Meeting Minutes

City of Ypsilanti
Sustainability Commission
Regular Meeting
City Council Chambers
1 S Huron St.
Ypsilanti, MI 48197
Monday, December 4, 2017, 7:00 P.M.

I. CALL TO ORDER: 7:03pm

II. ROLL CALL:

Sustainability Commission:

Commissioner Emily Drennen	Present
Commissioner Nancy Heine	Present
Commissioner Natalie Sampson	Present
Commissioner Thomas McKee	Present
Commissioner Brett Zeuner	Present
Commissioner Julia Bayha	Absent
Commissioner Keith Michalowski	Present
Commissioner Thomas Kovacs	Present

Staff:

Council Member Beth Bashert	Present
City Manager Darwin McClary	Present
Commission Secretary Seth Torkelson-Regan	Present

III. CONSENT OF AGENDA

A. Approval of Agenda

Drennen (second Zeuner) moved to approve the agenda. Unanimous approval. Motion carries.

B. Approval of Minutes

Zeuner (second McKee) moved to postpone approval of minutes for the November meeting until January meeting, after amendments have been made. Unanimous approval. Motion carries.

IV. AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION/COMMISSION RESPONSE:

Erica Mooney, Ypsilanti: Thanked commission for their work. Advocated for the SC to be cohesive with the work of other commissions. Voiced support for citizen committee on

affordability and accessibility and updates to Master Plan. Stated she will continue to support a sustainability action plan. Stated the CBO process is confusing regarding public participation and understanding. Wants the ideal recommendations for the sustainability action plan from the SC shared sooner than later.

Amber Fellows, Ypsilanti: Stated her support of the resolution passed to City Council (discussed in the previous meeting). Stated that she would like the City Manager's statement regarding why the resolution was not recommended to Council to be placed into the previous meeting's minutes.

V. PROCLAMATIONS AND PRESENTATIONS

A. Recycling presentation - April Baranek, Washtenaw County Energy Coordinator, Office of Infrastructure Management

[Below are the main points of the presentation. The full PowerPoint can be found on pages 14-29 of the Sustainability Commission agenda packet from the December 12th meeting, posted on the Sustainability Commission's page of the Ypsilanti city website.]

- Purpose of the presentation was to discuss the recycling program implemented by Washtenaw County
- Washtenaw CO has approximately 1200 employees, generating roughly 4800 pounds of trash each day.
- Benefits of recycling include: energy and resource saving, reduction of consumption and pollution, and job creation.
- Suggestions for how to implement smarter recycling programs: 1) waste audit; 2) purchasing policy that is environmentally friendly; 3) change the waste culture in the building; 4) communicate "why"; 5) work with your vendor; 6) standardize collection receptacles, centralize bin location, and eliminate desk-side bins
- Identify "single stream" recycling from bins that take other non-single stream recyclables
- Look for ways to reduce trash, including: avoid disposable items; purchase products with minimal packaging; and donate or sell used or unwanted items
- Recycle Ann Arbor is located at 2950 East Ellsworth, Ann Arbor. There are other recycling drop off locations in western Ann Arbor

Heine: Asked if county subscribes to consumer rate, instead of DTE rate, for natural gas.

Baranek: Responded that Michigan is one of few states that has a choice natural gas program. You have to buy gas through a choice provider if you want to get on a transportation program, such as a contiguous campus, like hers. Because of this, her department pays a cheaper rate. However, such programs are not regulated by the Michigan Public Service Program, meaning they can change the rates more frequently and drastically. If you get into a program like that, you definitely want to lock in gas rates. Her department has saved over $8600 in cash through this program.

Zeuner: Asked what is the closest recycling drop off to Ypsilanti.

Baranek: Responded Recycle Ann Arbor off of Ellsworth.

Zeuner: Asked why most of the recycling centers are on the west side of Ann Arbor.

Baranek: Responded that she is not sure why they are all located west of Ann Arbor. She manages the 415 W Michigan, which has recycle pick up.

Zeuner: Stated that another commissioner frequently advocates for recycling programs for multi-unit apartment buildings. He is curious about opportunities for residents in such buildings.

Michalowski: Added that Ypsilanti does have a recycling drop off near the park.

Baranek: Responded to Zeuner that the first step is auditing how much material is coming in so that one can understand what type of human effort is needed to move all the material.

