

Evanston Environment Board
7:00 p.m. Room 2200
Lorraine H. Morton Center
2100 Ridge Ave.

Quorum Present

Thursday May 14, 2009

Board Chairs: Susan Besson, Paige Finnegan

Board Members Present: William Gallagher, Susan Kaplan, Richard M. Kuntz, Eli A. Port, Edward J. McCall, Elizabeth Kinney, Kevin Glynn, Dan Cox, Suzanne Waller

Board Members Absent: Gemariah Borough, Anne Viner,

Community Members Present: Dick Peach,

Staff Present: Carl Caneva HHS, Karen Taira Parks and Recreation, Carolyn Collopy Public Works, Bob Dornecker Parks and Recreation

I. Approval of minutes for April 2, 2009

- P. Finnegan motioned to call the meeting to order, seconded by D. Cox.
- **P. Finnegan** motioned approval of the April minutes, seconded by R. **Kuntz** motioned carried

II. Dick Peach Update on Plastic Bag Ordinance

- **S. Besson** introduced Dick Peach, the Environment Board is looking to support efforts focused on Environmental Improvements and has invited Mr. Peach to talk about a Plastic Bag Ordinance Effort
- D. Peach stated the ordinance seeks to eliminate “t-shirt” plastic bags. Research was conducted looking at countries and cities that had banned the bags
- They looked at outright bans of the bags and fees. The most successful programs had fees attached to the plastic bags. Ireland enacted a 37c tax on plastic bags and in six months saw a great reduction
- The original thought was to address paper bags, as impact studies have show paper bags to have a greater impact on the Environment
- There is an effort to address paper bags as well.
- **S. Waller** asked if there was a specific plastic identified,

- The ordinance clearly addresses “t-shirt” bags only, they are not addressing “in store” bags, dry cleaning bags are excluded as are deli bags **D. Peach** answered no, they are interested in plastic bags
- **D. Peach** and the Solid Waste group has met with are merchants and has not seen any opposition to the proposal.
- **R. Kuntz** asked what the option would be if paper and plastic was eliminated **D. Peach** stated patrons would be charged 25c a bag
- **E. Port**, *identified an unintended loophole in the ordinance. The current draft of the ordinance would charge \$0.25 per free plastic bag, he stated that a merchant could charge a patron \$0.01 per bag thereby avoiding the higher fee.*
- **D. Peach** stated he would research this issue and address the loophole
- **D. Peach** stated the next step is to get citizens involved by contacting residents at local festivals; they are looking to build community support for the effort.
- **P. Finnegan** asked if an education campaign might be more effective than an ordinance, many if not all of the examples provided were overturned.
- **D. Peach** stated those other ordinances were overturned due to a failure to focus on specific bags
- **S. Waller** asked for a time frame to create the support, **D. Peach** stated the summer was the time frame
- **E. Kinney** asked the efficiency of recycling the plastic bags at Dominick’s, **D. Peach** stated research was done and the bags were not being recycled
- **E. Port**, asked why the City of Evanston is not being collected, **C. Collopy** stated the City of Evanston has a commingled pickup and the bags would contaminate the other recyclables.
- **D. Peach** indicated there is no marked to recycle the plastic bags. **E. Port** stated there was an incentive to turn in plastic bags in Japan due to the amount of Polyethylene in the bags.
- **S. Besson** asked if there was any further outreach to businesses planned, **D. Peach** confirmed that this was happening and he would be in contact with multiple merchant groups
- **D. Peach** reiterated he wanted public and merchant support; his group is meeting with legal to produce a draft of the ordinance. Their goal is to produce an ordinance and present it to the City of Evanston by the goal.
- **D. Peach** stated he wanted to get the bags out of the streets, trees. **S. Kaplan** asked about the overall environmental impact. The entire impact will be addressed in the Wheras statements of the ordinance. Any reduction will also address the goals of the Climate Action Plan
- **D. Peach** was thanked by the committee for his presentation and his work. He stated the Environment Board would review the ordinance prior to its presentation.

- **E. McCall** suggested an incentive to reduce the cost of permanent bag for the patron.
- **D. Peach** mentioned the City of Evanston should look into designing its own bags. **E. Port** stated the City of Evanston could begin the program at the Farmer's Markets.
- **W. Burroughs** stated that the bags could also be contaminated by food, and food juices.
- **P. Finnegan** thanked **D. Peach** and stated there was general agreement to move this ordinance forward

