



MINUTES OF THE SUSTAINABILITY COMMISSION

WEDNESDAY, DECEMBER 16, 2020, 5:00 PM
Virtual Meeting. Public may join via Zoom.

A. ZOOM MEETING INFORMATION.

I. This item contains documents which provide call in information and instructions for the Zoom Meeting.

B. ROLL CALL.

I. Chair--Seth Hoffmeister; Vice Chair--Ned Dorff; Alder Randy Scannell; Kaurie Mihm--PRF; Prof. John Arendt; Julia Noordyk; Cody Sandahl; Mark Walter

All present.

C. APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA.

I. Approval of the agenda of the December 16, 2020 meeting of the Sustainability Commission.

Moved by Ald. Randy Scannell, seconded by Professor John Arendt to approve the agenda. Motion carried.

Yes- Randy Scannell, Ned Dorff, Seth Hoffmeister, Julia Noordyk, Mark Walter, John Arendt, Kaurie

Mihm, Cody Sandahl, No- None, Abstain- None

D. APPROVAL OF MINUTES.

I. Approval of the minutes from the November 19, 2020 meeting of the Sustainability Commission.

Moved by Ald. Randy Scannell, seconded by Mark Walter to approve minutes. Motion carried.

Yes- Randy Scannell, Ned Dorff, Seth Hoffmeister, Julia Noordyk, Mark Walter, John Arendt, Kaurie Mihm, Cody Sandahl, No- None, Abstain- None

E. REGULAR BUSINESS.

I. EV Charging Station Update (Kaurie Mihm)

Moved by Ald. Randy Scannell, seconded by Julia Noordyk to approve the use of the remaining excess stadium tax funds allocated to Eland Electric to install PV at one or more fire stations. Motion carried.

Yes- Randy Scannell, Ned Dorff, Seth Hoffmeister, Julia Noordyk, Mark Walter, John Arendt, Kaurie Mihm, Cody Sandahl, No- None, Abstain- None

F. INFORMATIONAL.

I. Section 8.11, Noxious Weeds & Maintenance of Vegetation for Sustainability Commission review and input (Melissa Schmitz)

2. Update PV project(s) at City fire stations (Celestine Jeffreys)

3. The next meeting is January 20 , 2021 at 5:00 pm.

G. ADJOURNMENT.

Moved by Ald. Randy Scannell, seconded by Mark Walter to adjourn. Motion carried.

Yes- Randy Scannell, Ned Dorff, Seth Hoffmeister, Julia Noordyk, Mark Walter, John Arendt, Kaurie Mihm, Cody Sandahl, No- None, Abstain- None

H. VERBATIM MINUTES.

- On this computer. Okay, now tell us, you're ready to start.

- Seth we're ready to start.

- Lights, camera. All right, we'll call this meeting to order here. Item A, I think we got through that. We'll start then with item B, roll call, if we're ready to go.

- Hold on one second. Hold on one second Seth. Where's my finger? There it is.

- Celestine is asking for a pause. Okay.

- Okay, so, and then go to the next item. Next, next,

- With a pause? F being a man, is that a menopause?

- You know what? I'm done with you, I'm done.

- He's coming in hot.

- I say that every meeting.

- Okay, Seth we're in the roll call area now.

- All right, sounds good. Roll call, chair, Seth here. Vice chair, Ned.

- Here.

- Elder Randy.

- Present.

- Corey.

- Present.

- All right, John.

- Present.

- Julia.

- Present.

- Cody.

- He didn't hear.

- Cody

- Cody looks like he's here. It's a mute button issues. Cody, can you hear us?

- He's probably not.

- He's still moving.

- He looks frozen.

- Okay.

- Yeah, he's active on my screen, but he's not.

- So, Cody has to say... I have no audio video. Okay, wait, wait, timeout Seth. Tell Cody to call in. Does Cody have the telephone numbers? He has no audio or video.

- I can D or not to chat, chat to him.

- That's what I'm doing right now too.

- Oh, he did send it good. All right, okay. So we have to wait for Cody to come back in. I mean you still have quorum, so ask Seth what he wants to do if he wants to continue.

- And Mark you're here. Mark, are you here? Okay, well let's give him a second here.

- Don't forget John.

- Oh, good.

- I said John didn't I, did I miss you John? Should we just go around one more time?

- Should we go right here?

- So you should go, yes, right there. Go to this one. 'Cause that's, okay. Yeah, you should have been there. That's a weird, okay. And then admit Cody, you'll get the hang of it and you'll be like, oh my God, this is so easy.

- Okay, it looks like Cody's in. And his microphone appears to be working.

- Yes, there we go.

- Present.

- All right, deal. Cool. Roll call success. All right, well be able to proceed.

- Do I fight it?

