MEETING MINUTES
Evanston Environment Board
Thursday, March 8, 2012
7:00 p.m.
Lorraine H. Morton Civic Center, 2100 Ridge, Room #2200

Members Present: Paige Finnegan, Susan Besson, Hugh Bartling, Jacob Croegart

Members Absent: Jill Franklin, Likwan Chang, Anne Viner, Laurie Zoloth, Suzanne Waller, Kevin Glynn, Ellen King

Staff Present: Suzette Robinson, Public Works Director, Michelle Cain, Executive Secretary

Guests: Donnie Dann, Highland Park resident; Judy Pollock, Chicago Audubon Society

Presiding Members: Paige Finnegan, Susan Besson

I. CALL TO ORDER / DECLARATION OF QUORUM
   a. Meeting began at 7:04 pm.
   b. Minutes from the February meeting were not approved due to lack of a quorum.

II. CITIZEN COMMENT
    There was no citizen comment.

III. STAFF UPDATES
    a. Compost Survey Update - C. Hurley and S. Robinson met with NU students about survey (compiling data). NU Students will compile the data (about 250 responses with 50 being those who received the cans, estimated). Second week of April the data will be presented to S. Robinson. 250-300 additional garbage cans are available to modify to composters; survey data will help to focus efforts.
    b. Phase-Out/Fate of Parking Meters: Parking staff is doing a cost-benefit analysis of the meters. Mostly doing planning this year. Location of the boxes, for example. Hugh: Will the meters be able to offer variable pricing based on demand? (Recommended reference: Daniel Shoup, The High Price of Free Parking.) S. Robinson: Parking and Transportation Committee is in charge of this (Marty Lyons, Ricky Voss). Hugh: The assumption seems that they are going to be removing the old meters. We want clarification on that. The meter posts were left as a courtesy to bikers. Suzette: I don’t see that happening in Evanston. We don’t see
those as bike racks. We will provide other bike racks. Susan: Perhaps it could be a phased removal of meter posts. So that there are places for bikes until the racks are there. We’d also like to know what the metrics are for the “cost-benefit” analysis. Only considering the revenue of one parking place, for example. Hugh: They currently serve as bike racks and it’s going to be an issue if they’re removed. Suzette: They are not attractive on meter poles. Obstructing the right of way is not an option. We do not want them attached to meters and trees but we do want to provide appropriate places to park bikes.

c. **Bike Corral Pilot:** Suzette: Council received the packet. Summarized what we were trying to accomplish. Wasn’t able to get through the entire presentation before Ald. Burrus raised the concern of the lost revenue from the two spaces forfeited (approx. $6,000 for 2 spaces for one year). Susan: Were we able to provide additional background? Suzette: Public works has an assessment and Parking has an assessment. Suzette imagines that 90-95% of the bikers will be going into EAC. Paige: I would imagine that bikers would park there to go elsewhere. Suzette: A letter was sent to EAC asking them to pay $3,500 (or a portion) for the one year pilot. They have until March 16th to respond. Hugh: What happened to our recommendation (try 4 corrals throughout downtown)? It keeps going back to EAC but we’re trying to promote cycling downtown. There are multiple modes of transportation to downtown. Priority to low-carbon vehicles (per the City’s planning documents). How does it keep getting tied back to one location? Suzette: That was a proposal that was submitted to staff. That proposal was not accepted (Paige: by who? Staff or P/T committee?) “Blew up to revenue.” That is why we have a pilot location. We have to prove it. EAC is ideal due to the width of the sidewalk. The sidewalk is congested with bikes. There is not enough room. This is an easy one to try. Paige: Where is the meter near EAC? Suzette: There are unoccupied meters all throughout downtown. Paige: Where? Susan: The thinking is also not represented. Ald. Burrus is speaking to lost revenue and there was no response to that basic question. We immediately go to ask the business for the money instead of offering a response to the basic issue of money. Suzette: It’s not about the fight, it’s about the result. The issue will not move until the Ald. are satisfied. Ald. Burrus was upset that the P/T committee did not provide that information about revenue as it appears to have been asked before. Is it really lost revenue? Presented to A&PW on March 19th at which time they will vote. If it is approved, then it will move immediately to implementation.

