Athey: Right.

Mr. Anderson: Yes.

Ms. van Boekhold: But we want to actually have enough action items that are measurable, that are tangible . . .

Mr. Athey: Exactly.

Mr. Anderson: That are material and meaningful.

Ms. van Boekhold: Exactly. That make this meaningful. So, I think this one is definitely ready to kind of go on for being more fleshed out. And you have a transportation one.

Mr. Athey: Actually, that was going to be my only other question. What do you want us to do now with the other six or seven?

Ms. van Boekhold: I think transportation there was a consensus on the transportation and the planning one . . .

Mr. Anderson: And the green planning one.

Ms. van Boekhold: And the green planning one. I think those are the three that you should definitely kind of flesh out completely. What do you think, Helga?

Ms. Huntley: Yeah, I feel like we had a really productive conversation with energy today. It would be nice if we could have something like that on the other topics.

Mr. Anderson: Yeah, I agree.

Ms. van Boekhold: But what if they flesh out the baselines so the next time we are talking I would say okay, what is the planning, or what is the ridership, and they actually know the baseline. So, them fleshing out the baseline would be really helpful.

Ms. Huntley: But maybe they should focus on those three themes rather than all eight . . .

Mr. Athey: Right.

Ms. Huntley: For the next meeting.

## **5. NEXT STEPS: AECOM PRESENTS NEXT STEPS AND DISCUSSION**

Mr. Athey: Perfect segue because I'm trying to get with, you know, and I didn't mention Planning, I'm sorry, Mike, earlier in the list. But you know, with five or six groups here. Assuming we want to meet again like early December, assuming, I can't guarantee I'd be able to get with everybody but now you've told me who to prioritize. Clearly, the Electric Department would be the first stop. Bill, I'd probably look to meet with you. I think you could be very helpful. And then, maybe, Tim, who I'm going to see on something unrelated anyway, from a transportation standpoint. And then, Mike, you're already here, so I don't know, maybe get with you and Mary Ellen at some point on Code issues and things like that. So, we can try to get all three of those done in a month-ish. Hopefully that will fall into place okay.

Ms. van Boekhold: And we can another working one. Hopefully, we can actually tackle two things next time, or even more.

Mr. Athey: Yeah.

## **6. NEXT MEETING DATE**

Mr. Fortner: So, do you want me to Doodle Poll the week of December 3 or the 10<sup>th</sup>?

Ms. van Boekhold: I think the 10<sup>th</sup> would get maybe harder. Let's see if on the 3<sup>rd</sup> we can . . .

Mr. Fortner: The 3<sup>rd</sup>.

Mr. Athey: Yeah, let's kind of keep it maybe early in the month each month.

Ms. Smith: Is it, I'll have a Conservation Advisory Commission meeting if it's a Tuesday.

Mr. Fortner: That's the 11<sup>th</sup> of December.

Ms. Smith: Is that the second Tuesday?

Mr. Fortner: No, that would be, this would be the first week, so you're Conservation is on the 11<sup>th</sup>.

Ms. Smith: Okay.

Ms. van Boekhold: Thursdays? What about Thursdays? Are Thursdays not good?

Mr. Fortner: No, Thursdays are good, but we just had a problem with room availability has always been a thing.

Mr. Athey: Oh, are we going to be able to meet in your new location in December?

Mr. Swiatek: Ask me when we get there. I'll make sure we have chairs and everything.

Ms. van Boekhold: We can sit on the floor. We are very flexible.

Mr. Athey: Seriously, if we meet on December 4 or 5, you're just going to be 3-4 days in that new location.

Mr. Fortner: I'll try to get City Hall first, but . . .

Mr. Anderson: [inaudible]

Mr. Athey: We could but why don't we try to meet somewhere in Newark, unless you all carpool.

Ms. Smith: Which we should.

Mr. Athey: No, I mean we have a big conference room but, you know . . .

Ms. van Boekhold: Can't we get Newark Library conference room.

Ms. Fortner: Well, they're closed on Thursdays. And if we do something at AECOM and we have to make it available to the public.

Mr. Athey: Oh, right. No, City Hall would be best.

Mr. Fortner: Okay, I was going for City Hall and the problem is the Council Chamber is really the only room.

Mr. Athey: Right.

Ms. van Boekhold: And the George Wilson Center is not?

Ms. Fortner: Well, that's a feasible one too and I can always go for that. Now they have yoga and things like that, so that was in conflict for this day, as well. Thursday every room had a conflict. WILMAPCO couldn't do it and the Library was close. The Senior Center was available. That's something, too.



