PUBLIC NOTICE OF A MEETING

Evanston Environment Board

Thursday, August 14, 2014
7:00 pm – 8:30 pm
Lorraine H. Morton Civic Center, 2100 Ridge Avenue, Room 2200

AGENDA

I. Call to Order/Declaration of Quorum

II. Approval of Meeting Minutes from May

III. Citizen Comment/Follow-Up (Please sign-in) (10 mins.)

IV. Staff Updates (S. Robinson, C. Hurley) (5 mins.)

V. Plastic Bag Ordinance (C. Hurley) (10 mins.)

VI. Environmental Justice Committee Report (C. Hurley) (10 mins.)

VII. Bike Parking for Private Development – For Discussion (H. Bartling) (10 mins.)

VIII. Fresh Walgreens Construction in 5th Ward and Urban Gardens Ordinance (S. Robinson) (10 mins.)

IX. Solid Waste Survey for Commercial Franchise (S. Robinson) (10 mins.)

X. Roundtable (10 mins.)

XI. Adjournment

Next Meeting: September 11, 2014

Order & Agenda Items are subject to change. Information about the BCC Name is available at: www.cityofevanston.org/government/boards-commissions. Questions can be directed to Kenya Evans at 847-866-2950.

The City of Evanston is committed to making all public meetings accessible to persons with disabilities. Any citizen needing mobility or communications access assistance should contact the Facilities Management Office at 847-866-2950 (Voice) or 847-448-8064 (TYY).
MEETING NOTES-DRAFT
Evanston Environment Board
Thursday, May 8, 2014
7:00 p.m.
Lorraine H. Morton Civic Center, 2100 Ridge, Room #2200

Members Present: Todd Schwier, Tom Clark, Samuel Headd, Linda Young, Jamal Bowleg, Husayn Allmart

Members Absent: Ellen King

Staff: Catherine Hurley, Sustainable Programs Coordinator, Suzette Robinson, Director of Public Works, Kenya Evans, Executive Secretary

Presiding Member/s: Todd Schwier (Chair)

I. CALL TO ORDER – Todd Schwier called meeting to order at 7:05 p.m.

II. APPROVAL of MINUTES from April. Minutes approved with amendments. Todd Schwier made a MOTION to approve. All in favor.

III. CITIZEN COMMENT
Residents Linda Beck and Dorothy Headd introduced themselves and were representing Evanston Neighbors United. They had no further comments or questions.

IV. STAFF UPDATES (ATTACHMENT)
T. Schwier directed the board’s attention to the Staff Report. C. Hurley informed the board of the Evanston Liability Plan that will be presented to the Evanston City Council on May 19th 2014. This plan calls for the reduction of greenhouse gas emissions. C. Hurley explained that the City Council would like to exceed its past goal of about 13% and that 20% will be a new goal for the Council this year. C. Hurley then informed the board about the past Earth Day/Arbor Day Celebration. She stated that it was quite successful, and feedback from participants and volunteers was positive. Volunteers came to support the mission of protecting the environment and for clean-up efforts. T. Clark from the board also participated in this event and aided in clean-up efforts as well. T. Clark also suggested local activities all throughout the year rather than annual events and T. Schwier also posed a question about follow up events. C. Hurley will research further opportunities to present events to the public year round as well as any follow-up to Earth Day/Arbor Day. C. Hurley stated that she is looking into statistics and collecting data from Public Works for possible future events. Other updates included the newspaper boxes. T. Clark expressed concern regarding the amount of free newspapers and newspaper boxes in the city. He stated that many of these papers ended up littering the city. L. Young stated that through research
conducted from journalistic sources, she has since favored a reorganizational approach, rather than reduction.