- Nope, now you move on cause roll call, so you just want to do, you just wanna type, hold on one second Seth. You just wanna type all present. Okay, and click onto the next item.

- Do I click this one?

- Which?

- This.

- Nope, nope. 'Cause you're not voting. It's just, they're there. Okay, now go to the next one and set current. Okay, now tell if you're on to approval.

- I'm onto the approval of the minutes, agenda.

- Is there a motion agenda?

- I want to approve the agenda.

- Cool. Motion by Randy, is there a second?

- Hold on, hold on, hold this one. So this is what you do. So sorry everybody. I know this is painful, but where's your thing. Oh, there it is, okay. I'm so sorry. I'm all like all up on you too. So you do, you do add motion. Okay.

- Initiated by Randy.

- Initiated by Randy and,

- Seconded by,

- Seconded by John with Andres. There's a motion and a second.

- To approve a doc accept and save. Okay, then you click on this for the vote. Now Seth is gonna call the vote. Call vote Seth.

- All those in favor, say aye.

- Aye.

- All those opposed, say nay. Okay, deal. Good deal. Approved unanimously. Hold on one second. So now when you, I'll show you how to do it. I'll stay and I'll show you how to do it. Like it'll be easy. Now, click to the next, click to the next, click to the next. Go ahead Seth.

- Alrighty then, onto item D, approval of the minutes. There's a motion. Is there a second?

- Second.

- Second by Mark.

- Hold on. Right now, click to vote.

- This one?

- The orange one. All right, Seth call vote.

- All those in favor, say aye.

- Aye.

- All those oppose, say nay. All right, motion passed.

- Okay, now go on to the next, next and click set current. Go ahead Seth.

- Okey-doke regular business. All right. Metric vehicle charging station update, Corey. You can take it away.

- I'm gonna kind of start with a little bit of a recap of what brought us to where we are today and give you some more information that I've found out since we last discussed this. So almost a year ago, in December 11th, 2019, Eland Electric presented a recommendation to the Sustainability Commission for spending \$60,000 in excess stadium tax funding for solar projects in the city. These recommendations were based on prior discussions between Eland Electric and the city. And that was before my time with the commission. So I don't really know all those details, I don't know that they're really important at this point. So at the meeting, the proposal for the funding was to take \$16,000 and replace the solar panels and inverter at light park and to repair the tracker mechanisms so that they were functioning, resulting in an increase of energy output. It was also proposed for \$22,000 to install as many solar panels as we could for fire station five to reduce the usage at that facility by roughly 13%. And also \$22,000 to install as many solar panels as we could at fire station number four which could help to reduce the usage there as much as 10%. Within that proposal, Eland Electric and Jesse McCalsky who did the presentation had stated that he would like to avoid the charger EV charger at light park so that we could use the same micro inverters at every site to provide a scannable QR code and public link so that the people could view what kind of output that

the city was getting from the solar systems. And so I have seen that monitoring tool, it is working but I don't believe it's been made public. So I'm not quite sure what steps we need to go through to make that happen but we're definitely capable of doing that. So at that meeting, the following motions were approved and carried and one was to refer to staff to explore the installation of the solar rays at fire stations four and five. And then the second motion for the funding was to approve the installation of the light park solar ray, along with an EV charger. The installation is a replacement of solar panels and inverter and the repair tracker mechanism, is how it read. And so that went to city council and was approved. I do feel that it's a bit confusing because I think the second sentence there kind of reads as though we were just replacing what was already there even though the first sentence did include the EV charger. So I just wanted to make note of that. I'm not sure how much discussion there was about it at that city council meeting. Looks like Randy is shaking his head. Probably really not much if any, perhaps. So I wanted to make note of that. Then, let's see. Okay, so then in May of 2020, the solar ray work was completed at light park. And as I had previously mentioned to the commission, there were concerns from city staff regarding potential costs incurred from the use of the EV charger. And there was a decision made by city staff to not include the installation of the charger during the time of the other solar work. So the actual cost of the installation of the new solar panels inverter and the repair of the tracker was \$25,635. So that means the cost of the installation was 9,635 over the estimate, the price that was given at that meeting back in December, 2019. Then in September at our meeting, I tried to give some insight into the costs related to the light park energy usage and the amount of energy that the solar panels were generating. That question during that meeting as to whether or not the savings that were being generated from the panels was enough to cover the costs that we could potentially incur from the use of an EV charger. So since then I have been able to collect about six months worth of data from May 27th to November 29th. So we have a good idea now of what's being generated out there and what the usage is in the park. So the new panels produced 7,685 kilowatt-hours of energy. And the park use 7,765 kilowatt-hours of energy. So pretty close. That means the panels covered most of the kilowatt hours, but it did not generate enough power to cover all the energy costs. There was approximately or at approximately 12 and a half cents per kilowatt-hour, the city paid out \$10 for 80 kilowatt-hours. But that also does not include things like the monthly billing fees that we incur from WPS which is like the \$45 per month approximately depending it varies from month to month. So I did wanna note too, I found it interesting to learn that the city has charged about 12 and a half cents per kilowatt-hour, but we are only credited about three and a half cents per kilowatt-hour which is the wholesale rate that we receive for anything we generate over what we use. And so just wanted too to point out that we should keep in mind that there are many variables to consider when looking at these ongoing costs, first being that this was a COVID year and the energy usage that was shown within the last six months isn't necessarily great reflection of, you know how moving forward that energy usage could perhaps change. And then of course with different weather conditions we may generate more power, we may generate less, It's kind of hard to say. So with all of that in mind, Jesse did, so we did reach out, you know we'd have the discussion about, well what about if we did a pay station and that could help alleviate the concerns of having to have the city or parks or whoever be responsible for perhaps charges incurred with that solar rate. So I reached out to Jesse at Eland. He gave me a budgetary cost of about 3,500 to \$6,500 to install the pay station. And that could vary depending on wherever we decide to put the charger that sort of thing. If we installed it and it was on the high end, it would bring us about \$16,000 over the original budget. And so I just wanted to make you aware of that that if we wanted to consider keeping the \$22,000 for each fire station as originally planned, you know that additional, I guess we're over budget on light park already, is what I'm trying to say. So Jesse has confirmed though that even though we did go over budget with the solar ray at light park, that we have about \$34,365 remaining, that it would be enough to cover costs for either smaller to smaller fire station

