I. Approval of Minutes from November *(attachment)*

II. Citizen Comment *(Please sign in)*

III. Ongoing Business/News/Updates *(15 minutes)*
   a. Bird Friendly Buildings *(attachments)*
   b. Cook County Food Council Proposal *(attachments)*

IV. Disposable Bags – Update and Next Steps *(15 mins)*
   a. Status from Council
   b. Recommendation from Ald. Grover

V. Transportation – *(5 mins)*
   a. Nomination to Transportation and Parking Committee – **FOR ACTION**
   b. Recommendation to Human Services Committee

VI. 2012-2013 Strategic Plan Discussion, P.Finnegan and S. Besson *(60 minutes)*
   a. Amend By-Laws per Revised Guiding Principle from November *(For Action in January)*
      Article II, Section 2: “Guiding Principle”

**REVISED Guiding Principle (Approved November, 2011):** *To support the implementation of the environmental components of the City of Evanston’s guiding documents (including, but not limited to, Strategic Plan, Climate Action Plan, Multi-Modal Transportation Plan, Bicycle Plan) through research, policy recommendations, and coordination with other groups’ efforts.*
b. 2012-2013 Goals and Objectives
   i. Transportation
      1. Bicycles
      2. MMTP and the ECAP
      3. Powers of the Traffic Engineer
   ii. Waste
      1. Disposable Bags
      2. Deconstruction
      3. Composting
   iii. Board Effectiveness
      1. Working sub-committees
      2. Regular communications with Council/other groups
      3. Process development
   iv. Other ideas

c. Assignments and Next Steps

VII. Open Discussion

NEXT MEETING – Thursday, January 12, 2011
MEETING MINUTES
Evanston Environment Board
Thursday, November 10, 2011
7:00 p.m.
Lorraine H. Morton Civic Center, 2100 Ridge, Room #2200

Members Present: Paige Finnegan, Jill Franklin, Hugh Bartling, Susan Besson, Likwan Cheng, Kevin Glynn, Suzanne Waller

Members Absent: Laurie Zoloth, Anne Viner, Ellen King

Staff Present: Carl Caneva, Division Manager

Community Members Present: Stephen McMillan

Presiding Members: Paige Finnegan, Susan Besson

I. CALL TO ORDER / DECLARATION OF QUORUM
   a. There being a quorum, Chair Finnegan called the meeting to order at 7:10 pm.
   b. Minutes from October motion to approve Chair Besson, S. Waller seconded minutes approved unanimously

II. CITIZEN COMMENT
   a. No Comments

III. STAFF REPORTS
   a. City Code Update
      i. C. Caneva indicated the only item relating to code updates on upcoming C. Council agenda is on 12/12/11 Article 1 Municipal Elections. He will follow-up and continue to check the Council agenda against the Board’s proposed amendments.
   b. Environment Board Roster
      i. No further changes to the Board. C. Caneva will email the list to members.

IV. COMMITTEE REPORTS
   a. Disposable Bags
      i. Members discussed the bag ordinance recommendations. P. Finnegan summarized the recommendation made by J. Franklin and L. Zolath at Council on October 24, 2011. The City Council opposed the Board’s recommendations. The Board is concerned regarding the manner in which responses to questions from Ald. Fiske were presented, the reception by Council, and the process. P. Finnegan asked for a status update on the recommendation from
Staff. P. Finnegan asked the Board to decide next moves for the Disposable Bag Recommendation. P. Finnegan then asked how the Board could be more effective. C. Caneva stated there was no update on the recommendation on how to proceed.

ii. P. Finnegan and S. Besson stated the questions raised were legitimate, but the process and tone of the meeting was inappropriate.

iii. K. Glynn stated the take away would be to have items Council-ready prior to leaving the Board. Once items left the Board it was out of the Board’s hands.

iv. H. Bartling stated he didn’t see community support, and still doesn’t see it. He sensed the supporters did not turn out to the meeting. Mr. Bartling was concerned about the specifics of the fee.

v. S. Waller asked if the board should be pointing out the problem of bags rather than focus on the fee.

vi. H. Bartling stated he was unclear about the problem, too much plastic bag use? Litter?

vii. Chair Besson questioned clarity of the purpose and mission from the start regarding the disposable bag issue.