Michalowski: Asked Baranek to provide contact information about her current recycling provider.

Baranek: Responded that their current recycling provider is Waste Management. Stated there are four or five different recycling services in the area, including Viola, Republic Services, Advanced Waste, and Waste Management.

Heine: Stated Ypsilanti uses Waste Management.

Baranek: Advised separating and labeling bins very clearly so that waste is not contaminated and recycling material is not lost.

VI. ACTIVE BUSINESS

A. Sustainability plan subcommittee update

Kovacs: Stated that the committee met on November 20 and discussed the STAR rating system and what it will bring to the commission at a later time. The next subcommittee meeting is on Monday, December 18 at the downtown Ypsilanti library.

B. MGC plan subcommittee update

McKee: Stated the committee is in a holding pattern. They are waiting for the 2018 application challenge to go live. The commission is waiting to see if the metrics stay the same as the 2017 metrics. McKee has begun to organize the divisions of labor to track the measurements for the challenge. The spreadsheet is divided into three major categories of energy, resource management and transportation. The committee has spoken with some members of the community regarding research. No next meeting is planned.

Michalowski: Asked if someone could reach out to the MGC to ask for when the 2018 metrics will be released.

McKee: Responded that he will do that.

C. Outreach subcommittee update

Michalowski: Has begun streaming events and meetings through Facebook live. Hopes to expand streaming beyond meetings to include business showcasing and activities in the town. He is considering reaching out to a group of people he has collected who want to create a more concerted plan for outreach efforts. Anyone interested in helping should let him know.

D. Peninsular Dam update (Council Member Bashert)

McClary: Stated he has worked with the Huron River Watershed Council and the Friends of Pen Park regarding the scope of the project, to make sure neighboring property owners are comfortable. Believes all have come to agreement regarding the scope of the study, and this will be discussed at the City Council meeting on December 5. The Friends of Pen Park has committed to contributing to the cost of the study. Princeton Hydro will be performing the study work, under contract with HRWC. He anticipates the study will be completed in the spring. Once completed, the study will be reviewed by City Council, who will also review the 2014 dam restoration study. The Council will determine which option is best for the community--dam restoration or dam removal. The city does need to come up with a plan as soon as possible for the DEQ. A report was supposed to be made last February, but the city is moving forward.

Kovacs: Asked how the SC may participate in this process.

McClary: Responded that he will share the deliverables from the study along the way with the SC. The working group will consist of a representative from Friends of Pen Park, the executive director of the HRWC, McClary, and one representative each from Ypsilanti and Superior Townships.

Kovacs: Asked how the SC should request such deliverables.

McClary: Responded that no request is needed.

Zeuner: Asked if there is anything the SC can do if Council approves the beginning of the study tomorrow.

McClary: Responded that some of the fieldwork will not be completed till the spring. Encouraged commissioners to read the packet describing the scope of work in the study, which are available on the city website. There is also a project schedule in that packet.

Zeuner: Stated that he would rather discuss in the January meeting the schedule for the study.

Bashert: Reminded the commission that the study will be weather dependent.

Zeuner: Added that he would like to read over the study outline before making any motions or having any discussions on it.

Michalowski: Stated he will add a discussion on this item for next meeting.

Zeuner moved (second Kovacs) to add a discussion to the next meeting agenda regarding the dam study. Unanimous approval. Motion carries.

E. Bike share update (Commissioner Kovacs)

Kovacs: Stated at the bike demo that LimeBike's bicycles were a bit small. The university has made no decisions beyond the demoing. He has had no conversations with the city. EMU is proceeding with the bike share program.

Bashert: Asked McClary if the city is a part of this conversation.

McClary: Responded that he understood EMU to be spearheading this project and he is not aware if his staff has talked with EMU about anything beyond the demo. He does not know if the assumption is that the Sustainability Commission will be leading the city's participation in the project because his understanding is that the city will not be a contracting partner.

Bashert: Stated that she thinks it is relevant to the Commission that it works to make the bike share program city wide, and not simply by EMU.

Zeuner: Suggested making a subcommittee to work on the bike share program.

Bashert: Asked if it is the goal of the commission to pursue a city-wide bike share program.

Michalowski: Asked the commission if there is a motion to pursue such a program.

Zeuner: Stated he would motion if one of the bike share programs does not require a smartphone to participate.