projects or perhaps one larger one. So I know Celestine and Melissa have recently spoke with the fire department and I think we're gonna be getting an update from either one of them later. And so I think with that, I really am just ready to open up the floor for discussion or questions or anything like that.

- I'd like to dig into a couple of things there. So thank you for the report Corey, on the budget for light park. You mentioned the city getting the wholesale utility rate for any energy we generate over what we actually use. And it's my understanding that the utilities do that when an array crosses a certain threshold of is it 20, I dunno, 20, 20 kilowatt thresh, it's some kind of, I don't remember what the threshold is when they start to payback the utility rate instead of the customer rate. But for the energy that we generate, regardless for the energy we generate not above what we use, we still get paid back the customer rate, correct?

- Yes. Wait, no, I'm sorry. Can you say that again?

- We're getting paid back net metering, right? We're getting our energy use is offset. Our cost is offset directly by the energy that we generate. We're not getting paid back the wholesale utility rate if we're not going over the amount of energy that we use.

- Yeah, so my understanding is to kind of keep it simple, say the meter reading is at 100 at the start of the month. If the meter reads say 200, at the end of the month then we would pay the 100 kilowatt-hour difference. If say it was reduced by 50, you know, then the meter would read at 50 versus the 100. And then we would be credited the 3 cents per kilowatt-hour for those 50 kilowatt hours, I think.

- Yeah, yeah. That's true on a large array. That's true on like a really large array. And I don't know that our light park is large enough to to only get back that 3 cents an hour.

- That's what I was told by WPS. I spoke with Corey, I'm not certain of his last name right now but that's what WPS had told me was that the 3 cents per hour that we're getting.

- If we generate more than what we use.

- Correct.

- Okay. And I know that that is true over a certain threshold. And I think that that's a good reminder to us when we do projects to not build for 100% at this point, to to kind of look at what is the 100% per month and then ratchet it down, go to like, you know, 75, 80% of what we actually need. Otherwise we do end up in that position of overbuilding and possibly getting paid back, not a great return on the investment. So with the electric vehicle charging station, you know we talked about this, I guess a couple of times since you reported this fall as that kind of a project would entail a lot more kind of in-depth study and like a whole different, that's a whole different project. Like it's a whole different ball of wax. And I think we kind of all came to the agreement that if we were gonna do that, it would be something that wouldn't be free to use. It would be something that somebody would pay to use. So, yeah, I'm curious if that's something that Melissa, you know it would be kind of under her purview to look further into because we did, I mean, we did build the project as we were gonna have an EV charging station at light park. You know, coming back and looking at it a year later, I don't think we should have said it was going to be free. I think, you know, learning from the guest we had from California a couple of meetings ago, you know she drives an electric car, she expects to pay to use energy. And I think that makes sense. So I don't want the idea to die, right? But I also don't want it to come at a cost to the city, the taxpayers, because if we're putting in something to generate energy, then it should recoup its costs over time. So I would love, I don't know, you know, what the right, I think the idea would be more to recommend that we have staff look into some of what are the actual costs over the longterm of putting in an electric vehicle charging station at light park. If we were to buy it, you know buy into that system where people can charge their cars and pay for it at the park. You know, if this is an action item, are we talking action on the EV chargers? Are we talking action on the remaining \$34,000 right now or both? You know, could we come out with two motions from this item?