viii. J. Franklin recalled asking months ago for guidance on how much outreach to other groups and retailers, and was told the Board would offer policy recommendations but is not expected to perform outreach.

ix. L. Cheng indicated the questions raised were very specific and the Board did not have evidence to address the questions.

x. Chair Finnegan stated in the case of the Green Building Ordinance and Hen Ordinance there was an ordinance and the recommendation was only a discussion item. Chair Finnegan expressed a need to figure out the best and most effective process with regard to moving these issues forward.

xi. J. Franklin stated she reviewed the minutes and found there was to be an action plan not an ordinance.

xii. K. Glynn asked the output level of other City committees to compare. C. Caneva indicated he could not speak to the actions or the output of other boards and commissions.

xiii. Chair Finnegan stated the Board wanted scrutiny from the Council to provide a future path of action. The issue again was the process.

xiv. S. Waller asked if the task would be to address the questions from Ald. Fiske and report back.

xv. C. Caneva will find out by the December meeting where the recommendation lies and report back.

xvi. Chair Finnegan asked the board if the issue of disposable bags should be used for the strategic plan

xvii. J. Franklin and S. Waller indicated they are interested in continuing the issue. Agreed the cause was worthwhile to pursue.

xviii. K. Glynn asked about the process, to what extent should the Board consider the politics at hand? Should the ordinances and recommendations be politically crafted to best be presented?
xix. H. Bartling stated the process was as important as the topic, suggested a more deliberative process to be more effective.

xx. L. Cheng reiterated Board recommendations needed to come from evidence. The one place where there is evidence is at the level of the landfill.

xxi. J. Franklin reviewed the information presented by Sustainability Programs Coordinator Catherine Hurley on the plastic bags with regards to efficiency.

xxii. J. Franklin asked if the Board was going to issue a response. Chair Finnegan stated the board would wait for a status update then pursue the matter if necessary.

xxiii. Mr. McMillan, Whole Foods, asked what the future holds. Chair Besson stated there was no action to take forward, but the Board would be considering efforts to address disposable bags. Chair Finnegan stated to Mr. McMillan the Environment Board’s work was one step in a long process.

b. Multi-modal Plan

i. H. Bartling asked about the Transportation and Parking Committee (T&PC) and requested an update. He understood the T&PC to be in favor of an Environment Board member to be on the Committee but, it was not on the Rules Committee agenda. C. Caneva will find clarification on the next steps. H. Bartling summarized the Bike Corral Demonstration Recommendation (see November Packet). H. Bartling collaborated with Public Works and proposed a corral at the Evanston Athletic Club (EAC). Chair Finnegan asked if the project should be taken to T&PC. Chair Besson asked what the process should be. Chair Finnegan asked if Downtown Evanston would be willing to split the cost of the corral. Chair Besson stated the idea of lost revenue is short-sighted, as monies lost in meter revenue could be more than recouped in increased business by numerous cyclists. H. Bartling stated you could fit 10 bikes in the space of 1 car.

ii. H. Bartling stated both the Multi-Modal Transportation Plan (MMTP) and the Downtown Plan both have recommendations for more zero emission vehicles.

iii. J. Franklin asked who the authors of the MMTP were. Chair Finnegan stated the study was authored by consultants.

iv. J. Franklin asked about the issue of car congestion and how the corral would address this issue. She was concerned with the argument about congestion, as a driver she could not use a bike, and thought taking away a parking space would increase congestion.

v. P. Finnegan stated there is a parking surplus, there may be small amounts of street parking but there is plenty of parking in the numerous ramps around town and in the downtown.

vi. S. Waller stated that she bikes from Central St. to Downtown when it’s not as busy. As the culture changes the usage of bikes will also change.
vii. Chair Besson indicated the City’s award-winning entry for the Governor’s Sustainability Award referenced increased bike parking created by City.

viii. P. Finnegan reviewed the memorandum distributed by C. Caneva and C. Hurley concerning bicycle expenditures, enforcement, and registration. She called attention to Part II regarding registration and enforcement. There was concern about the discrepancy between registration and enforcement. For example, the number of violations issued to bicyclists by police increased 25% from 2009-2010 and another 26% from 2010-2011 while the number of registration efforts fell by 57% between 2009-2010 and an additional 44% between 2010-2011.

