Meeting was called to order by Chair Finnegan at 7:07 p.m.

I. Approval of Minutes from December
   - S. Besson motioned to approve the minutes, minutes passes unanimously

I. News (10 minutes)
   a. Green Building Ordinance
      - Chair Finnegan updated the Committee regarding the Green Building Ordinance, it passed 8-1
      - Committee will contact community members regarding presenting a guide for the website. Document intended to be: “Easy tips for green remodeling.” FAQ for next meeting a draft will be presented to the committee Anne Viner will take the lead
   b. Wind Farm Updates
      - Mayor Tisdahl was sent a letter asking for endorsement of Wind Farms no response at this time.
   c. Other News/Update
      - A question was raised about a CARE grant for community justice. If the city moves forward it is recommended attempting to achieve level 2.
      - Breakfast for Citizens for Greener Evanston Thursday January 22, 2010
      - Monday January 26, 2010 BASE will present Green Restaurants. Green Chicago restaurant Co-op. They formed together to purchase green products for businesses. 6:30-8:30 at Great Harvest Bread Company on Central st.

II. Amending the By-Laws
   - Motion to amend Article 4 Section two to read odd years by K. Glynn seconded by E. Port, motion withdrawn
   - Discussion by board regarding co-chair issue and further issues of meeting
   - Motion to amend Article 4 Section 1 to add or a single chair if the board so votes motioned by A. Viner seconded by D. Cox passed unanimously
   - Motion to amend entire document where chairperson replace with co-chair/chairperson passed unanimously
IV. Backyard Chickens

- Craig Garfield presented the committee with information regarding the proposed backyard Chicken ord. There is an article in this month's urban gardener magazine. The ord. prior to 1974. They have adapted the Bee ordinance to address the issues with regards to the chickens.
- Question from Chair Finnegan to C. Caneva regarding if this was a stand alone ordinance
- C. Caneva explained the process of moving the ordinance forward
- S. Besson asked for further clarification on issues raised by CARE. Specifically what happens to unwanted chickens
- Mr. Garfield stated the ordinance specifically states no slaughtering, he indicated the issue regarding older chickens would not be dissimilar to current practices with pets
- The Red Door is a non kill animal shelter that may provide assistance with unwanted chickens
- S. Waller asked the average life span Mr. Garfield stated 8-10 years and the laying potential is 4-5 years.
- E. Port stated he is pro-chicken, he is concerned the ordinance may not be complete. There is no enforcement of violation of this ordinance. What would prevent someone to hatch their own eggs? He questioned $10.00 for inspection and license and was concerned it would not cover the City's costs. He asked for the birds to be banded and to have appropriate vaccinations. He also asked for the birds to be sexed, have an appropriate coop, and have a balanced diet, in place of scraps.
- It was proposed to give additional eggs to shelters or the Farmers Market
- E. Port stated he was concerned about the hazard to small pets and small children and may attract nuisance. E. Port stated that he would provide the committee with a list of concerns at the next meeting.
- Mr. Garfield stated the enforcement for the dogs and cats would be reviewed, to find out if it was applicable here
- A. Viner asked if other municipalities had addressed the issues that E. Port asked, the general consensus was no.
- A. Viner asked if a neighbor became distraught by the chicken what is the recourse, how are issues handled.
- Ellen King stated the issues with chickens with less than dogs.
- Amy Morton identified issues to the nuisance code, the typical issues addressed are number, space from property etc.
- S. Waller asked if bunny hutches are permitted
- C. Caneva stated preliminary responses from the building department stated there would not be a permit required, and yes bunny hutches are permitted
- Ellen King stated there are sites out there that give blueprints to construct coops and some are ready made.
- E. Port asked to find recent ordinances that may have been repealed. He also stated a concern regarding the quality of feed for the chickens.
- Debbi Hillman stated she met with the City Manager and he stated he had not heard an uproar regarding this issue.
- D. Biss asked about feeding requirements for the animals why would we get involved in the diets of feed. E. Port stated that Salmonella can be an issue when commercial diets are fed.
- Marcelo Ferrer stated no evidence of literature about salmonella being propagated by commercial feed
- Chair Finnegan asked why slaughter is prohibited.
- Ellen King stated the reason is for the general public not to see the actual slaughter
- She also stated there are butchers that can be used to slaughter the chickens
- In Section D4, Chair Besson, asked about other building, gazebos, and their proximity to the coops
- C. Caneva stated he had spoken with the Zoning Department they preferred building rather than lot line, with regards to locating the coops
- C. Caneva will request a written opinion
- S. Besson asked about the licensing cost the committee stated
- **C. Caneva** stated that rather than have a higher cost to the application the applicant would register with the department of agriculture, HHS would go out on a complaint basis only
- **D. Biss** questioned how the issue of un cared for animals would be handled.
- Mr. Garfield stated they will volunteer to give advice and help to others
- **D. Cox** asked what literature could be provided at the point of licensure
- **P. Finnegan** directed Mr. Garfield to incorporate Whereas as well as the amendments proposed
- **C. Finnegan** thanked those presenting