- I mean, I think the most important thing coming out of this conversation would to just be to like have our minutes reflect that we want the remainder of the money to go towards the fire station money, the fire station solar projects which I think we'll get an update on next. In terms of looking into EV feasibility, I think that something that should definitely be on our radar, I guess, in terms of like capacity I know there's a number of other like clean energy kind of things in the works. So I guess I'm not sure if it, I agree it should be something we should look into and prioritize over the next year or so, but I would defer to Melissa on whether that's worth making a motion on right now, if that's within, you know her capacity in the highest priority or something we should just kind of back for a little bit while other things shake out.

- I would say it's probably not the top priority right now but Ned, I do think it is something that should, you know, that I can keep looking into. And I've had conversations with a gentleman from department of public works that deals with parking. And we had a conversation with, I can't remember the name of the organization, but basically several years ago, it's like the mayor's electrification coalition or something. And they offer technical assistance to municipalities. So I did have a conversation a couple of weeks ago with the representative of that company it's a nonprofit

organization. I did receive some information to look at. I haven't dug into it yet. I think it's a broader conversation of where the best location would be. Maybe not, it might not be at light park. It might be in a different parking area. So I don't want you to think that this is a dead issue by any means. I don't, that that is totally not where my mind is. I think though, that the action that we're looking for today is to discontinue, you know the idea of putting in an EV charging station at light park with this funding that we have that the grant funding specifically for PV. So that's the action that I'm suggesting we take tonight, to focus the remainder of dollars on PV projects at one or more of the fire stations.

- Thank you, Seth and Melissa for that feedback. I think the EV charger it's still kind of a loose end out there. It's something we voted on. It's something the city council voted on and I don't know that we've ever brought it back to kind of put it to bed officially, right? Staff made a decision in May and I think it's probably the right decision if it was gonna create some serious budget problems, but it's still out there as, you know the city council directed staff and Eland to put this charger in. So what would be the appropriate way for us to handle that loose end? Would it be to refer it back to staff?

- No, I think that's what we're doing tonight. I think we are tying up that loose end with the motion.

- I think to keep in mind the funding is not there to do everything we wanted to do. So I think that's really the biggest item here that needs to be considered as we move forward with whatever we move forward with is we don't have funding to do everything we wanted to do like we initially thought we did. So I just, I don't know how we would do that without another funding source. That's agenda item initially you know, was addressing projects with funding we had but if we don't have the funding, then I don't know. I'm not quite sure.

- My understanding is that the grant money was specifically for PV.

- What is it, what's PV?

- Photo-voltaic for solar installations? That was the intent of the original \$60,000 from everything I've read leading up to to this point.

- So I guess it's the appropriate motion that we as a commission recommend using the remaining stadium tax funds on the fire station, PV projects. Yes?

- Project or project?

- Depends.

- Our next little bit here.

- Is there some important information we should hear first before directing it to one or more projects though? Or are we gonna have to make that decision next month?

- So let me just reiterate that the original determination for this fund was to spend it at light park to redo, replace the solar ray, potentially add an EV charger and then solar panels on one or more of city building. So it's already included, the one or more of city buildings and yeah, hopefully that answers your question.

- Yeah.

- We're still going forward with the solar lighting at light park though, correct? Or no?

- Yes, that was installed in May. So the solar ray has been upgraded already.

- Okay. Then I'll make a motion that we direct the rest of the funds to one or both fire stations.

- Sorry, hold on one second, you guys. Okay, so Randy made a motion and then somebody needs to second it.

- I second it.

- Okay. All right, so save it and then yup. To, nope, you want that one. Then save. And then what you do is you type. Give yourself some notes there about what Randy said. Hold on one second. You can figure it out. Okay, all right. So now Seth call to vote.

- All those in favor, please say aye.

- Aye.

- Aye.

- Go ahead, click it. And you can click. Yes and then save as passed. Okay, and then you can move on to the next one and then I'll show you how to do the minutes.

- Okay.

- All right, cool. Jumping on then to informational Mosa. We've got ya with some vegetation fun business. So take it away.

