1. Call to Order.

The meeting was called to order at 6:35 p.m. by Trustee Sharon Sweas.

2. Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag.

3. Roll Call.

Members present were Co-Chair Trustee Sharon Sweas, Margaret Sabo, Cynthia Rataj, Randy Juras, Joe Turrise, Nancy Carlson, and Staff Member Melissa King.

John Lobick - Advisor was also in attendance

Absent: Co-Chair Trustee Ruben Pazmino, Andy Panelli, Bob Moses, Gary White and Cathy Rehr - Advisor

4. Approval of Amendments to the Agenda.

No amendments were made.

5. Minutes.

a) January 7, 2020

Member Rataj made a motion to approve the minutes from the January 7, 2020 meeting; Member Turrise seconded the motion. No Discussion. The motion passed unanimously. The meeting minutes were approved.

6. Public Comment.

No public comments were made.

7. Old Business.

a) A reminder about the comprehensive plan update workshop on the Sub-Areas.

b) Dark Sky Commercial Lighting Brochure

Staff presented a mockup of the brochure and requested comments or suggestions from members. There was general consensus to send to all brick and mortar business, approximately 300, and to commercial/industrial property owners of developed property and also property managers.

- Members want to add “Don’t make an expensive mistake”, maybe add it to the bullet list after Call the building department....maybe do it in a separate section with a font that pops.
- Probably more affordable to have it printed out of house.
- Address on flip-side; at top or in the middle of the postcard
- No return address required, need to verify

c) Landscape Code, Design Guidelines Draft (Savoy Consultants)
Landscape Code Guidelines
Staff introduced the item for discussion. Explained that the guidelines will help the Board of Trustees with policy direction for the drafting and the adoption of a new landscape code. Members discussed the concern for adopting a code that would make existing single family homes upgrade their own property, staff indicated that this is typically not something that is required. Savoy did specifically ask whether or not the Village would want to support adding more regulations for landscaping on lots within in a subdivision. Members had the following comments:

- Be very clear about applicability of landscape code
- Basic regulations for lots, number of trees per lot required at development
- Maybe introduce requirements at an entrance
- Maybe set minimums a little above what we actually want
- Canopy tree size, maybe recommend 3” instead of 2 1/2”? Member Turrise mentioned that the arborist Roger Ross indicated that trees larger than 2 1/2” become difficult to establish
- Research to make sure what size is typically available from the nursery so that we aren’t specifying trees that aren’t available
- Transition buffer yards; members were not supportive of the reduction of plant material if a fence/wall was incorporated
- Addition of buffer zones adjacent to right of ways; can be called corridor zones
- Include list of approved trees and prohibited list
- Increase measures of diversity; evergreen deciduous; native percent; and percent of same species/variety of species
- Would like to introduce groupings of trees and plantings along corridors/roadways, in addition to the normal parkway plantings
- General support of naturalized pond plantings/BMP’s
- Would prefer to have wet ponds versus dry
- Want to make sure that a good amount of landscape is provided around signage

Tree Preservation Ordinance Review
- Building activity area replacing disturbance zones is an important change; concerns about this allowing “flexibility” for the developer
- Concern about quantifying mitigation based on tree stumps maybe this should say “based on tree survey or in lieu of a tree survey; village staff may estimate based on stump size or other method”; this needs to be researched. Members discussed have a tree permit through the Village.
- Would it be possible to have comments right on the red-lined version; so it’s easier to compare?

4) Lighting Upgrades – ComEd Energy Efficiency Program Update

Summary of Discussion
- Members discussed and were in general agreement that the code section (C. and D.) is confusing and needs to be clarified.
- Dark Sky Partners has indicated they would look at amendments to their final report to include recommendations for LED’s. Members discussed that they did want Dark Sky Partners, LLC to update the Final Report and amended
ordnance. They did not specifically state whether they wanted to send the 2017 draft to the Board, but once we get the final report and amended ordinance we could ask them at that point if we should send it.

- Member Sabo indicated that Dark Sky Partners, LLC did state that the PC Amber was the most equivalent specification.
- With regard to street lighting, all the members agreed that based on the initial review and recommendation by Dark Sky Partners, LLC that the 2200K LED/PC Amber would be the closest equivalent to an HPS lamp equivalent.
- Members discussed whether they would be ok with 3,000K on private property, such as parking lots, but there was consensus among all members that the 2200K LED/PC Amber should be the requirement for all lighting not just for street lighting.
- Members were in agreement with the 2200K white LED test streetlight; and ok with the location of those test streetlights, one along the ring road and one in Cedar Brooke, preferably next to the one existing flat lens.
- Members gave feedback on the 3,000K Cyclone lights along the ring road which included: quite bright, better than some but violated code, not warm, should replace the fixtures.

There were numerous iterations of the motion, but the intent by the committee based on the conversation was very clearly 2200K white LED or a 2200K PC Amber LED whichever dark Sky Partners, LLC recommends in their report and that this would apply to street lighting and all other lighting in all lighting zones.

Member Rataj made a motion to recommend the 2200K White LED or the PC Amber LED dependent upon the recommendations of Dark Sky Partners, LLC for all lighting zones, including street lighting; Member Juras seconded the motion. No Discussion. The motion passed unanimously. The meeting minutes were approved.


a. Environment Budget, Discussion Only
   - Budget for Earth Day Event, $4,200
   - Increase to tree planting budget, from $1,400
   - Increases to the star gazing events

b. 2020 Environment Committee Events and Activities
   - **Stargazing, May 29 and September 25**
     Co-Chair Sweas indicated that we could use the train from Konow’s to bring people back and forth between the indoor activity and the stargazing area.

   - **Earth Day 2020, 50th Anniversary**
     Staff gave a brief overview of ideas for Earth Day Event
     ➢ April 25th, 10am-2pm
     ➢ Kite Making Kits/Kite Demonstration
     ➢ Planting Seeds/Make and Take
     ➢ Environment Info on Table
     ➢ Food Truck/Healthy, 1 or 2
➤ Tree Saplings
➤ Library Craft Fair
➤ Do we want an animal person?
➤ Who will volunteer?

Members were concerned that this event was going to be too big like the last Earth Day event; will need staff assistance day of and also for publicity. The EC members talked about having a table. (Member Sabo has some ideas about lighting to include at the table as a handout; losing the light and also about the blue light that we are exposed to from our computers). There was consensus among the members that we should order the free trees and if we are unable to get those we can purchase the seedlings. Member Turrise mentioned that there were a lot of leftover saplings; so we should have a back-up plan for where to plant any that are left.

Member Carson made a motion to obtain the 200 free saplings for the Earth Day Event; Member Rataj seconded the motion. No Discussion. The motion passed unanimously.

c. Will/South Cook Soil & Water Conservation District Donation
   Event is February 29th, 2020. Members discussed $100 for a donation or a table, or just send committee members?

Member Sabo made a motion for the Environment Committee to use a $100 from their budget as a donation to the Will/South Cook Soil & Water Conservation District Donation; Member Turrise seconded the motion. No Discussion. The motion passed unanimously.

9. Announcements/Committee Member Communication

Co-Chair Sweas brought the old newsletter and requested feedback from the Committee on what to include in the Spring newsletter.

Member Turrise discussed the no plastic bag effort in Evanston.

10. Adjournment.

Motion to adjourn made by Member Rataj; seconded by Member Turrise. Motion carried. The meeting was adjourned at 9:57 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted:

Melissa W. King
Senior Planner/Project Manager