



## Minutes City of Tempe Sustainability Commission September 17, 2018

Minutes of the Tempe Sustainability Commission meeting held on Monday, September 17, 2018, 4:30 p.m., at the Public Works Conference Room, City Hall, 31 E. 5<sup>th</sup> Street, Tempe, Arizona.

**(MEMBERS) Present:**

Corey Hawkey (Chair)  
Kendon Jung (Vice Chair)  
John F. Kane  
Arnim Wiek

Gretchen Reinhardt  
Alix Monty  
Stephanie Milam-Edwards  
Ryan Mores

**(MEMBERS) Absent:**

Anne Gill  
Reyna Olvey  
Laura Medina

**City Staff Present:**

Marilyn DeRosa, Deputy Public Works Director - Engineering  
Braden Kay, Sustainability Manager  
Grace DelMonte Kelly, Energy Management Coordinator  
Craig Hayton, Parks Manager  
Vanessa Spartan, Transportation Planner  
Robert Yabes, Principal Planner  
Shannon Reed, Public Information Officer

**Guests Present:**

Lauren Kuby, Vice-Mayor  
Alexandra Neumann, ASU Student  
Frederiter Schwarz, ASU Student  
Ashley Mack, ASU Student  
Cliff Anderson

Chair Hawkey called the meeting to order at 4:32 p.m.

**Agenda Item 1 – Public Appearance**

Chair Hawkey asked members of the public to introduce themselves. Sustainability Manager Braden Kay said several students here are working with Lauren Withycombe-Keeler in the School of Innovation and Society. Four students are working with us on the climate action plan and helping with the energy forum and the transportation forum we are doing.

### **Agenda Item 2 – Approval of Meeting Minutes**

Chair Hawkey introduced the minutes of the August 20th meeting. Vice-Chair Jung made a motion to approve the minutes.

**Motion:** Vice-Chair Jung

**Second:** Commissioner Kane

**Decision:** Approved 8-0, all present approved

Voted to Approve:

Corey Hawkey (Chair)

Kendon Jung (Vice Chair)

John F. Kane

Arnim Wiek

Gretchen Reinhardt

Alix Monty

Stephanie Milam-Edwards

Ryan Mores

### **Agenda Item 3 – Chair Update**

Chair Hawkey said the purpose of today is to get experience from client departments on how they currently do infrastructure projects and discussed the tool (matrix) that will be used in the discussion of sustainable construction and infrastructure. This will give us a better understanding of what goals to prioritize and what information we need to make better recommendations. I wasn't here last time and it sounds like the commission felt pressure to make a decision on which goals to prioritize in the recommendation to council. If you feel we need more time and want to go through a learning process, we need to tell Marilyn and Braden what we need to give solid recommendations.

### **Agenda Item 4 – Integrated Pest Management**

Parks Manager Craig Hayton presented Integrated Pest Management (IPM). Two years ago, he came to speak to the commission to discuss the city's approach to using compost and organic pesticide in parks. He will review what IPM is, talk about practices in Tempe, review the document, review key pieces, talk about next steps, and ask for feedback. If this is a document you will support, we are looking for feedback.

IPM is a decision-making process in a holistic approach and triple bottom line. We look holistically to understand

- Decision-making process
- Triple-bottom line
- Holistic approach
- IPM program cycle

City of Seattle established an IPM program cycle for employees who are mowing and working in the field. We consider all the options available, make sure we are documenting and evaluating. IPM is a decision-making process each time we deal with pests.

Tempe's pest control overview:

- Field Operations/ Park services – we use organic materials as well as pesticides
- Transportation/Transit – manual removal, in decomposed granite, we use herbicides to address weeds

- Water utilities – wells, use mechanical means, stump treatment, etc.
- Contracts – multiple contracts for lake maintenance / bacteria, fish, mechanical removal of algae, algicide.

Weed zap is an organic herbicide we've been piloting. We have synthetic and non-synthetic. Some of the organics are more dangerous than synthetic.

Diving into the IPM document, we've been practicing IPM for past 20 years. We understand that Parks is not the only one addressing IPM, you have many different field supervisors and contract administrators, this is a pathway to become a green organic program. We are moving away from synthetic herbicides to do something that is more green based.