Zeuner (second Drennen) moved to have the Sustainability Commission engage in further discussion with EMU regarding the bike share program and to push make it a city-wide program.

McKee: Asked if any research has been done to show whether the city has the geographic density to support such a program. Stated he is hesitant because of this.

Kovacs: Responded that he has been confused as to how the city would be part of the bike share process alongside EMU. It is not clear to him whether any such thing needs to be done by the city. Suspects the staff needs to be more involved than the Commission. Responding to McKee, stated the bikeshare program is free, so there is little to no risk or cost to the city. The company has incentive to put bikes where people will use them. The only thing is liability, but he believes the company bears all liability.

Zeuner: Added that the city could do an Memorandum of Understanding with EMU to show support for the program. It would be more symbolic support for the program.

Michalowski: Stated his understanding is that bikes can be taken anywhere riders want. His suggestion is that if the city be involved, there should be bike locations around the city so that city-wide participation is encouraged. Asked Darwin how the Commission can get the city participating in this bike share.

McClary: Responded that it depends on what the Commission wants. The city needs to make sure its ordinances support and do not go against the program. He would prefer the city not get involved with an MOU. The city's role would also be monitoring the program, making sure there are no issues with where bikes are left, how they're managed properly, etc. It all depends on the nature of the program.

Bashert: To Kovacs, stated it is not fair nor ethical to ask him to represent the SC when it discussion with EMU on this topic. Stated that, from her understanding, the perception at EMU is that the city has no interest in it. This topic may be more relevant to the Non-motorized Transportation Commission.

Michalowski: Added that the Non-motorized Transportation Commission is meeting soon to discuss their goals for this next year.

Zeuner: Stated that if the Non-motorized Commission takes this up, the Sustainability Commission can still work on this as support.

Bashert: Stated that either EMU will decide all of this, or the Commission needs to have a seat at the deciding table.

McClary: Asked who started the discussions with EMU about the bike share program.

Kovacs: Responded that EMU was interested in a dock program, but they could not afford one. Kovacs proposed a dockless program, which then led to he and former Commissioner Vanlandingham researching other options. All EMU is considering are dockless bike share programs. He has a seat at the table during these discussions at EMU.

McClary: Stated his surprise that EMU feels the city has no interest in the program.

Kovacs: Added that he is also surprised by that statement. He is not sure how the EMU organizing person is interfacing with the city. He is not sure what the city's role is in this process.

Zeuner: Suggested the Commission follow up with EMU people who went to the bike share demo, as well as with other city commissions and staff who are working on this topic.

Michalowski: Stated it appears the city has left the responsibility to EMU to make the decisions on the bike share program.

Sampson: Asked Kovacs if anyone from the Commission could participate in the conversations with EMU.

Kovacs: Responded that he would invite anyone to the table.

Bashert: Shared an example of why the city should be involved: Student A goes downtown for two hours of classes. Another person takes the bike home, but it was the only bike there, so Student A is now stranded. If there is no city participation, the program will be less effective because the company will have less understanding of the potential usage.

Kovacs: Stated that the bike share companies are for-profit companies, so they have incentive in making bikes as available as they are demanded. Stated his intention in working on this program with EMU has been to include the city to connect the university and city more effectively.

Zeuner: Asked if the Commission should postpone this discussion until after Commissioners have participated in more discussion with the university.

Michalowski: Responded that the Commission can discuss the topic more after the January meeting with the EMU representatives.

[Repeating the previous motion]: **Zeuner (second Drennen) moved to have the Sustainability Commission engage in further discussion with EMU regarding the bike share program with the goal of making it a city-wide program. Unanimous approval. Motion carries.**

F. Special Joint Meeting with Planning Commission and Human Relations Commission update

Zeuner: Stated he felt the meeting was a good starting point. His takeaways were: 1) the master plan needs to be updated and there is concessis across commissions for the need to address affordability and accessibility. The idea of citizen action committee was well received by most of the three commissions.

Kovacs: Stated the discussion was positive and well received.

Zeuner: Stated that he thinks joint meetings will be valuable in the future.

Michalowski: Stated his takeaways are 1) the citizen committee will focus on affordable and accessible housing in the master plan; 2) only the Planning Commission can update the Master Plan; 3) local concerns in quality standards in housing (mold, radon, heat ducts); and 4) and the PC expects to have a charter developed for the next PC meeting. It would be good for SC members to attend the meeting in order to follow up with this charter.