Ms. Smith: Michael, why were the City people missing today?

Mr. Fortner: Well, it's the budget. There's a budget hearing tonight and they're all booked up and it could be the final one . . .

Ms. Smith: Okay, that's the reason. Got it.

Mr. Fortner: They might actually approve it, so they were all on deck for that.

Ms. Smith: So, that was just tonight?

Mr. Fortner: Yeah. It was a fluke, yeah.

Mr. Athey: Let me ask about, then, the, we were kind of presenting this just like a straw man. We hadn't really gotten into the, should be we doing on these other two themes, or would you all rather kind of develop the goals? Or do you want us to take kind of the first stab at it, in addition to just kind of the research, or do you want us again to kind of tee it up for you?

Ms. van Boekhold: I don't know. I'm looking at everybody. I don't mind if you guys tee it up and not 100% because we want to have conversation. But you see how we kind of had these four different goals for City . . .

Mr. Athey: Okay.

Ms. van Boekhold: And you can actually take it . . .

Mr. Athey: Get part way there, at least.

Ms. van Boekhold: Yes, I think a baseline of where we are can be kind of defined with opportunities and what eventually will be action items, a potential list of them.

Mr. Athey: Okay.

Ms. van Boekhold: Can we brainstorm? But I think the Committee will add because we know, you know, what are the resources or what are the strengths.

Ms. Smith: And if you have it available and you do a process like we did where you go through and edit it and change it . . .

Mr. Athey: Okay, that's the direction we'll go.

Ms. van Boekhold: Yeah.

Ms. Huntley: What [inaudible], I just looked at the two goals. There was one that was greenhouse gas specific that we totally dropped.

Ms. van Boekhold: No, I think actually we moved the greenhouse gas to under the energy.

Mr. Athey: I'm sorry, Helga, where are you?

Ms. Huntley: You had under your clean energy, your second goal was a greenhouse gas emissions inventory and we didn't talk about anything like that at all.

Mr. Anderson: No, we didn't.

Ms. Huntley: So, my question to the group is do we want to keep it in?

Ms. van Boekhold: We should keep it.

Mr. Anderson: And there's a second option, too, which I kind of like and I wanted to introduce is from ICLEI which is sustainability for cities. They have a tool that has a nine-step to address climate change for a city and I think it's a little more cookbook. They have apps that you use and between that or this protocol, so we may want to choose one or the other.

Ms. van Boekhold: As objectives?

Mr. Anderson: As an objective. Yeah, it leads you through it.

Ms. Smith: What's the name of it?

Mr. Anderson: I'll email it. It's I-C-L-E-I, ICLEI.

Ms. Huntley: That's a method for doing your greenhouse gas emissions . . .

Mr. Anderson: Yeah, they have a, what's it called? It's like green cities climate something or other. I'll email it.

Ms. Huntley: So, do we want to add to . . .

Mr. Anderson: It's an alternative protocol for getting control of your inventory.

Ms. Huntley: So, do we want to specify that we have a target reduction of our emissions? Or do we want to say we will create an inventory?

Ms. van Boekhold: Actually, I'm split on that because I think not knowing our emissions and [inaudible] so we can't have some 5% or 10% of whatever baseline because we have to define a baseline. So, we can have a target, a small target.

Mr. Anderson: A small target.

Ms. van Boekhold: As we incorporate all of these energy ones, again, the challenge is measuring them and then going back and measure. I actually had a comment for that. I know it will be a lot, I have seen Philadelphia update it every two years and it ended up being every three years, so I just kind of know it's a hard one.

Mr. Anderson: Okay, yeah.

Ms. van Boekhold: So, kind of getting it and knowing where we are and reducing it, and then the first objective is to do this every three years. You have to create your baseline and measure it.

Mr. Anderson: What do you want to have for your baseline year? That's a decision you need to make.

Ms. van Boekhold: Whatever they use, if you're going to measure our baseline 2018 or 2019, that should be our baseline. I don't think we should go back.

Mr. Anderson: Yeah, okay.

Ms. van Boekhold: But please do look at other ones because I think if we're going to measure our greenhouse inventory now, we should use that as a baseline.

There being no further business, the Newark Community Sustainability Plan Steering Committee meeting adjourned at 6:25 p.m.

As transcribed by Michelle Vispi  
Planning and Development Department Secretary