V. PLASTIC BAG ORDINANCE
T. Schwier directed the board’s attention to the plastic bag ordinance. T. Schwier advised that the board prioritizes bike parking rather than plastic bag ordinance. C. Hurley states that although the board should address bike parking, it would benefit the board to also be informed of current ordinance issues which include the plastic bag ban in Chicago. C. Hurley stated that Chicago has recently passed this ordinance regarding stores with 10,000 square feet or more. Evanston may consider this ban as well and it will possibly be brought to City Council. Linda Y. supports possible plastic bag ordinance and asked if this is phase 1. And if so, would there be a second phase to the ban as well.

C. Hurley stated that stores less than 10,000 square feet may be researched as part of phase 2. However, most of the bags found in Evanston as trash have been coming from big box stores and chains. Linda Y. asked if this also included stores such as Sam’s and Foods for Less. C. Hurley affirmed that these chains would be also included. Linda Y. raised a concern about the economics as many people shop there to save money and if the ban would negatively impact them. J. Bowleg also inquired if the fines found in the Chicago ordinance would be duplicated in Evanston. And if so, would that include a person or organization. C. Hurley stated that fines would be assessed to businesses and organizations only. C. Hurley will also clarify this point with council. T. Schwier commented that the last ordinance passed in Chicago was not well received, but Evanston could try to bring the ordinance to fruition as long as no real difficulties can be seen to ensue. T. Schwier made a MOTION to support discussion of ordinance to council. ALL IN FAVOR.

VI. ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE STRATEGY
S. Headd submitted to the board a proposal for creating an ad hoc committee regarding strategies to work with community members and volunteers on environmental issues. C. Hurley proposed that this committee would help build a framework onto which issues can be addressed alongside community members. K. Glynn asked if committee can then ask for grants and educational opportunities for the community. C. Hurley stated that some of the proposals from the committee could include both grants and educational opportunities. H. Bartling stated that he was particularly interested in the board looking into other issues including waste transfer. C. Hurley stated that some of the challenges include the focus on community needs and a bigger picture perspective. C. Hurley stated that this perspective is needed so that the community can be engaged in many of the plans and big proposals. She stated that the board can also look into how to apply strategies across communities. K. Glynn asked for clarification and if the goal was to ultimately create a framework to apply across the community. C. Hurley affirmed this point. S. Robinson commented that due to certain segments of the population possibly being overlooked, a strategy that reaches across the entire community would be beneficial. K. Glynn raised the point as to how committee should proceed. T. Schwier requested that board continues to address certain topics and issues. T. Schwier then made a MOTION to create subcommittee. K. Glynn seconded. ALL IN FAVOR. S. Robinson then asked if any board members
were interested in staffing the committee. K. Glynn, H. Bartling and S. Headd all expressed interest. Linda Y. will also contact a colleague who works in environmental justice give her expertise to the committee. The board moved to discuss this in further detail at the next meeting.

VII. BIKE PARKING FOR PRIVATE DEVELOPMENT

H. Bartling asked that the board refer to the attachments and stated that zoning codes are different across the board. H. Bartling stated that many of the zoning codes for Evanston have little to do with bike parking. H. Bartling suggested that the board continues looking into including a bicycle parking guide for developers to follow. This kind of guide would not cost developers money. Linda Y. asked if multi-family dwellings will be considered in any bike parking plans. H. Bartling stated that most documents researched were regarding commercial establishments. Linda Y. stated that the board should think about multi-family properties as people usually have no place to park their bikes. S. Robinson supported this point and stated that these experiences are common to multi-family dwellers and the board should explore possibilities of researching incentivizing bike parking for owners of multi-family properties. She stated that there are many modifications that can occur on the properties to accommodate bikes. H. Bartling also suggested that new developments use proposed bike parking guides for those modifications as many of these dwellings have only a limited amount of spaces per unit. H. Bartling also supported incentives for bike parking in multi-family dwellings.