V. IPM Ordinance
- All mentions of natural lawncare was removed
- Added clauses on training
- FIFRA law requires testing of certain pesticides, no comments received by the City of Evanston
- **S. Besson** asked about the training element, the IPM or contractual firms to provide education every 2 years.
- **S. Pincuspy** stated for IPM training there are 3rd party certifications for pest control. There is a cost.
- **S. Pincuspy** presented documents from San Francisco’s identifying the least toxic chemicals, also the state of NY has a website searchable for prohibited toxins. He also provided the City of Seattle Pest Reduction Strategy
- **E. Port** had concerns about adopting a list that is not from the state of Illinois or the Federal Government is not a good idea.
- **S. Pincuspy** stated FIFRA sets minimum standards for pesticides, states have the ability to be stricter than the Federal Government. Many cities do not have the staff or ability to perform research, the way that New York and California do.
- **E. Port** questioned what the process of forming California’s list. Mr. Pincuspy asked why is this a burden.
- **E. Port** asked if the USEPA information not adequate for the ordinance’s purpose
- **A. Viner** stated NY and CA were able to put more resources toward defining unallowable.
- **S. Pincuspy** stated this ordinance is not a ban on chemicals but their use on City of Evanston property
- **Chair Finnegan** stated the ordinance is a codification of City of Evanston practices
- **A. Viner** stated the USEPA list was broad and vague
- **S. Pincuspy** stated other municipalities have adopted
- **E. Port** requested an amendment to Section 2 paragraph d) replace attract with mitigate
- **Chair Finnegan** asked why Section 7 would not follow section 4 and become section 5 and renumbering. Request for consistency in Section d FIFRA in italics
- **Chair Finnegan** motioned to recommend the IPM ordinance to the Human Services Committee, seconded by S. Kaplan, motioned passed unanimously.

VI. EEB Strategic Plan
a. Code Review Update (Gem/ Kevin)
- **G. Burrough** sent members a list about deconstruction, the focus should shift from demolition to deconstruction
- **D. Cox** recommended deconstruction as the first step in salvaging what can be used of a demolished.
- **G. Burrough** stated there needs to be a different mindset this is simply an additional definition.
- **Lou Dickson** spoke to the definition, she stated her concern was that this definition is lacking teeth, and will make no difference
- **S. Besson** stated the intent was not grow teeth but, rather to align with the Climate Action Plan.
- **S. Besson** asked what would the next action to take, with the potential for an additional ordinance.
- **A. Viner** requested that cautiously be removed from the section addressing asbestos
- It was requested that **S. Kaplan** provide her research on the issue
b. K. Glynn updated the Committee regarding the issue of solar there is a requirement for appearance and materials. The ordinance does not allow white roofs or photovoltaic cells. There is no right to light in the state of Illinois.

c. A. Viner has been on a call with the consortium of other North Shore members to work on more regional issues. She offered information and assistance. There is a proposal for goals and a mission statement in development. A. Viner stated Deerfield was just beginning a similar Committee and asked for a copy of the bylaws.

d. D. Cox stated there was an outreach call. He introduced the idea of a forum to consolidate all the activity from all of the environmental groups and track it. Sharing of stories and best practices. Creating a place on the city website, where there is an online space for people to track their ideas.

The website could be used as a place to look for new ideas.
C. Caneva will research the issue of placing the website online.

D. Cox motioned to adjourn at 9:31pm passed unanimously.

VII. Roundtable Public Comment

NEXT MEETING – Feb. 11, 2010