ix. K. Glynn stated the memo showed an investment in bike lanes and the riding needs to be supported by a corral for parking.

x. Chair Finnegan stated the want to move the recommendation to Human Services.

xi. The Board agreed the recommendation be moved forward to Human Services.

xii. H. Bartling asked if the exact locations proposed should be indicated, the Board indicated the sites should be located.

xiii. Chair Besson asked if there would be too much focus on sites.

xiv. J. Franklin indicated she agreed with the idea of providing locations for bike racks and hoped other aldermen would be interested.

xv. K. Glynn motioned for the recommendation to go to Human Services with amendments and the map indicated motion was withdrawn.

c. Strategic Plan

i. Mission

1. Chair Besson made changes to the draft mission, Chair Finnegian asked for input about the changes. (See November Packet)

ii. Guiding Principle

1. Chair Besson stated the guiding principle would be to support the climate action plan, MMTP, Lake Front Plan, Strategic Plan, Downtown plan, Bicycle Plan.

2. J. Franklin supported the changes and agreed they needed to include but not be limited by those referred to in item 1.

iii. SUZANNE WALLER moved to approved mission and guiding principles in the bylaws, 2nd ed by K. GLYNN. Motion passed unanimously

V. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

a. 2012 meeting dates as presented in agenda approved, no changes necessary.

VI. OPEN DISCUSSION

a. K. Glynn requested a discussion on the goals. He indicated his understanding that the Board was interested in bikes, bags, and he was interested in the powers of the traffic engineer.
b. S. Besson indicated an interest in transparency and Board efficacy.
c. Chair Finnegan stated the use of work groups was effective.
d. Chair Finnegan stated Stormwater Management, Commercial Composting, Deconstruction and the Evanston 150 should also be considered to guide the work of the Board.
e. The Board discussed not adding more items to the by-laws but instead address any topics that may surface.
f. The Board discussed the idea of formulating a template for process to be more effective.
g. L. Cheng is working with the Utilities department regarding the operation of the waterworks.
h. Chair Besson attended the CONSEC (Council for North Suburban Environmental Comissions meeting, a number of communities are looking into the idea of aggregating power.
i. L. Cheng asked about air pollution, its impact, and interest from the Board as a Board goal. Chair Finnegan asked how air pollution could be addressed by any guiding documents. S. Waller asked if the pollution had to do with automobiles. L. Cheng indicated it is regional pollution. Board indicated it may be beneficial to tie air pollution to the bike recommendation.

Meeting was adjourned at 9:04 pm
NEXT MEETING – Thursday, December 8, 2011

Respectfully Submitted,
Carl Caneva
Division Manager
Hundreds of millions of birds are killed in the U.S. each year from collisions with windows in structures of all sizes, from homes to office buildings to skyscrapers. While typical skyscrapers can kill hundreds of birds per year from collisions, even small buildings can kill more than 50 birds a year, resulting in tens of thousands across a city or community.

The Peregrine Falcon, the City of Chicago’s Official Bird, thanks you for protecting birds.

Richard M. Daley
Chicago Department of Environment
Chicago Department Housing and Economic Development
Birds and Buildings Forum

BIRDS AND BUILDINGS
DESIGN GUIDE FOR NEW CONSTRUCTION AND RENOVATION

Produced 8/06
Revised 4/11

Printed on recycled paper using soy-based inks

Bird photography by Jerry Kumery, Mary Hennen

Barn Swallow   Black-throated Blue Warbler   Canada Warbler   Chickadee
Eastern Bluebird   Flycatcher   Prothonotary Warbler   Snow Bunting
THE FACTS

Birds do not understand that reflections are false.

Birds do not understand that glass is a solid barrier.

Birds are easily trapped in niches, courtyards and other recessed areas.

Birds are attracted to light and try to fly into lit spaces.

Birds are attracted to vegetation indoors or reflected in buildings.

RESOURCES

Chicago's Bird Agenda (www.cityofchicago.org/Environment)

Lights Out Chicago (www.lightsout.audubon.org)

Bird-Safe Building Guidelines (www.birdsandbuildings.org)

Bird-Collision Research (www.abcbirds.org)

Reducing Bird Collisions with Existing Buildings (www.cityofchicago.org/Environment)

DESIGN GUIDE FOR BIRD-SAFE BUILDINGS

NEW CONSTRUCTION AND RENOVATION

A bird-safe building can be a cutting-edge design, meet LEED standards and protect important species.