C. Hurley informed the board that buildings less than 20,000 square feet are not required to address this issue. She suggested that it is possible that CDBG funds could be used to fund bike parking for some of these types of properties. H. Bartling commented that ordinances could be a good way to compel landlords to build spaces for bikes. T. Schwier then proposed that all information being presented regarding bike parking be uploaded to google documents so members could discuss and exchange ideas. T. Clark suggested that the board look into creating a guide depicting good places for individuals to park. S. Robinson stated that board look into various ways bikes can be mounted in many places without sacrificing space such as wall mounts. T. Clark raised a concern about the number of abandoned bikes in the city and S. Robinson agreed that it was a concern as the city has about 300 abandoned bikes, many of which have quality issues and cannot be used.

H. Bartling raised a concern regarding the city’s current proposed bike lane draft. He was concerned about the possible restrictions suggested by the online map and wanted clarification. S. Robinson stated that restrictions are on side walk biking which is limited to only certain areas within Evanston. Restrictions are also in effect for areas where signage restricting biking is posted. S. Robinson is collecting feedback from residents and businesses regarding restrictions and routes. S. Robinson stated that online maps are proposals, and will not be complete action plans until all options are thoroughly considered. S. Robinson also stated that routes along Dempster, Maine and Central are high stress areas. These areas experience high volumes of traffic, including an influx of trucks. There needed to be reduction in stress levels of cars, trucks and also buses. H. Bartling
also wanted to know if reduction of bike lanes on certain routes such as Main Street and Central will occur. S. Robinson reiterated that routes are only proposals and there is no clear indication of what routes will be eliminated or restricted if any. She also stated that as she looks into statistics, comments and opinions from the public, it is unsure if we will have a comfortable corridor in certain areas as a number of factors are at play. H. Bartling mentioned that this point needs to be clarified on website. S. Robinson will look into modifying some of the website content to reflect that plans are proposals only.

Linda Y. then raised a question concerning the Divvy Bike Program. The concern was if there will be stations at Maine or Dempster and how will draft plan integrate Divvy into Evanston. S. Robinson stated that some transit stations are included and proposals will possibly include other roads and routes. C. Hurley stated that Evanston is still in active conversation with state and local officials regarding Divvy as well as applications for grants. There has been no full commitment as of yet to locations. Linda Y. stated that her concern was that people could ride to the train station. S. Robinson concurred and stated that talks were not resistant to this idea in any way. Tom C. supported this point as well as also supported the creation of alternate routes.

H. Bartling asked that the board look over the attachments regarding bike parking developments and ordinances further and raised the issue that bicyclists could not park bikes in Downtown Evanston or near businesses. S. Robinson stated that restrictions are only at where signs are posted in business areas and not all areas in the downtown area have such signage. Places such as Noyes and Howard Street don’t have signs. She stated that the question is not about banning bike parking or development in this area, but if sidewalk biking will be restricted. Robinson also stated that there are a number of community officials, individuals and businesses looking to create harmonious solutions for all modes of travel. T. Schwier inquired if there will be a final decision regarding these issues in June. S. Robinson reports that there will be a presentation of survey results and data regarding preferences and corridor options. T. Schwier raised a concern regarding how feedback will be generated. S. Robinson informed the board that there is a two week window for the survey and up to 500 respondents did the original survey and will receive a link to the new survey when it is ready to be presented. Also, a press release will be sent out as well as I-Pad surveys.