- Okay. So as you know, from a couple of months ago we carried the green infrastructure code audit over to this month. We've been working on seeking staff input on the noxious weeds ordinance. The amendments that were made to the landscaping code amendments and storm water were the primary areas that were addressed in the green infrastructure code audit. It's in your agenda packet I'm not looking for any action right now, but I included that so that everyone that wanted to weigh in and offer feedback on the proposed amendments for noxious weeds can do so over the next three weeks. What I'm hoping is that you can provide written feedback. You can send your written comments directly to me. I'm compiling all the feedback that we get from staff. And now that it's in the hands of the commission, we'll be looking at that as well. And the main things with the noxious weeds, it did receive a preliminary grade, shall you say, of an A minus. So it was already in pretty good condition, you know, according to our consultants. The main areas that were addressed, were the, some of the provisions for, if a citizen wants to adopt it, do a natural lawn. So there were some things regarding that. And then also with what's considered a noxious weed. So there was some more language added in for that as well. If anybody has any questions, if you looked at it in the

meantime, you know, from the time I sent it out to tonight, I can try to address your questions. Otherwise I can share my screen and go through it really quickly. I encourage you to reach out to me individually as well over the course before the next meeting in January, if you have specific questions. I don't know how this is typically approached, you know, when it's sent to a come to the commission for comment if everyone weighs in, or if there's just certain members that are maybe a little bit more tuned in to this particular issue that will offer feedback. Anybody have anything to say at this point?

- I was gonna say Melissa, if it's just informational and you're seeking a written feedback, I'm not gonna tie up commission time with my suggestions. I will actually send you the suggestions that I've compiled.

- Thank you and I appreciate that. I appreciate the written comments because it'll be easier to incorporate if, you know, depending on what the nature of the comments are. So I do request written feedback.

- Okay, thank you, Melissa. Anybody have non-written feedback before we move on to the next item here?

- It's roughly five pages long. So it's not like, you know hours and hours of work, hopefully.

- Wonderful, thank you, Melissa for that.

- I was happy that city Alder wasn't listed as a noxious weed. I was very happy to see that.

- Yes.

- And you said that, sorry, Melissa, you said that it's made the rounds in the departments that,

- Yes, more or less. More or less, more or less. More or less, it has made the rounds.

- I do have a question about the registration and the amount of planned natural landscapes that are allowed on a property. And maybe where those came from. Like how many, it says up to four planned natural landscapes may be allowed on any property.

- Let me just pull it up so I can look at it while you're, do you actually have it in front of you right now Ned? What section are you in?

- Section six letter A, I believe.

- Registration required. That area? So the way it's written right now in the code is that, and this is hard to read when it's all crossed out and all the markings are in here. So I'm going to do my best. But basically any owner of a property and any tenant upon signed yada yada yada may implement a planned natural landscaping area with the department of public works. So right now it's written as may, which means that technically, they don't have to register a project like this.

- Right, okay.

- So that was actually one of the things that came up today in a conversation with staff. So that is being looked at. If a required or a may is really the better approach to this. And then it says up to four planned natural landscaping areas may be permitted on one property with a maximum cumulative surface area of 300 square feet or 5% of the gross area block, whichever is greater. Do you have a question on that or is it a concern?

- It's a concern. It's a concern. I don't know why 300 square feet would be the maximum somebody could have on their property.

- It might be, I'm not sure if it, you know, I can't really say exactly why it was written that way initially, but maybe so that the entire front yard of a space can't be overrun. I don't know. That's just my, that's my gut feeling on that, but, oh, okay.

- Is that four areas can be 300 square feet, so 1200 square feet in total?

- I read it as a cumulative, as a maximum cumulative area. So 300 square feet would be the total.

- And that's like 30 by 10. Yeah, I'll send some written feedback on that one, but that one definitely concerns me.

- It does also say, or 5% of the total gross area of the lot, whichever is greater. So it actually, I mean, this does allow for more than 300 square feet.

- Or 5%. So it's an or.

- Which is strange combination.

- You know, I know what I'll do is, I'll go back and I'll talk to our consultant, JB Heinz and I'll ask her for a little bit more clarity on that. 'Cause if we're having a hard time interpreting it then the average person's probably gonna have a hard time interpreting it also. So maybe there's a better way of writing that.

- Isn't restrictive before?

- No.

- So yeah. To me though, that wouldn't have probably come from her that would have come from city staff.

- Absolutely.

- It's kind of funny to have a restriction on something that's planned, you know, or I mean, the whole point of this is to have it planned. I don't understand the restriction either. Or the required registration.

- The required registration I think draws back to a court case that the city got involved with some time ago, with someone who had a planned, I don't want to call it a planned area, I wanna call it a natural landscape in their front yard that got out of hand. So the registration stems from that. So that a plan can be approved because if you don't have registration, then it's hard to necessarily have an enforcement measure down the road if necessary.

- I also see that as a concern as well. To me, it seems like a very minimal area that we would be allowing folks to do the naturalized landscaping. And I often think about, well, okay there's no restrictions for the amount of other vegetation besides turf grass. So as long as you have it plants, if you're allowed to have as many plants as you want on the lot, as long as they're arranged neatly in somebody's eyes, you know.

