

**Greenhouse Gas Reduction Ad Hoc Working Group  
Meeting Minutes  
February 9, 2022**

A meeting of the Greenhouse Gas Reduction Ad Hoc Working Group was held on Wednesday, February 9, 2022 via Zoom. Chairperson Mary Oppenheim called the meeting to order at 3:00 pm.

Present:

Trustee Mary Oppenheim, Chairperson  
Don Anderson, Sustainability Commission Chairperson  
Camilla Dadey, Go Green Deerfield  
Elaine Jacoby, Village Trustee  
Victoria Street, Executive Director, DBR Chamber of Commerce  
Art Wilde, Go Green Deerfield

Absent:

Bill Mertes, Sustainability Commission

Also Present:

Dan Nakahara, Village Planner  
Robert Phillips, Director of Public Works and Engineering  
Andrew Lichterman, Assistant Village Manager / Director of Community Development  
Clint Case, Building and Code Enforcement Supervisor

Document Approval

Commissioner Wilde moved to approve the minutes from the January 26, 2022 Greenhouse Gas Working Group meeting. Commissioner Dadey seconded the motion. The minutes were approved unanimously.

Public Comment

There were no Public Comments received via Zoom or email or in person.

Business

Discussion of Possible Policies, Programs and Resources –

1. Focus Area: Waste Wrap-Up

Ch. Oppenheim summarized the waste discussion from the last meeting. She noted there was consensus to reduce our waste footprint by two-thirds by 2030. She noted that while the Village is implementing most of SWALCO's recommendations and are ahead of many communities, we see a need to increase both the recycling and composting rate, especially in the commercial sector. We are working to obtain additional information regarding the largest waste producers and a survey of which businesses are recycling, which are not and why. In addition to education

campaigns, we discussed if there are ways to offer stronger financial incentives to encourage businesses to recycle. The group supported the idea of creating a business recycling recognition program and hosting business-to-business recycling and food scrap forums. There was support for providing another round of free compost kits to residents and to include composting at public events such as the farmers market and Harvestfest. There was support for exploring doorhangers as a way to encourage residents to use the compost bin. There was no support for restricting the use of plastic bags or single-use plastic containers at this time. Staff will continue to monitor and evaluate the construction and demolition recycling ordinance as construction codes and standards change overtime.

Ch. Oppenheim asked if there are other items to include in the recap. Commissioner Wilde noted it was a complete summary but suggested that the group revisit the issue of plastic waste since plastic film is a major landfill contributor. He inquired how we could reduce plastic film and suggested that one day we could possibly have a curbside option to manage that waste stream. Commissioner Dadey noted that SWALCO has signed onto the U.S. Plastic Pact. The Pact identifies specific plastic materials such as straws, stirrers, cutlery and other plastic packaging that industry leaders and material manufacturers are working collaboratively to eliminate from production. These efforts help support the circular economy.

In response to a question from last meeting, Mr. Lichterman reported that the waste hauler indicated that grocery stores are the largest waste producers. Additionally, he noted there were questions about the Village's construction and demolition recycling debris ordinance and confirmed that 75% of the construction debris from any structure 1,500 square feet or larger must be diverted from the landfill, per the ordinance. Mr. Case confirmed that the ordinance is comprehensive, effective and adequate.

Mr. Wilde suggested that variable rate pricing or "pay-as-you-throw" is another waste concept that could serve to incentive the correct behavior and financially incentive people to recycle and compost. The idea is to structure the residential and commercial solid waste contracts to economically advantage recycling and composting. Mr. Lichterman noted that setting up the financial incentives to reward recycling and composting is a great concept but that the "pay-as-you-throw" concept may not be the correct path to achieve that outcome. In recent conversations with SWALCO it has been found that that type of program can also lead to increased contamination since users may choose to place refuse into a recycling bin in order to avoid the fee. For that reason, SWALCO no longer pushes that program as strongly as they used to. Mr. Wilde noted that is a great experience to learn from so we should continue to learn from examples from around the country to establish the correct pricing structure and program to incentivize the behavior change that is most sustainable.

Ch. Oppenheim noted there is a need for large education campaign related to the business community. Commissioner Street noted that one of the challenges with the businesses is that the landlord is the manager of the garbage. The tenants may not even know that recycling is available and they don't pay the solid waste cost because it is built into their rent. This requires a lot of education and there are multiple audiences to reach. She noted sometimes it's the cleaning

service that needs to be educated. Commissioner Street noted that the hotels are a whole separate category and often they do not have recycling in the rooms.

Commissioner Dadey reported that grocery stores often donate large amounts of food and use that as a means of diverting waste from the landfill. She also noted that there could be a fee on certain plastic items at grocery stores such as single use plastic bags or produce bags that could easily be replaced with BPI certified compostable bags. Mr. Wilde noted that some municipalities have fees that can be returned back to the business to support the costs associated with transitioning to a more sustainable option. Commissioner Dadey noted the fee is not to punish the retailer; it is to change the behavior of the consumer. Commissioner Anderson noted that if there is a fee on plastic items such as a single-use bag at a grocery store some consumers will drive to a surrounding town to do their shopping to avoid the fee. Ch. Oppenheim noted that ideally this is something we would do in partnership with other communities and this is something we should keep on our list as we investigate the potential partnership with neighboring municipalities.

Mr. Phillips noted the amount of junk he receives in the mail and all the waste that it generates. Commissioner Dadey noted the FTC has a phone number that people can call to opt-out of junk mail.