VIII. EEB RESPONSIBILITIES/TRANSPORTATION INPUT
S. Robinson directed the board’s attention to the board’s current responsibilities. S. Robinson will work with Alderman Wynne on how to go about creating a framework for issues going to either the Parking & Transportation Committee or the Environment Board. S. Robinson informed the board that the Parking & Transportation Committee is seeking new members. C. Hurley also informed the board that it was possible for the board to keep biking issues within the framework of the Environment Board or send it to Parking & Transportation. H. Bartling suggested that perhaps moving a member from EEB to Parking & Transportation could possibly work. However, he stated his concern would be about what the impact would be. S. Robinson stated that the Parking & Transportation Committee is currently asking for more transportation topics and issues. She also stated that the board could take on more transportation issues that affect the environment.
She asked the board if they would like to take on these issues rather than take on the issue of bike parking. H. Bartling commented that his concern was that the Parking & Transportation Committee was automobile focused, and they could use a more multi-modal approach to transportation. He also stated that because of this issue, it would be beneficial for someone from the board to also have a seat in that committee as well. Linda Y. asked if there was any opportunity for both committees and boards to interact. C. Hurley commented that she would keep the board apprised of updates and opportunities to interact. T. Schwier stated that he felt the biking issues should stay with the board with updates. The board will move to discuss this issue at a later date.

IX. SOLID WASTE SURVEY FOR COMMERCIAL FRANCHISE
Board moved to discuss this issue at the next meeting due to time constraints.

X. ROUNDTABLE
There were no items for discussion.

XI. ADJOURNMENT
T. Schwier MOTION to adjourn. T. Clark seconded. All in Favor.

NEXT MEETING – June 12, 2014
Community Dialogue on Shopping Bags

Community Meeting June 2014

Catherine Hurley
*Sustainable Programs Coordinator*
Agenda

• Presentation
  – Overview and Updates

• Questions on presentation

• Questionnaire and Discussion
### Past Discussions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>April 25, 2011</td>
<td>• Presentation to City Council on options for bag reduction efforts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Staff asked to gain community input</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 24, 2011</td>
<td>• Community Presentation and Discussion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 13, 2011</td>
<td>• Presentation to City Council on feedback</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Environment Board for review and recommendation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 24, 2011</td>
<td>• Presentation and Recommendation by Evanston Environment Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• on $0.05 tax per bag on disposable shopping bags</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• No action by City Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 19, 2014</td>
<td>• City Council asks staff to seek community feedback on shopping bag</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• issues and actions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Types of Bags: More than Just Paper or Plastic

Variety of uses and users: restaurant/carryout bags, grocery stores, drugstore, mall/department store shopping, drycleaners, farmers markets, etc.
“Who Pays and What Costs?”

• Costs to city, consumers, retailers, producers, and the environment

• Production (resource input), consumption, disposal/litter costs

• Additional concerns: price, waste, recyclability, reuse, health, etc.
Bag Initiatives in Action

• City Ordinances:
  • Plastic bag bans or fees
    Currently in over 130 cities and towns across the US

• Specific stores:
  • Store credits (Whole Foods, Target)
  • Reusable bags sold (almost all)
  • Fee for bags (Ikea, Aldi)
  • No plastic bags (Whole Foods, Costco)

• Grassroots/coalition efforts:
  • NY City (NYC Bag It Coalition), Portland (Ban the Bag PDX)

• State level Policy:
  • Unsuccessful state bans (California)
    • De facto state ban in Hawaii
  • Recycling programs (IL, etc.)
Plastic Bags Regulations in the US

Number of Plastic Bag Bans and Charges in the United States, 2007-2015

Source: Earth Policy Institute, April 2014
Plastic Bags Regulations in the US


- Rest of United States
- California

Year Implemented:
- 2007
- 2008
- 2009
- 2010
- 2011
- 2012
- 2013
- 2014

Note: 2014 is partial year.

Source: EPI
Over 130 cities and towns across the US now have bag policies:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RANK</th>
<th>CITY</th>
<th>Plastic Bag Regulations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>New York City</td>
<td>Plastic bag regulations in process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Los Angeles, CA</td>
<td>Passed plastic bag ban, June, 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Chicago, IL</td>
<td>Passed plastic bag ban, April, 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>San Antonio, TX</td>
<td>Plastic bag regulations in process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Dallas, TX</td>
<td>Five cents fee, plastic or paper, March, 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>San Jose, CA</td>
<td>Passed plastic and paper bag ban, December, 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Austin, TX</td>
<td>Passed ban on plastic and paper bags, March, 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>San Francisco, CA</td>
<td>Passed plastic bag ban, April, 2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Seattle, WA</td>
<td>Passed plastic bag ban, December, 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Washington, D.C.</td>
<td>Five cents fee, plastic or paper, July, 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Portland, OR</td>
<td>Passed plastic bag ban, July, 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Long Beach, CA</td>
<td>Passed plastic bag ban, May, 2011</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Global Plastic Bag Bans or Charges