- There has to be, you know how this is written, is that a plan indicating, you know plant species or seed mixes to be used. So there is some specificity asked for in this. And then the types of plantings, there are some examples given in the code update and some other requirements. For instance, edging, I mean, that's a broad definition. Edging can be an earth edging, you know, a cutting edging or something like that. It doesn't necessarily be brick or stone or plastic or anything like that. But that edging, some form of edging is required. The plant height of that maturity. There's gotta be some, you know potentially so that it's not blocking views. And how close it is to the curb, it's not allowed in terrace areas. So as you go through this, you'll see all of the, some of the things that were, that the consultant is suggesting to be redacted and then the additions. I didn't send you the cleaned up version I sent you so you could see both.

- And I can't recall were rain gardens considered a naturalized planting that you would need to get registered as well?

- Let me see if that's in here.

- I know Corey that there's a definition of a rain garden in there, and I'd have to defer to Julia in terms of maybe some of that language, because I do not think of a rain garden as an excavated area

that is back-filled necessarily. I mean, and whether that's a plan, I believe it's somewhere in here also it's part of the planned natural landscaping area. But yeah, it doesn't say that clearly.

- Because of the amount of flooding the city deals with, I think we would want to make it as easy as possible for people to put rain gardens on their properties. So I think restricting it, you know I think some restrictions are okay, but it does seem to me that it's being restricted maybe more than we should be considering right now in my opinion. Yeah, I think I, my whole yard is, does not fall under this amended code suggestion. So yeah, I don't know where all the restrictions came from if it was more open before and what the actual need is to try to control plants. And it's just like, I don't know.

- It was much more open before from yard line to what 100% of your yard could be. That was a lot of work. So that section is antithetical to all the work that was, that probably we gave it that. So I don't know, Yeah, I don't know where it came from, but it is definitely, it would sink the idea of using your yard or business, you know a business using it's yard as a way to counteract some of the flooding or provide pollinator habitat. So yeah, I'm kind of shocked that that part's in there. But I do see that you know, a three-foot boundary from the right of way. I understand that if people need to get through, you know that could make sense. But yeah this is definitely way more restrictive than the original ordinance.

- Which seems like it would make it more of a barrier in discouraging rather than encouraging. I know in like other communities you have like the registered things to more, maybe, you know, this one's based on a previous lawsuit here, which makes sense but also to potentially deal with neighbors and complaints. And so then you, like, if someone calls they can say, well, if this is approved kind of landscaping that has been approved under code. But I don't know who's gonna enforce that law too. I'm surprised that there's like limit for the plant lists too because normally you would want to just have it more open. So there's more flexibility on what you can do.

- Yeah, it would, it would seem in that the plan natural landscaping areas shall adhere to the following standards and then types of plantings that are there kind of moves it out of the arena of being natural.

- What section are you in Mark?

- Oh, on page, whatever this is. Page well, it's six. Plan natural landscaping areas, registration required under B plan natural landscaping areas shall adhere to the following standards, types of plantings. As soon as you call it a plan natural landscape and then you get into some strict definitions of what that

natural landscape is, it's moving away from a natural landscape into a planned landscape and it's not quite the same thing anymore.

- Well, you know, and I know part of this is so that we're not getting noxious weeds into the mix of people's home landscapes either. But I mean even planned Prairie's have a planting plan. It's not all Willy nilly. There's a science behind that in a mix that's determined of what will thrive in certain areas. So I don't think having a little bit of direction on it is necessarily a bad thing.

- But is that in code or I don't know. If anyone's ever done, I mean, gardener, if you know anything about gardening it's not like something you plan out from day one and stick to.

- If you wanna have like your, you know part of your yard deemed like a natural area for butterfly habitat or birds or whatever and it's maybe gonna be, you know, quote and quote more natural looking than your tulip border that comes up in the spring, I think that's what this is specifically addressing. And I agree, I'm a gardener, I've been a master gardener for almost 20 years and I totally get it, Julia. You know, things just kind of, oh, I'm feeling this this year, you know, I'm gonna do this or whatever. I think a lot of it's to address some of the issues that the city's encountered over the years with yards and complaints and things like that.

- Yeah, Melissa's right. There has to be some intention to use native Wisconsin plants. It can't just be letting a yard go to waste and rural vacant lot, you know. And the Wild Ones group helped create this ordinance. And in part of their slogan is like, you know natural landscaping or it's using those native plants. So there has to be some intent behind these plantings. And I think, you know anyone that's worked in that field understands, you know, you want to use plants that are actually good for the environment, that are native for the environment. So yeah, I think that's okay to leave that.

- So what I'm asking for comments is by January 13th. Which is one week before our next planned meeting. Does that seem reasonable for all of you that wanna submit written comments?

- Will we receive like an email asking?

- I can definitely send an email. I'll send a formal email out after the meeting to everyone saying, please comments by January 13th. I just wanted to make sure with the holidays and everything going on if that seems realistic for all of you. Okay.