III. **GBO (Green Building Ordinance) Update and Next Steps**

- **E. Kinney** gave a summary of the Human Services meeting on May 5, 2009. The ordinance was approved for introduction at the May 26, 2009 meeting. Page seven (7) of the handout will be added to the ordinance and presented to the council. The changes include a sliding scale.
- **S. Besson** asked about the range of fees, **B. Dornecker** stated the fees are similar to the structure already in place for building permits.
- **B. Dornecker** stated the Law Department will make additional changes and the board will receive the changes.
- **S. Besson** asked about interest accrued by the deposit and how it would be addressed. **E. Kinney** did not get an answer from Human Services during the meeting. **B. Dornecker** will research the issue of interest with regards to the deposit.
- **E. McCall** asked whether the ordinance applied to the City of Evanston. **P. Finnegan** asked how would the City of Evanston pay the fees associated with being a green building? **B. Dornecker** stated the fees are typically waived for city projects. **P. Finnegan** suggested a statement from the City of Evanston indicating projects would achieve LEED status
- **D. Cox** asked if the City of Evanston has any agreements that make sustainable construction difficult like that of the City of Evanston's agreement with GROOT
- **C. Collopy** stated GROOT would give residents certificates and recycle waste at their request, potentially at a higher cost
- **S. Besson** stated she was reminded of the new energy code making its way through the state government.
- **C. Collopy** stated legislation was being enacted forcing cities to enact the 2009 Energy Code. She stated she was unaware of its impact on the GBO
- **E. Kinney** stated she thought the interest should go to the developer if LEED certification was obtained and to the Climate Action Fund if it was not.
- **B. Dornecker** stated the new information requests would need to be sent to the City of Evanston Legal Department and would cause any

action or introduction of the ordinance to be delayed until the June 8, 2009 City Council meeting

- **B. Dornecker** stated the information would need to be made available 10 days prior to the next council meeting. He summarized the process, the ordinance would go for introduction on June 8, 2009 then return to Council on the next Council Meeting for action.

IV. IPM (Integrated Pest Management) Ordinance Development and Next Steps

- **S. Kaplan** stated the cornerstone for any ordinance is to involve the public. She stated Steve Pincuspy is interested in providing education on the following topics: Home yard pesticide use, IPM Strategies, or insect and rodent control
- **P. Finnegan** stated the Board's duties extend to educating the public about pest management issues. Safer Pest Control has performed work throughout the Chicagoland
- **K. Glynn** requested information be provided in Spanish
- **S. Kaplan** is requesting a timeline for the ordinance and its development.
- **P. Finnegan** stated Safer Pest Control has committed to visiting the committee with a draft ordinance at the June Board Meeting
- **D. Cox** stated Safer Pest Control may need to address this via a personal health issue.
- **E. Port** questioned if there was an effort to go to commercial providers, he mentioned the Farmer's Market as a place for presentations.
- **S. Kaplan** stated that many municipalities that have gone to IPM ordinances and policies, education is at the cornerstone of an IPM effort
- **S. Besson** questioned the need for an ordinance
- **S. Kaplan** stated there needed to be something in writing, in case of turnover and new staff
- **R. Kuntz** stated what impact would this have on the city. He supported a more general ordinance
- **E. McCall** stated expense issues were the key to the ordinance. **S. Kaplan** stated the IPM programs for natural lawn care paid for itself after a few seasons
- **E. Kinney** suggested having IPM at the Green Living Festival.
- **K. Glynn** asked if there could be a threshold of acceptable compliance
- **P. Finnegan** is interested in pursuing the ordinance further, and have it applied to everyone
- **K. Glynn** asked how the issue of leaving the City of Evanston and purchasing chemicals to treat the lawn would be addressed.
- **P. Finnegan** requested members bring questions for the IPM Ordinance

V. Climate Action Plan/ Strategic Plan

- **P. Finnegan** requested members attend the June 8th council meeting, and there will be a presentation at the next meeting

VI. Roundtable Discussion

- **BASE** (Business Alliance for a Sustainable Evanston) will have its kickoff on Monday May 18, 2009 at 6:30 p.m. at Boocoo in Evanston. **S. Besson** stated parking on the SE corner may be available.
- **Citizens for a Greener Evanston** June 4th 7:00p.m. townhall meeting. The meeting will feature a carbon footprint presentation by Carolyn Collopy.
- **E. Port** questioned as to the numbers of calls made regarding noise violations, **C. Caneva** stated that there had been greater than 7,000 calls regarding noise violations. **E. Port** stated the ordinance was comprehensive, he stated there is a noise problem near Northwestern, in his own backyard. He wondered if there is a problem with the police investigation. **P. Finnegan** stated the board was not an enforcement board. **E. McCall** stated the noise ordinance was focused on addressing the issues of leaf blowers. **S. Besson**, would like to look at more evidence addressing the issue of noise.
- **E. Port** requested the board give him direction on the next steps to take
- **E. McCall** stated there was tolerable noise and intolerable noise, stating it was difficult to pursue the ordinance.
- **K. Glynn** stated any information further should address the issues of mechanized noise.
- **R. Kuntz** suggested garbage trucks be reviewed
- **E. Port** requested a contact at the police department to talk about noise calls

E. Kinney motioned to adjourn at 8:50pm seconded by **P. Finnegan**.

Minutes Respectfully Submitted by,

Carl Caneva

Division Manager Health and Human Services