- **Ireland**: bag tax in 2002, with 90% reduction
- **Rwanda**: one of the first and strictest adopters of a bag ban
- **Hawaii**: de facto statewide plastic bag ban
- **Australia**: ½ of territories now ban plastic bags
- **China**: plastic bag ban in 2008
What Are Plastic Bag Bans?

Plastic bag bans have been designed in various ways based on the unique contexts, considerations and priorities of each place.

Considerations:
- Overall effectiveness in reducing plastic bag use
- Consumer behavior, awareness and incentives
- Overall effectiveness in limiting negative impacts of all single use bags
- The potential negative impacts of a bag ban on consumers, retailers
- Inequitable social and economic impacts

Variables:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types of bags banned</th>
<th>Thin HDPE bags, thin and thicker, all plastic (even recycle/compost)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Inclusion and amount of fee</td>
<td>Paper single use bags: 10-25 cents in California, 5-30 cents globally</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Types of reusable bags promoted</td>
<td>Cotton, thick plastic, non-woven polypropylene or polyethylene</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sizes and types of retail venues</td>
<td>From large retailers and supermarkets only, to all retail venues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incentives to enforce ordinance</td>
<td>Fines and fees for non-compliance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exemptions</td>
<td>Pharmacy bags and bags for meat and produce Customers on food assistance programs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Plastic Bags vs. Paper Bags

Overall yearly use:
- 100 billion plastic bags
- 10 billion paper bags

Grocery bags:
- 4 out of 5 grocery bags in this country are plastic

Consumer:
- Fast and convenient
- Can be reused as trash bags, etc.
- ~1-5% becomes litter
- Ecological damage
- Average use of 12 minutes
- “Single most ubiquitous item on Earth”

Impacts:
- More expensive
- More energy and resource intensive to produce and recycle

Recycling:
- ~Less than 5% recycled
- Recycled in special collection sites
- ~50% recycled
- Recycled in curbside pick-up

Cost per bag:
- Plastic bags: $.03
- Paper bags: $.10

Made from:
- Plastic bags: ethylene, a byproduct of petroleum or natural gas
- Paper bags: trees, often with recycled content
Reusable Bags

• Sold at almost all stores now
  – Walmart, Home Depot, etc.
• Multiple versions and styles available
  – Prices range depending on quality, material and durability, starting at $1.00
• Can be prone to breakage after repeated use
  • Whole Foods offering $0.99 bag with warrant
• Not convenient to carry around for other shopping
  • Collapsible multi-use bags
    – Designed to be stored in a purse or your pocket
• Should be washed to maintain cleanliness

Buy Smart! Check material, durability, washability, source and disposal.
Life Cycle Assessment

- Assess all environmental impacts throughout all stages of life
- Trade-offs and assumptions built into any LCA
- Doesn’t necessarily take into account full social context and factors

Looked at many different Life Cycle Assessments, including…

- ULS Update, 2008
- Boustead Associates, 2007
- Herrera Seattle Report, 2008
- Green Cities California Report, 2010
LCA Summary: Paper vs. Plastic
(Carrying Capacity Equivalent to 1000 Paper Bags)
Source: Boustead, 2007

Energy Usage (MJ)

- Paper (30% recycled)
- Compostable Plastic
- Plastic

Municipal Solid Waste (kg)

- Paper (30% recycled)
- Compostable Plastic
- Plastic

Greenhouse Gas Emissions (CO2 Equiv. Tons)