Heine: Asked what is the correlation between the SC, HRC and PC.

Michalowski: Responded that the joint meeting was established by the PC to discuss affordability and accessibility in housing, and they were informed that the SC and HRC would be interested.

Sampson: Asked if there is a timeline for the Master Plan update.

Michalowski: Responded that they have to review it next year (2018), so they plan to do a focused update in 2018 in regards to affordability and accessibility, and then do a broader review the following year (2019).

McClary: Reminded the Commission that an important part of its definition of sustainability is social equity, and this is the connection to the HRC. Other issues including economic equity and environmental justice are areas in which the Commission needs to work closely with the PC to create congruent language for the Master Plan.

Kovacs: Stated that he thinks this is why transportation is an essential component of sustainability.

McKee: Stated he was also troubled by how accessibility and affordability were discussed at the joint meeting, but he believes that it is necessary for this Commission to make sure other forms of accessibility are considered in the citizen committee's work.

G. New member / youth member update

Michalowski: Stated that the Commission needs a new member. Asked wh

Bashert: Stated the mayor nominates and the Council approves commissioners.

Zeuner: Asked if previous applications are being considered for the position.

Bashert: Responded yes. She has also received applications from a youth member.

Michalowski: The Commission has two spots available, and other commission have openings as well.

Sampson: Asked if there is the online application process and any other promotional materials.

Michalowski: Responded yes.

Kovacs: Asked if the quorum for the Commission is four now that one commissioner has left.

McClary: Responded that it is five--a majority.

H. YCS Recommendations of sustainable development update

Michalowski: Stated he hoped to deal with one or two of the feedback bullet points this meeting.

Kovacs: Stated that from reviewing the feedback only briefly, he understands more clearly that he has a lot to learn about the process of creating a sustainable development plan. Stated that he thinks the recommendations should be discussed later after having more time to view them.

Bashert: Stated that the Commission should not feel about about the feedback on their recommendations. Suggested the Commission dig deeply into the feedback, because much of it is positive and helpful.

Sampson: Stated that she affirms the need for digging deeply into the feedback. Added that the climate action plan needs to come up in the Commission's meetings more.

Zeuner: Reminded that Commission that the context in which the recommendations were given was the potential development of International Village, and so the recommendations were a bit rushed.

Zeuner (second Kovacs) moved to discuss this business at the January 8th meeting.
Michalowski: Suggested choosing a few pieces of the feedback to discuss in the January meeting.

Bashert: Suggested the chair choose the parts to place on the agenda for January.

[Repeating earlier motion]: **Zeuner (second Kovacs) moved to discuss this business at the January 8th meeting. Unanimous. Motion approved.**

Heine: Stated she has a meeting with Beth Ernadt to discuss recycling.

Sampson: Asked if someone could contact Julia Bayha about recycling updates.

VII. NEW BUSINESS

A. Sustainability Commission schedule for 2018

Michalowski: Stated that he proposed the Commission change its meeting dates to the second Mondays of each month.

Heine: Suggested it would be better to do 7-9pm.

Heine (second McKee) moved to change commission meetings to second Monday of each month in 2018 and to officially extend meeting times to 7-9 pm. Unanimous approval. Motion approved.

B. STAR presentation and resolution discussion (Drennen)

[Below are the main points of the presentation. The full PowerPoint can be found on the Sustainability Commission agenda packet from the December 12th meeting, posted on the Sustainability Commission's page of the Ypsilanti city website.]

- STAR Communities is a 501(c)(3) nonprofit organization that works to evaluate, improve, and certify sustainable communities. It is the nation's leading comprehensive framework and certification program for measuring local sustainability. STAR was built by and for local governments.
- Ann Arbor went through the STAR Communities rating process and received a 4 star rating.
- The framework of the Rating System includes: 7 *sustainability goal areas* supported by 44 objectives
- The sustainability plan subcommittee would like to take these goal areas and objectives and make them into a Sustainability Framework. The hope is that it would get adopted into the Master Plan during the update next year.
- Main path to working with STAR is to pursue certification, which the committee does NOT recommend for Ypsilanti because of cost and the cumbersome process involved.
- Another option is to report on 21 leading indicators, which the subcommittee recommends Ypsilanti and this Commission begin with.
- Completing the leading indicators for a few years could be a good prerequisite before pursuing full certification.
- Reporting the leading indicators and eventually pursuing certification would fulfill the Commission's mandate for a sustainability plan.
- There is an included Technical Guide to the rating system.
- Full access to the STAR system costs $1000 annually, and this includes access to the technical guide I just talked about, the Leading Indicators project, valuable methodology and technical guidance manuals, resources for communicating sustainability progress, and tools to support data collection and reporting. It would also entitle us to technical assistance and training from STAR staff.
- The sustainability plan subcommittee recommends the city purchase the full access package.