## 2. Focus Area: Transportation Introduction

Ch. Oppenheim asked Mr. Lichterman to summarize the background information provided in the packet on transportation. Mr. Lichterman summarized the materials noting that transportation accounts for 11% of the overall carbon footprint and that it is suggested try and reduce that by half by 2030 to achieve our overall carbon reduction goal. Additionally, the Village sells approximately 11,000 vehicle stickers annually and about 200 of those vehicles are fully electric. The Village's fleet is roughly 50 vehicles and staff is suggesting a goal of converting 30% of the fleet to electric by 2030 and 90% of the fleet to electric by 2050. The Village would start with converting the administrative vehicles because the technology is not reliable yet to convert heavy equipment or police squad cars to fully electric. Relatedly, the Village would endeavor to install at least one public EV charging station and one or two charging stations for the municipal fleet.

Mr. Nakahara summarized the planning initiatives related to transportation and discussed the Village's efforts to adopt and enforce land-use policies that reduce sprawl, preserve open space, and create compact, walkable urban communities. The Village also has policies that promote transportation options such as bicycle trails, commuter rail and bus service. The Comprehensive Plan also includes a section that specifically promotes all relevant modes of transportation, which results in better planning and development. Mr. Nakahara specifically noted the advantageous associated with creating Planned Unit Developments that increase circulation and allows for developments to be constructed in a way that uses complement each other and so that the site plan can be laid out in the safest and most efficient way to move people and vehicles through the site. The PUD concept allows for shared access, shared working and results in more open space. The Village encourages Transit Oriented Development and we require bike storage in all new residential developments.

Mr. Wilde inquired about how we can incentive walking or biking rather than driving to a location and how we can make those benefits clear. He noted Chicago has enhanced their bike lanes with green paint down the center of the road.

Mr. Nakahara noted that the Village has a plan for the Northwest Quadrant that is designed to increase pedestrian connectivity and welcome people to our town that get off the train. Ch. Oppenheim noted that some of the arterial roadways that you might want to see a bike lane on are not our jurisdiction such as Lake Cook Road, Deerfield Road and Waukegan Road. Mr. Phillips concurred with that observation and noted that we have explored the addition of bike lanes at some of these locations and often the roadways are found not to be wide enough to meet federal standards for incorporating bike lanes.

Mr. Phillips discussed the Village's efforts to connect sidewalks and widen sidewalks and often times neighborhoods do not want the installation of new sidewalks because it can change the character of the neighborhood and cause trees to be removed. Mr. Phillips noted that we have a dedicated sidewalk improvement project in addition to the sidewalks that get reconstructed during capital improvement projects. He noted that over the past 10 years the Village has installed 711,000 square feet of sidewalk at a cost of \$4.2 million. This is equivalent to a 5-foot sidewalk stretching for 5.4 miles.

Mr. Phillips also reviewed various funding sources that are used to assist the Village with intermodal transportation projects and other improvements to mitigate traffic congestion. Some key transportation projects that leveraged federal funds include the construction of the Deerfield Road underpass, reconstruction of Deerfield Road and various traffic signal optimization projects. Mr. Phillips also inquired about the school bus transportation companies and how that service can be made more efficient.

Ch. Oppenheim noted that some of this is policy related but a lot of this is culture based and requires large amounts of education. Commissioner Anderson concurred with that assessment and noted that he observes the Pace buses operating in town are often empty. Mr. Lichterman noted that the Pace bus routes do indeed struggle to meet minimum ridership, particularly the 626 route; however, the shuttle bus that services the corporate campuses has been very successful.

Mr. Wilde believes there are things we can influence related to convenience. For example, giving electric vehicles the best parking spaces in a shopping mall are ways we can signal to the community that we value EVs and that can help change people's behavior. Additionally, Mr. Wilde discussed the vehicle sticker program may be another way to reward the use of EVs. Commissioner Dadey noted that many people are driving gas powered vehicles not because they want to but rather because they cannot afford to purchase an electric vehicle.

Mr. Nakahara suggested that the Village could incentive EV charging stations by amending our Zoning Ordinance to allow the stations to be installed as a permitted use, whereas currently they would require special use approval.

Commissioner Anderson reported that a number of years ago the Sustainability Commission evaluated the installation of EV charging stations but there were equity issues since the Village was going to pay for the station but the Commission found the station was going to be utilized by non-residents. Mr. Anderson also noted that implementing a pricing differential on the vehicle stickers for EV versus gas powered vehicles effectively results in residents subsidizing someone that has purchased a \$100,000 Tesla and that is not good optics. He thinks there are better programs and symbols that we can find to support EVs.

Ch. Oppenheim noted there are many good ideas and initiatives included in the GRC2 plan and asked how we can quantify the data. Mr. Lichterman confirmed that many of the programs such as converting gas powered vehicles to electric vehicles can be measured.

Ch. Oppenheim noted that we will capture these ideas on the working document and that we will begin discussing the ecosystem focus area at the next meeting.

#### Public Comment

Mr. Lichterman read an email submitted by George McClintick. Mr. McClintick's email discussed the C-Pace program which offers Lake County commercial property owners clean energy financing programs and resources. It was noted that Lake County will be hosting a webinar about the program on February 13.

Mr. Lichterman noted that the Village would promote the upcoming webinar in our e-newsletter.

#### Adjournment

There being no further business or discussion, Trustee Wilde moved to adjourn the meeting. Commissioner Dadey seconded the motion. The motion was approved unanimously.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:51 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Andrew Lichterman

Assistant Village Manager / Director of Community Development