- Paper (30% recycled)
- Compostable Plastic
- Plastic

Fresh Water Usage (gal)

- Paper (30% recycled)
- Compostable Plastic
- Plastic
## Plastic Bags: Stats, Facts and Impacts

### Recycling Problems:
- Hard to recycle
- Easily escape and carried by wind
- Often only down-cycled
- Separate recycling with separate bins:
  - Though mandated collection sites in California (2007) at all supermarket and large retail store, only collecting back 3% in 2009
  - Break down into toxic smaller bits

### Additional costs:
- Jam recycling
- Clog storm drains
- Quality of life/aesthetics
- Ecosystems and wildlife

### Costs retailers more than $4 billion dollars, which is passed on to consumers in hidden costs
- Used on average for 12 minutes, though can have life expectancy of a thousand years.

- Often referred to as “urban tumbleweeds,” plastic bags are icons of convenience culture, considered “the single most ubiquitous item on Earth” (Guinness Book of World Records, 2010)
Life Cycle Analysis: Conclusion

All bags have costs and impacts

“The shift to one single use bag may improve one environmental outcome, but may be offset by another environmental impact.”

- Paper bags have a greater overall environmental impacts
- Plastic bags have significant localized impacts (litter, etc.)

“The issue is not paper or plastic, but rather finding ways to reduce, reuse, and recycle both of them – in that order.”

Reusable bags are the best alternative!

Though their exact benefits depend on number of reuses and material of bag
Impact of Bag Regulations

Reduction of Single-Use Plastic Bags by Jurisdiction since implementing plastic bag regulations

- San Jose, California: 90%
- L.A. County, California: 90%
- D.C.: 60%
- Boulder, Colorado: 68%
- Santa Monica, California: 81%

• Studies have shown that all actions taken (education, bag bans, bag fees), have an impact on reducing bag use.
• The most reductions and benefits result from charging for all single-use bags, followed by banning plastic bags and then education.
Conclusion on Impacts:

“Local economies, including affected retailers and their customers, are not negatively impacted in the long-term”

• Higher costs due to increased use of paper bags or the initial purchase of reusable bags are mitigated as people transition to reduced overall use and reuse of bags.
• Additional savings through reduced litter and contamination costs.  
  (Equinox Center Plastic Bag Report, 2013)

Broader impact:

• Paves the way for additional waste reduction measures
• Alerts and engages residents in taking direct action
• Demonstrates city’s commitment to being a green leader
• Works to establishes best practices in single-use bag reduction

*Data could be collected to measure effectiveness and guide future actions.
Approved April 30, 2014 with a vote of 36-10
  • Bans plastic bags
  • Requires paper bags that are 100% recyclable, compostable and with at least 40% post consumer recycled content.
• Applies to retail establishments meeting following requirements:
  – May sell perishable or non-perishable goods
  – Chain stores (three or more stores with same owner)
  – Franchise stores
  – Does not apply to dine-in or carry-out restaurants
• Phase 1 Implementation (Effective August 1, 2015)
  • 10,000 square feet and greater
• Phase 2 Implementation (Effective August 1, 2016)
  • Less than 10,000 square feet
City of Chicago Ordinance
Supporting Information

- 3.7 million plastic bags are used citywide daily,
  - The average Chicagoan uses 500 plastic bags a year, totally 3 billion a year.

- 3-5% of them become litter, getting stuck in drains and causing flooding, clogging landfills and jamming recycling machinery.

- Plastic bags have significant environmental impacts on local wildlife and ecosystems.

- Existing plastic bag recycling ordinance is not enough.