- The subcommittee drafted a resolution to be considered by City Council.

Drennen (second Kovacs) moved to approve the following resolution to City Council:

"Whereas City Council charged the Sustainability Commission with the task of developing a Sustainability Plan for the City of Ypsilanti; and whereas the STAR Community Rating System is the nation's leading comprehensive framework and certification program for measuring local sustainability; and whereas the Sustainability Commission and city staff can use the STAR Community Rating System to measure and report on Leading Indicators and perhaps eventually pursue STAR certification which would meet the Commission's mandate for developing a Sustainability Plan; therefore be it resolved, that the Sustainability Commission urges the Ypsilanti City Council to allocate $1,000 annually to pay for a full subscription to the STAR Communities Rating System."

Kovacs: Stated that he thinks using a STAR program will be important for avoiding getting set back by the Commission's lack of knowledge of state laws.

McKee: Stated his concern is that there will be a trade off for the efficiency of the STAR system in that the system loses the local knowledge and specifics of Ypsilanti.

Drennen: Responded to McKee that the STAR system requires specificity and local knowledge in different ways and that it is built into the rating framework.

Zeuner: Added to Drennen's statement that an example of a specific of specificity might be that the SC is working with the DEQ around the developments at Bell Kramer.

McKee: Asked Drennen how the logical knowledge is incorporated into the framework.

Drennen: Responded that the framework piece is not entirely known yet, but the idea come up with so far is that the seven categories of the STAR system would make up the Sustainability Plan framework as well.

Kovacs: Added that the Commission has six months to create the framework, so the Commission can add local specificity in that time to the framework.

Zeuner: Stated he thinks there will be opportunities for collaboration between the STAR system and the MGC Challenge program.

Michalowski: Asked if the technical assistance will review information submitted to them and give recommendations.

Drennen: Responded that she is not sure if that happens for the leading indicators track. The leading indicators are designed so that small communities like Ypsilanti can still engage with the rating system without paying too much.

Michalowski: Asked if Drennen thinks engaging in the system is more valuable and worthwhile compared to simply using the free materials.

Drennen: Responded that the subcommittee thinks doing the full access package will help the Commission gain experience in how to evaluate and quantify its sustainability metrics.

Michalowski: Asked Bashert and McClary if the language of the draft resolution is appropriate.

McClary and Bashert: Responded that it is appropriate.

Sampson: Suggested to the Commission to think of a strategy of how working the STAR program could be updated regularly in order to spread the workload between current and future Commissioners and staff.

Zeuner: Responded to Sampson that this topic was discussed by the sustainability plan subcommittee.

Sampson: Asked if other commissions would buy into this, and might possibly track one or more leading indicators.

Zeuner: Responded that he thinks HRC could track indicators relating to civil and human rights. He thinks this could be a cross-commission tool.

Kovacs: Stated the subcommittee suggested engaging external networks to aid in this process, similar to the citizens' committee. This could include networks of groups and individual citizens.

McClary: Stated that it is important to remember that the staff is very limited. The city staff is very stressed and stretched compared to a decade ago. However, he stated that the city can offer resources and connections with other consultants as assistance to the Commission.

Bashert: Added that staff may help, but it will be on a case by case basis.

McClary: Stated that the Commission is proceeding with this process in the right way. As the Commission understands the future work in the process, his staff will be able to assist or allocate resources to aid in that process.

Kovacs: Asked if the Commission could begin the program at the time of their choosing if the Council approved the $1000 cost of a annual subscription.

McClary: Responded that the Commission will have until June 30th to decide yes or no to obtain the annual subscription, otherwise that $1000 lapses on June 30th. In that case, the money could be approved for the following budget. Council will continue supporting the annual subscription as long as they and the Commission believes it continues to be beneficial and important.