d. **Alley Ordinance:** Suzette: Submitted to A&PW for introduction to codify our alley paving process. Used to be that residents paid 100%, move to 50-50% was never codified. A green alley pilot was done using CDBG
funds. We have had residents ask about the green option and we looked at providing that as an alternative. That item was tabled and held in Committee. 75-80% done with the memo. The cost and value could be an issue. Staff estimate that the cost premium for green alley is about 20%, it really depends on the soil. Comparing 2008 paved alleys to the green alley for cost (was 35% more for green alley than the normal paving program, with sewers installed). That was on sand, if on clay it could be 50% higher. Suzette has since met with the CMO and has provided some other options that will be presented to the Board of Local Improvements on Monday (was returned to them by A&PW). Ald. Rainey does not want CDBG dollars used for this if it’s not cost effective. Hugh: What is the payback on the green alternative? Doesn’t it reduce the impact on the sewer system? How is that quantified? Can you measure that off of the current green alley? Suzette: I don’t think we can. Hugh: Then why do we even have one? Susan: Might be hard for that specific option but perhaps CNT could show some equation. Hugh: If the green alley costs 30% less over the life of the alley. Suzette: There is currently NO green option. 50-50 is ONLY for standard alley paving. The proposal was a good thing. We just need to work through the costs. We were trying to make it revenue neutral to the tax payer. Hugh: When you’re doing conventional alley paving, there are no additional considerations (soil type, etc?)? Suzette: No. Need soil samples in advance. Residents must submit a petition with cost estimates to their neighbors. In presenting a green option, we must show all costs. If the costs are too low, then the City eats the costs.

IV. Proposal for Bird-Friendly Building Ordinance:

a. Donnie Dann of Highland Park and Judy Pollock of Audubon Society offered a presentation with hope that Evanston would develop a bird-friendly ordinance. D. Dann read from State of the Birds, Secretary of the Interior, 2011, and offered a 1-page handout from Inform featuring the Aqua Tower in Chicago by architect Jeanne Gang – lots of “visual noise” is created around the glass. Judy: There are two issues with glass – reflectivity (solved by adding barriers to windows). Neo-tropical migrants are those that are being killed, not necessarily just local birds. Judy sees about 125 species of birds in her yard in SE Evanston. Our location on the lake makes us particularly prone to bird collisions. Donnie has had 176 species of birds in his yard in Highland Park. Birds navigate by the stars. Lights throw them off. The City of Chicago has a voluntary lights out program with buildings. “Lights Out” program started in Chicago in ’99. Focus during migration times. April-June, August-October. San Francisco ordinance is new and is “light-years ahead” of others. Definitions: ‘location-related hazard,’ ‘urban bird refuge,’ would include James Park, Lovelace Park, Northwestern campus and the lake itself.
‘Building feature-related hazards’ include internal courtyards (Levy Center), free-standing clear glass walls, windows facing windows. ‘Area of hazard’: grade to 60 feet (5 or 6 stories). ADA – was fought by the building industry. However, after the implementation it was found that there is no additional cost in new construction. Same with bird-friendly buildings. Doesn’t cost anymore in new construction. New types of glass (UV lines scratched into glass). Lower coefficient of energy. No additional cost. With existing buildings, there is additional cost. Hugh: Is this for all zoning districts? Judy: No, exemptions apply in residential districts – in our proposed ordinance too. Highland Park: Required for all new public construction, voluntary for others. Paige: Can this be added to the GBO? Donnie: Think about the ADA. Northwestern’s stand? Add to the GBO list? Talk to Alderman.

V. Strategic Plan:
   a. Board Orientation – should we do that? Planning discussion was tabled for April meeting.

VI. OPEN DISCUSSION
   None

VII. ADJOURNMENT
   The meeting was concluded at 9:15 pm.

NEXT MEETING – Thursday, April 12, 2012

Respectfully Submitted,
Paige Finnegan