- Good deal everybody. We'll move on to then items two on information.

- Because it's informational, so you can just go ahead and do the next one. Oh, okay. Wait, go to the next one. Go. Oh, okay. So yeah, so we're still in informational, right? Okay, all right. Okay. Seth are you onto the update PV projects at city fire stations?

- Yeah, let's do that. Take it away Celestine.

- Okay, so we had a, you know this project has been kind of hanging out there for a little bit. And thanks, yeah. And got a little delayed because of the election, that little, that small detour. Melissa and I had a very good meeting with fire department lead staff, their senior staff on putting PV, photovoltaic, thank you, chargers or not chargers, sorry. PV. Thank you. And fire stations. And just referring back to the original analysis that Jesse McCalsky had done and then my intern, my King had done some pictures. There were two fires. Well, there were really three buildings that were identified that were good candidates for PV panels. And one was the, Baby Pavilion the West wing where the shop is. Another was Arnie Wolf fire station which is number five across the East town mall. And the third one, and in no specific order the third one was station four, which is by the Onadie family fitness on West point road. So when we talked to them about, you know the possibility of moving forward with these projects, they're very interested in moving forward. So our next step internally is for the fire department, cause we're not talking about Baby Pavilion, we're talking about the fire department. Is for the fire department to figure out roof needs. So Arnie Wolf pros and cons of both Arnie Wolf and fire station four. So pros and cons. Pros of Arnie Wolf over four is that Arnie Wolf is actually more visible. It fronts Mason street. There's a lot of cars going back and forth East town mall, et cetera, et cetera. So Arnie Wolf is actually more visible. The roof space is about the same as it is for station four, right?

- There is absolutely no shading issues.

- At station five, right? So the roof is newer. That's a pro. The roof is newer at station five and there's no tree issues, which is funny for us as the sustainability commission to be talking about the benefit of not having trees around, right? The only time, only time. So those are the pros of station five. The cons are that while it does meet the threshold of I think having a bill of \$500 a month and more, it's not the fire department's most electricity consuming station. That would be station four. Okay, so now let's move to station four. Pros of station four is that it's on Oneida Reservation. And as you know, we are still talking with Oneida for a cooperative governance agreement that was delayed because of the plague. And so we're getting back into those negotiations. Thank goodness. I'm very

happy about that. So this is an opportunity I think at least from my perspective for us to do something potentially together. But the biggest benefit for station four is that that's where they have their backup server. And that back the cooling equipment for the backup server consumes a lot of electricity. So that's their highest electrical need at station four. The cons are, the biggest con is that that is a 20 year old roof. So there is not a roof replacement currently in the capital improvement plan. I think for, like there isn't a specific plan to replace the roof on station four. There's nothing specific saying we're gonna do this by August of 2021. So what the fire department has to do is to just to assess exactly how much life is left in the roof. If there's not a lot of life, how much would it cost? Is there money for it, et cetera. That's a con. Another con is the amount of tree cover. It's beautiful, but that's a con over at station four. They are the most interested in station four, quite frankly. But I think the easiest one would be stationed five even though in terms of payback because that's what this is about. Let me just reiterate that the savings we get from the solar panels need to be put aside for maintenance and for other issues. There needs to be a payback. So the payback is bigger at station four than it is the station five. So our next step, so fire department is going, they're going to, like I said do some due diligence about station four's roof and we'll meet again in early February. Questions? Yes.

- I always have questions. The payback should just be based on the size of the array and how much it's collecting sunlight. So I think regardless of where that array is it's gonna be collecting the same amount, right, if it's in direct sunlight. So I think if it's at four or five it's gonna generate the same amount of payback for the city at this point, right?

- Yeah, I'm not sure about that.

- It depends on how much potential shading there is, Ned, on those panels.

- And when I say payback I mean the ability to offset electric bills. That's what I mean.

- Well, if the array isn't big enough to do 100% of either one of them, it's gonna be fine. It's gonna generate the consumer ray it's gonna get paid back based on the size of that array. So either way we're gonna make the same amount of money back. We'd probably even make more in an unshaded area. 'Cause neither one of those is gonna be over capacity, right? We're not overbuilding array.

- Ned, I don't know if you can hear me or not, I'm off the side, but the proposal, you know that one page proposal that Jesse from Eland put forth last December to the sustainability commission said that at those locations it would offset approximately 10% of the electric usage.

- Okay, good.

- Okay, so there's more electric usage at station five, four, sorry than there is at station four. So that's why the chief was more interested in putting it up there because that bill is offset.