SITE STRATEGY/LANDSCAPE

• Analyze surroundings to identify location and angle of birds’ approach to the building; modify glass on this approach facade
• Plant trees and other vegetation so that they are not reflected on building surfaces
• If trees and other vegetation are desired close to the building, plant them immediately adjacent to the existing exterior glass walls (not more than three feet from the glass) to obscure reflections
• In small exterior courtyards and recessed areas, define the building's edge clearly with opaque materials and non-reflective glass
• Avoid walkways constructed of clear glass

COMPOSITION

• Create visible details that birds will recognize
• Avoid flat reflective openings larger than two inches wide or four inches tall
• Include visible structural details such as columns, balconies and lintels in building facades
• Angle glass toward ground or sky so that the reflection is not in a direct line of site (optimum angle: 40°)

MATERIALS

• Select bird-safe glass, or glass that is transparent to humans but not to birds
• Use fritted glass, window film, decals, decorative paint and grills to minimize clear window area
• Specify non-reflective glass
• Attach external screens to operable windows

EXTERIOR

• Design facades with elements that are visually interesting and create a physical barrier, e.g. vines or sun shades
• Use awnings to cast shadows and mute reflection

INTERIOR/LIGHTING

• Integrate design elements in a way that mutes reflections or makes the space appear solid, such as blinds, drapes hung close to glass, perforated shades or artwork installed close to glass
• Select patterns and material of window coverings to create a visible barrier for birds
• Interrupt views through parallel glass facades with objects such as sculptures and furniture
• Avoid decorative lighting; for necessary outdoor lighting, avoid “up-lighting” by directing light toward the ground
• Install motion sensors on interior lights to ensure they are not left on overnight

OBJECTIVES: CREATE VISUAL SIGNALS • MINIMIZE REFLECTIVITY • MINIMIZE LIGHT AT NIGHT
Under the proposed Bird-Safe Buildings Ordinance Amendment, all new County buildings and major renovation projects would be required to incorporate measures to mitigate bird collisions and deaths; existing buildings would need to be made bird-safe where practicable.

The amendment directs the County to consider the guidelines developed by the City of Chicago, New York City Audubon, and the City of Toronto, but permits the use of other techniques and guidelines as well. When considered from the beginning of a construction project, the incorporation of bird-safe measures incurs very little additional cost—frequently none at all.

The goal of any bird-safe measure is to reduce or eliminate the reflections and light sources that confuse birds into thinking open air lies ahead.

- Bird-safe techniques in new construction or renovation include the use of non-reflective glass, fritted glass, or awnings to reduce or eliminate reflections that confuse birds.
- Existing buildings may be made bird-safe at low expense as well. Turning off lights (particularly during migration periods), moving indoor plants away from windows, applying decals and films to windows, lowering blinds, and even soaping windows are all effective.

Why is this ordinance necessary?

- Millions of birds migrate through Cook County every year.
- The Cook County Forest Preserves and surrounding areas are home to at least 290 known species of birds.
- Cook County lies along the Mississippi Flyway, through which more than 300 different species of birds pass during seasons of migration.
- In the United States, as many as one billion birds perish annually when they collide with windows.
- Field Museum scientists studied bird collisions at McCormick Place and found that by simply turning out the lights, collisions could be reduced by 83 percent.
- In the United States 64 million people a year participate in bird watching activities, generating an estimated $40 billion a year in economic activity.
- Warblers and thrushes are of particular concern because they have been declining in population in recent years. Their decline is a result of habitat loss and collisions with windows and towers.
RESOLUTION ENCOURAGING THE IMPLEMENTATION OF BIRD-FRIENDLY BUILDING MODIFICATIONS

WHEREAS, birding is a hobby enjoyed by 46 million Americans and generates more than $30 billion a year in economic activity in the United States; and

WHEREAS, as many as one billion birds may be killed by collisions with windows every year in the United States, according to studies by Dr. Daniel Klem, professor of ornithology and conservation biology at Muhlenberg College in Allentown, Pennsylvania; and

WHEREAS, Field Museum of Chicago scientists studying bird collisions at McCormick Place found that turning off lights reduces bird collision deaths by 83 percent; and