- Commitment to being one of America’s cleanest cities.
Considerations for Evanston

• Livability: quality of bag/shopping experience, cleaner environment
  • Livability Plan, Climate Action Plan, Strategic Plan
• Equity
• Reduce waste
• Recycle (city program vs. store program)
• Reduce litter/city beautification
• Efficiency (cost, energy)
• Reduce emissions/environmental impacts
• Engage community
What would this look like in Evanston?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Store Type</th>
<th>Number of Stores</th>
<th>Average Size (Square Feet)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arts &amp; Crafts</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8,535</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Books</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8,572</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clothing</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15,561</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cosmetics</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,430</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electronics</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>19,318</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>25,596</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>157,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>25,436</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pet</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25,431</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grand Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>50</strong></td>
<td><strong>23,641</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Evanston Shopping Bag Data

- Evanston stores already taking action on shopping bags
- Reusable bags for sale at most stores
- No bags provided
  - Sam’s Club
- Bag provided at extra cost
  - Aldi: $0.07 plastic and $0.11 paper
- Bring Your Own Bag Incentives
  - Target - $0.05 per bag
  - Whole Foods - $0.10 per bag

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Store Type</th>
<th>Plastic (bags/year)</th>
<th>Paper (bags/year)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Large Grocery</td>
<td>1,000,000</td>
<td>450,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drug Store and Other Large Retailers</td>
<td>500,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialty or Gift/Boutique</td>
<td>3,750</td>
<td>4,500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Summary and Take-away points

- All bags have impacts that can be addressed
  - Ultimately beneficial impacts depend on reduced use and increased reuse of bags
- There is a rapidly growing movement to address this through grassroots and city ordinances banning and/or taxing plastic and paper bags
  - Significant progress has been made in cities that have taken action
- There has been progress as both retailers and consumers are becoming more aware of these issues and looking for alternatives
- Evanston previously considered this at the very beginning of this movement, but did not take new action at that time

Evanston can do more

- Goal to be “The Green City”
- Climate Action Plan recommended investigating a tax or ban on plastic bags
- Keep up with our progressive ideals and peer cities

We need your input, feedback and support to make any program or policy appropriate and relevant for Evanston
Next Steps

• Gather Community Feedback
  – Fosters Senior Club
  – Public Meeting
  – Information Table at Levy Senior Center
  – E-mail comments to: \( \text{Sustainability@cityofevanston.org} \)

• Present findings to City Council
Questions and Comments

Catherine Hurley
Sustainable Programs Coordinator
churley@cityofevanston.org
847-448-8069
Shopping Bag Questionnaire

The City of Evanston is interested in addressing concerns about the negative impacts of “single-use” shopping bags. We are looking for input and feedback from the community and we would appreciate your response. Please complete the survey below. Thank you!

How often do you use shopping bags? (Check one)
- Multiple
- Daily
- Every
- 2-3 times
- Once a
- A few times a day
- Other
- Day per week week a month

What kinds of bags do you typically use for shopping? (Check one)
- Paper
- Plastic
- No bag
- Reusable
- Other
- Reused plastic (ex:basket)
- Grocery bag
- Paper bag

Do you own reusable bags? (Circle) Yes / No

Which bag do you prefer (if cost is not an issue) and why?
- Paper
- Plastic
- Reusable bag
- Other (basket, etc.)

What do you usually do with bags after their initial use?
- Paper
  - Reuse
  - Recycle
  - Trash
  - Other
- Plastic
  - Reuse
  - Retailer recycling collection site
  - Dispose in trash
  - Other

Are you concerned with the environmental impact of single-use shopping bags?
- No, these issues are not significant for me.
- Yes, because of... (Check all that apply):
  - Litter
  - Hidden costs in purchasing
  - Hidden costs in clean up (contamination, etc.)
  - Environmental impact on wildlife and ecosystems
  - Greenhouse gas emissions and resources used
  - Not easily recycled
  - Overused and wasted
  - Other

Do you have concerns with reusable bags? (Check all that apply)
- Too expensive/have to pay for them
- Hard to remember to bring
- Don't want to carry around/too bulky
- Limited function compared to plastic
- Don’t like how they look
- Hygiene concerns with reuse
- Can't compete with free bags/other bags are just better
- Other