- So if we imagine, so we have 34,000 to put in solar panels, right? So however many solar panels that buys is how many are gonna go in. And it might get like 13% of station five's and 10% of station four's. It's the same amount of money at either place. It's the same amount of energy at either place all things considered. Like we're getting that block of solar panels for this money. So wherever you stick that block of solar panels, as long as you're not overbuilding your array, you're gonna get the exact same amount of energy and cost savings back, no matter where you put that thing as long as you're not generating over 100% of what that building uses. So my, you know, my recommendation I know we're not doing a recommendation but I think it would make more sense to put it in an area that doesn't have that shading and roof issue.

- Well, okay. So just to back up, the roof on station number four, Eland specifically is aware of that shading issue. They're not gonna mount the panels in a heavily shaded area, I'm just saying. So the East side of the roof line has no obstruction. So they recommended on the East side. And then there are certain areas of the South roof that could also accommodate some additional panels as well. So it is still a good location. It's just not the entire roof can't be plastered with solar panels because you wouldn't wanna put solar panels on the West facing side of the roof that's potentially gonna have a lot of afternoon sun, afternoon shade. The plan's been thought out by Eland as far as how to maximize the production even with some trees to avoid those shaded areas. It just depends, you know, over the years, trees get bigger. People have to make decisions. Are we gonna keep those trees? Are we gonna trim those trees back? So, I mean, those are all things that any project is gonna have to take into consideration.

- Honestly, the next step is to let the fire department come back with their recommendations.

- I think it's kind of more in their court.

- Yeah. I mean, I think station four, station five, we'll see you know, we'll come back to the commission and report what the fire department has found, you know through their own due diligence, it's their buildings.

- The good thing is, is they were very receptive. There was not even any hesitation on their part at all. You know, some places are like really? Roof penetrations? I don't know. You know, they weren't like that at all.

- Not at all.

- When you have a willing partner, that's always a great thing and if it can help them cut down on some of their utility costs a little bit I think that's a win.

- Good deal. That's all very great news. Thanks for, yeah, talking with them and looking forward to hearing what the fire station says. Any other questions on this item before we move on to item three and then adjourn?

- Do we think we'll hear back from the fire department within the next month or so?

- No. So the next step, Nope. So the permission we'll hear back into, sorry. It is really hard to do this and socially distance. The next step is for the fire department to take a look at things and then Melissa and I are gonna meet with them again in early February.

- February 1st Ned, that's the next scheduled meeting with the fire department.

- And so then for the February sustainability commission meeting, we'll have an update for you.

- Awesome, thank you. Well, can't wait until then. Cool, well, that's all for item two. Item three looks to be pretty self-explanatory. January 20th, next year at five. And then we'll move on to,

- Oh, go back. Wait, go back. Okay, set current.

- Now?

- Now, okay. All right, and then wait, you're not there yet. Wait, did he just adjourn the meeting?

- No, not yet.

- Okay, all right, sorry.

- Okay, I think January 20th just came up with other meetings. Is inauguration day and there's a lot of stuff planned, so it's not the best day to meet for anybody generally. So it might be worth, I don't know, but I know it's regularly scheduled for us but just to point that out. It's not the best day to meet.

- It's not gonna work. Let me just,

- Okay. Just making a note Julia here, that date might not be good.

- I think someone had pointed out like most of the events online that day are like from eight to 4:00 PM but so ours is a little later, but I don't know if people are taking, yeah. I'll just leave it there for that.

- Celestine is saying that we could potentially move it to the third Thursday.

- Is that the 21st?

- Let me just look. Thursday is the 21st.

- That works for me.
- I'll show you how to change the event.
- Okay. So January 20th was that a conflict for everyone?
- Not necessarily.
- If no one cares then that's fine. I just was pointing that out.
- Okay. If it's not a conflict for everyone and we still have a quorum, then I would recommend that we keep our time. Okay.
- Cool. Awesome. Well then we'll move on to item G adjournment. Is there a motion to adjourn?
- Were you gonna do committee member updates?
- It is not on the agenda.
- Not on the agenda
- Next time.
- All right. So I don't think we can do that if it's not on the agenda. Yes.

- I'll add that to the agenda for next month.

- Cool, so I guess just adjournment. Is there a motion to adjourn?

- I was gonna say just to go to go back to that comment by Julia, can we make that a standing agenda item? Maybe member updates so that, I mean, it should be there, I mean, as part of our, and that's what we're here as a commission to do is to bring up other things as necessary. And I think that's an important item to have on the agenda all the time.

- Okay.

- Figuratively, I second that, but not literally. It's not on the agenda. Cool, all right. Well, is there a motion to adjourn then?

- Motion to adjourn.

- Second by, Martin Mark. All those in favor say aye.

- Aye.

- Happy holidays everybody.

- And Randy, it's not noxious. It's not noxious city council members, it's obnoxious city council members.

- There we go.

- ...what about larger containers like a peanut butter and you put it on the jar?

- And you wanna stop this cause I adjourned.

- Any plastic container that had...