WHEREAS, bird-safe design features can be incorporated into new public construction and major public renovation projects at no extra cost, and existing buildings may be made bird-safe through the use of simple, low cost adaptations; and

WHEREAS, bird-safe practices often go hand-in-hand with energy efficiency improvements.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the President and Board of Trustees of the Village of Barrington, that, in consideration of the foregoing, the Corporate Authorities of the Village desire to and do hereby encourage owner(s) of property within the Village to incorporate various cost-effective bird-safe modifications in any new construction and in the remodeling of existing structures, including but not limited to, those measures recommended by the City of Chicago’s “Bird-Safe Building Design Guide for New Construction and Renovation,” the City of Toronto’s “Bird-Friendly Development Guidelines,” and New York City Audubon’s “Bird-Safe Building Guidelines.”

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that such cost-effective, bird-safe modifications to buildings within the corporate limits of the Village as herein encouraged shall be evaluated from time to time by the Village staff to determine their effectiveness in reducing bird collisions, and the recommendations of the Village relative to such modification(s) shall be updated from time to time to reflect new and/or updated studies and recommendations as they become available.
PASSED THIS 13TH DAY OF DECEMBER, 2010, BY ROLL CALL VOTE AS FOLLOWS:

AYES: 

NAYS: 

ABSENT: 

ABSTAIN: 

RECUSE: 

APPROVED THIS ________ OF DECEMBER, 2010

________________________________________
Karen Darch, Village President

ATTESTED AND FILED THIS ____ DAY
OF DECEMBER, 2010

_______________________________________
Adam Frazier, Village Clerk
(SEAL)
PARTIAL DRAFT: Seeking input on substantive sections  
(Nov. 21, 2011)

A RESOLUTION  
CREATING THE COOK COUNTY COUNCIL ON FOOD

A. NAME. The Council shall be called the **Cook County Council on Food** (the Council).

B. PURPOSE. The purpose of the Council is to integrate all County departments, all County municipalities and other local units of government, as well as grassroots organizations, non-profit organizations, and food and farming businesses in a common effort to

1. improve the availability of affordable, safe, and nutritious food for all residents
2. Remove obstacles to all County residents’ ability to feed themselves on a daily, meal-by-meal basis.
3. Remove obstacles to all County residents' ability to feed other County residents in their care, on a daily, meal-by-meal basis.
4. Maintain an emergency food assistance plan based on principles of local control and "first responders".

C. DUTIES AND RESPONSIBILITIES.

1. The Council may:

   a. Monitor the source, availability, price, and quality of food throughout Cook County;
   b. Collect data on the food security and nutritional status of county residents;
   c. Through the issuance of reports and other communication, inform County policy makers, administrators, and the public-at-large about the status of the region's food system and food security;
   d. Explore new means for municipal and County governments to improve the food economy, the availability, accessibility and quality of food and assist County and municipal governments in the coordination of their efforts;
   e. Recommend to County and municipal administrations adoption of measures that will improve existing and add new programs, projects, regulations, or services;
   f. Facilitate the creation of food councils at the municipal or district level.

2. Council members will:

   a. Prioritize issues for Council action;
   b. Serve on the Council’s subcommittees;
   c. Assume a leadership role within the community related to food issues;
   d. Bring areas of concern to the Council;
   e. Serve as the eyes and ears of the Council in the broader community;
   f. Attend meetings and public events as necessary;
   g. Participate in special Council activities and events;
   h. Identify opportunities for promoting food programs and other efforts intended to reach the goals of the food policy; and
   i. Identify and recommend leaders in the community for appointment to the Council and to serve on Council subcommittees.
   j. Review County policies that impact Cook County residents' ability to feed themselves and others in their care. Make recommendations to County agencies or the County Board, as appropriate, to (1) remove obstacles to that ability, and/or (2) implement policies that promote and facilitate that ability.
   k. Review state and federal policies that impact Cook County residents' ability to feed themselves and others in their care. Make recommendations to state and/or federal officials to (1) remove obstacles to that ability, and/or (2) implement policies that promote and facilitate that ability.
   l. Work with the Illinois Local Food, Farms, and Jobs Council to implement the food procurement goals of Public Act 96-579 and other "local food system" legislation adopted by the Illinois General Assembly, including, but not limited to:

      County Code-Board of Health-Local Foods  Public Act  96-0620
      Farm Fresh Schools Program   Public Act  96-0153
      DCEO Capital Bill - Fresh Food Fund   Public Act 96-0039
3. The Council will report to the Board of County Commissioners on at least an annual basis.