What do you think would most increase the use of reusable bags?
(Rank the following from 1-5, with #1 being the best incentive)
- Increased signage at stores
- Free reusable bags
- Ban plastic bags
- Educational outreach on impacts of bags
- Charge for single use bags (plastic and/or paper)
- Other

Additional questions, comments, or concerns:

Please Return To:
Fleetwood-Odell
Community Center
1615 Foster St.
Evanston, IL 60201

To provide further input or to learn more please contact:
Catherine Hurley
847-448-8659
sustain@cityofevanston.org

Check out Evanston Green Buzz to keep up to date and find out how to get involved! http://evansongreenbuzz.org/
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Memorandum

To: Members of the Administration and Public Works Committee

From: Catherine Hurley, Sustainable Programs Coordinator
      Suzette Robinson, Public Works Director

Subject: Disposable Plastic Shopping Bag Issues

Date: May 13, 2014

Recommended Action:
It is recommended that City Council consider the attached information regarding efforts to reduce the environmental impacts of plastic shopping bags in Evanston and provide direction on next steps.

Summary:
The City of Chicago passed a partial ban on the distribution of disposable plastic shopping bags on April 30, 2014. The ordinance applies to retail establishments that sell perishable or non-perishable goods but does not apply to dine-in or carry-out restaurants. Only retail establishments that are chain stores (three or more stores under common ownership) or stores that are part of a franchise are subject to the ordinance. The ordinance will be implemented in two phases. Phase 1 would apply to retailers 10,000 square feet and greater starting August 1, 2015. In Phase 2, retailers with less than 10,000 square feet will be subject to the ordinance starting August 1, 2016. A copy of Chicago’s ordinance is provided as Attachment 1.

The City of Evanston previously considered creating an ordinance targeting disposable shopping bags with the goal of reducing their environmental impact. Addressing disposable shopping bags was a recommendation of the 2008 Evanston Climate Action Plan and past discussions were held at City Council Meetings in the spring and fall of 2011. A summary of the legislative history is provided at the end of this memo. The agenda items from the June 13 and October 24, 2011 meetings are provided as an attachment.

Staff presented the Evanston Environment Board with an update on the City of Chicago’s ordinance at the Board’s May 8, 2014 meeting. The Environment Board voted unanimously in support of bringing this issue before the Administration and Public Works Committee for discussion and consideration.
Based on Evanston’s past interest in addressing the environmental impact of shopping bags, staff would like to hold a public meeting to re-engage the community on this issue. The meeting would include an updated presentation on issues and opportunities related to shopping bags, review the provisions of the City of Chicago’s ordinance and seek feedback from the community and stakeholders. Staff proposes holding the community meeting on Thursday, June 5th at 7:00 pm at the Ecology Center. Feedback from the community and recommended next steps would be presented to the Administration and Public Works Committee at the June 9th meeting.

Legislative History:
April 25, 2011  Staff presents overview of options to address disposable shopping bags and Ordinance 67-O-10 proposing a $0.05 tax per bag; Ordinance 76-O-10 amended by Committee to be a bag ban; Staff was directed to gain community input.
June 13, 2011  Presentation by Staff to Administration and Public Works Committee on community feedback; Ordinance 76-O-10 as amended was referred to Evanston Environment Board for review and recommendation.
October 24, 2011  Presentation and Recommendation by Evanston Environment Board on enacting a $0.05 tax per bag on disposable shopping bags.

Attachment:
City of Chicago Approved Ordinance SO2014-1521

Link to Item APW1 from June 13, 2011 City Council Meeting:  
http://www.cityofevanston.org/assets/APW1%20Disposable%20Bag%20Discussion%20final%206-13.pdf

Link to Item SP1 from October 24, 2011 City Council Meeting  