[Repeating original motion]: **Drennen (second Kovacs) moved to approve the previously stated resolution to City Council. Unanimous approval. Motion approved**

Drennen: Asked McClary if Council would need anything from the Commission to help them understand the proposed resolution.

McClary: Suggested the subcommittee give a short presentation at the Council.

Kovacs: Stated that he would like to present at the beginning of the Council's meeting and not at the end.

McClary: Responded that the subcommittee could be placed at the beginning of the Council meeting agenda.

Drennen: Asked if 3-5 minutes is appropriate for the presentation.

McClary: Responded yes.

C. Sun Shot Challenge grant (Council Member Bashert)

Bashert: Stated that Dave has identified fifty of the best rooftop. Suggested that the SC do the following: 1) request a list of the fifty locations 2) distribute the locations among the Commission 3) anyone with knowledge of the owners of the fifty locations contact the owners directly and encourage them to support Dave's goal. Regardless of whether the city gets the Solar Sun Shot Challenge grant, the city is nationally recognized. Dave is aware of what it takes to get Ypsilanti to win the grant.

Michalowski: Asked Drennen to contact Dave and ask him to share information with the Commission.

Zeuner: Asked Bashert for the deadline for the Sun Shot Challenge grant.

Bashert: Responded she is not sure at the moment. Added that there are two goals: 1) The grant, and 2) the fifty solar roofs.

Zeuner: Asked if the Sun Shot Challenge Grant subsidizes the fifty solar roofs, or vice versa.

Bashert: Responded she is not sure, but that is a good question for Dave.

Sampson: Stated a page in the agenda packet describes the Sun Shot Challenge Grant.

Kovacs: Stated he was part of the grant. It was a DOE grant that would offer a pot of money to a few groups who would compete for the bigger pot, a million dollars. Ypsilanti is still able to compete for the million dollar prize, but we do not get the sixty thousand dollar prize to help us reach the million dollar prize. Suggested that the Commission hire an intern from EMU to work on this project.

Bashert: Stated that utilizing personal connections to contact people who own the fifty roofs being targeted is more effective than hiring a stranger or intern to do so.

D. Bell-Kramer update (Manager McClary)

McClary: Stated that he does not know the details of the history of the Bell Kramer neighborhood. The PC petitioned the rezoning of the Bell-Kramer neighborhood two years ago. The City had rezoned the area to PRD because the City was concerned about the potential for contamination of the area from adjacent land that was a former industrial zone. The residents in Bell-Kramer were upset--many have lived there a long time or are children of original residents in the neighborhood. The rezoning could cause problems for residents being able to make new mortgages, being able to sell properties, and new purchase being able to get mortgages on their properties, as well as some of the properties being developed for residential use. The city is determining what environment impacts may have occurred through multiple tests, including soil, gas, and air quality testing. There were eight initial test locations in June. The DEQ suggested the city do tests quarterly over a year period. The first round of testing did not indicate any concentrations of target parameters of DEQ screening levels. The second round of testing was done in November, and two more will follow in the next six months. The PC has looked at making further changes to zoning of the neighborhood, because the city is sensitive to the emotional connections citizens in the neighborhood have to the area.

Zeuner: Stated that in the 2011 Needs Assessment for the South Side Neighborhood, the mayor at the time and others stated that they would rezone Bell Kramer if a development was proposed. DTE was the one who sounded the alarm about gas underground because they said it would be a development liability. There were plans in 2011 in the Needs Assessment for redevelopment. He feels it should have been kept residential while it was being figured out. He would be happy to share the 2011 Needs Assessment with commissioners.

Bashert: Responded that no development project has been planned for that area.

Zeuner: Responded to Bashert that from his perspective the neighborhood should be kept residential. He is glad to hear the PC is moving back to residential.

McClary: Stated that the city needs to do a better job at engaging residents in decision making process, making sure they understand the history behind communities, and the emotional connections people have to their neighborhoods.

VIII. AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION/COMMISSION RESPONSE - none

IX. PROPOSED BUSINESS

Zeuner: Stated that the recycling meeting is on December 11, so there should be follow up on that meeting. Should also be a follow up on the PC meeting, and on the topics of the bike share program, dam, and sustainability plan.

X. NEXT MEETING DATE: January 8, 2018

XI. ADJOURNMENT: 9:46pm

Kovacs (second Zeuner) moved to adjourn the meeting. Unanimous approval. Motion carries.