D. MEMBERSHIP; OFFICERS.

1. The Council shall consist of 28 members:

One (1) staffperson from the following Cook County agencies, appointed by the Cook County President of the Board of Commissioners:
- Department of Public Health
- Bureau of Economic Development
- Planning and Development
- Environmental Control
- Commission on Human Rights
- Commission on Women’s Issues

One (1) representative from each of the following non-County governmental agencies, designated by each agency:
- Chicago Metropolitan Agency for Planning (CMAP)
- Illinois Department of Agriculture - urban staffperson
- Illinois Local Food, Farms, and Jobs Council
- USDA Natural Resources Conservation Service - Soil & Water Conservation District (Cook County has two offices, north and south)
- USDA Food & Nutrition Service (Midwest Office)

Seventeen (17) members of the community, one from each Cook County district, appointed by the Cook County President of the Board of Commissioners with advice from each district Commissioner. These 17 members should be personally engaged in the production and distribution of food, or in the effects of food on the local economy and health of county residents, representing the following areas of expertise:

3 local food systems advocates (2 minority ?)
6 businesses in the food sector, representing the following components:
- production
- distribution (aggregation, transport)
- retail (grocery, restaurant)
- institutional food management (school, hospital, university, corporate)
- consumer (eater)
- waste management
1 parenting and families
1 emergency food assistance
1 nutrition education (health professional)
1 land-use (natural resource conservation, planning)
1 financing
1 communications (journalism, web technology, social media)
1 University of Illinois Extension (agro-economy specialist ?)

2. Members shall reside in Cook County shall have expertise in relevant fields, and to the extent possible, shall represent the diversity of the community in aspects such as culture, gender, age, and geography.
Coleen and Catherine:

This is what I learned talking to folk in Brownsville, TX, Westport, CT, and Dubuque, IA, where they've enacted bag reduction strategies: Their experiences confirm:

-- a bag ban makes sense, and it works to significantly reduce disposable bags in the community ("the bags are gone"; "we don't see bag litter anymore");
-- bag fees or taxes generate revenue ($300,000 in Brownsville this year already, used to fund bulk trash pickup days); BUT
-- bag fees/taxes also generate a lot of annoyance to business owners and city staff; they all said not to bother with a fee/tax, especially one set at a non-deterrent $.05; even Brownsville said that to do it again, they wouldn't bother with their $1 "transaction fee";
-- that businesses survived without plastic bags and economic activity did not suffer because of the bag bans;
-- that the larger community effort generated local pride and larger environmental awareness.

Brownsville and Westport didn't have much of an environmental identity before the bag ban; in Brownsville, the bag ban has been very enlightening for the whole community.

Because Evanston is already far down the road of environmental consciousness, a bag fee/tax does feel unnecessarily punitive. We're already the good guys and doing so many of the rights things, so let's work with that positive momentum and put everyone on the same team.

Here's my suggestion, somewhat like Dubuque's strategy, although less patient:

1. Measure Evanston's current plastic bag consumption as reported by our larger retailers' purchases of plastic bag stock. We may already have this number.
2. Set a goal for reduction of that usage rate (50% reduction in one year? 75% reduction in 18 months?)
3. During the 12-18 months, ramp up the educational effort, distribute reusable bags, teach cashiers (habits adjust, merchants use up bag inventory).
4. If Evanston fails to achieve its goal, as determined by re-measuring bag consumption, then we enact a ban on plastic bags, $1 fee for paper (preserving consumer choice). The whole community will bear responsibility for reaching the goal or failing to.
Other ideas:

Bring together our objecting businesses with the businesses that don't dispense bags, both large (Sam's, Aldi's) and small (Healthy Green Goods) for business-to-business advice.

Recognize businesses that do their own bag-reduction campaigns (store signs, reminders, etc.).

Let me know if you want the contact information for the people I talked to in Brownsville, Dubuque and Westport. I'm sure there are other municipalities with successful bag bans (and probably no unsuccessful efforts), but those three seemed diverse enough to be helpful here. And I would be happy to share my research with the Environment Board.

Jane