4 key goals:

1. Central location for tracking everything, documenting what we're doing and who is doing it
2. Research and organic pesticides
3. Identify highest level of usage to determine goals
4. Identify funding sources to impact those goals

There are ten best practices labeled in our document. Some of them include:

1. Identify a person responsible for IPM from a staff perspective
2. What are some areas in city considered limited use pesticide areas, e.g. children play grounds. If we're not using pesticides, or if we do use them when we have bees, ants, what is the process, we need to communicate.
3. Eugene, Oregon has pesticide free park program, neighborhood / community group. Would they like to partner with us?
4. Partnership for example at Kiwanis park at 125 acres, commitments we would make as a partner. Sign a contract thru the adopt a park program.

A commissioner asked where are we applying volume of synthetic herbicide? Craig said we have made a lot of progress, still not able to track how much of this product have we used? By this fall, I hope to have staff try out the software/program and we hope to have it tracking by the beginning of the year.

A commissioner asked if IPM Coordinator exists? Craig said it is currently just him. The next step is working with Shannon to make sure we can coordinate. So far it has been inter-departmental. Once we see what the impacts of this we'll be able to see if it's something we should consider.

A commissioner asked about process. Craig said it could be he and a supervisor on a visit, a weed may cause a sprained ankle, or it could be staff just pulling weed. There are different circumstances in different areas. We will come back yearly to re-visit the document. We are trying to document best practices and outline a path. A commissioner asked if the document incorporated training of staff? Yes, it did. Anyone who is doing pesticide work has to be certified through the state. A commissioner asked about where the documentation will live. Craig said it will be an internal work order system.

Craig said the next steps are: present to the Neighborhood Advisory Commission and the Parks and Recreation Commission. We will take all feedback and comments we received, go back and update document and then meet with staff, so that every level understands this info and then post the document. City of Portland has a fantastic document, City of Santa Fe has strict guidelines, very short. We hope to develop something between the two. Craig asked for input and support.

A commissioner asked are there any stated principles or philosophies behind the document or any strategic goals of council? Craig said yes, they would be a great addition, to align this with strategic goals.

Gretchen recommended integrating water quality goal from council priority. Braden said there will not be a clear goal to address human exposure, some cities have goals to reduce exposure to chemicals. You could support handbook and reduce exposure to humans. You could support a Pesticide-free parks pilot and/ or support the document. You could support one or the other.

Chair Hawkey made a motion to support the IPM document and the pilot program for pesticide free parks. Alex Monty seconded the motion.

Commissioner Wiek said he hears pesticide and he's not comfortable especially with synthetics.

Addendum to previous motion:

Add re-evaluation annually to sustainability commission on a 2-year basis. Continue to evaluate sustainability best practices to integrate into IPM, e.g. air quality, water quality.

**Motion:** Chair Hawkey

**Second:** Commissioner Jung

**Decision:** Approved 8-0, all present approved

Voted to Approve:

Corey Hawkey (Chair)

Kendon Jung (Vice Chair)

John F. Kane

Arnim Wiek

Gretchen Reinhardt

Alix Monty

Stephanie Milam-Edwards

Ryan Mores

### **Agenda Item 5 – North Rail Spur Multi-Use Path Project**

Transportation Planner Vanessa Spartan introduced the North rail spur multi use path project. Vanessa stated she just joined the Transit team in late June and is the lead for the north south spur multi-use path. She is working with Union pacific and ADOT, on north south spur multi-use path, ultimately the all the way up to Tempe Town lake.

Phase 1 will be from University Drive to Baseline Road. The preliminary design has MAG design assistance.

Phase 1 is in design, \$500K in budget and the City received \$2.3 mill from CMAQ. The Phase 2 extension design will begin in 2020.

There is a local match of \$338k. After design, there will be a full review process. The overall goal and intent of project is to be one of the largest bike/pedestrian corridors, 7 miles long and will be integrated as a vital north/south connection, improving safety by providing an alternative route to existing north south corridors.

Along Alameda drive, we have received a lot of comments already and complaints about the proposed bollards. There is an assessment on the north side, will we have to go on street for that segment.

We will:

- Have some adjacent pathways and bike lanes to connect to and will signalize cross areas to create a low stress route
- Introduce nodes and rest areas

- Have way-finding and traffic-calming on Kyrene road
- Address ADA compliance at Alameda, we have constraints high voltage power lines,
- Have some challenges on transitioning from on-street path to off-street

Using Kyrene Road, is a very wide street, we can do a 2-way path. A commissioner said in the first case you talked about buffer zone, but is there a physical buffer? Could you stripe it and put plastic flags or fixed curb, some areas put in driveways? Vanessa said we are looking at options to put in a barrier. Commissioners agreed the barrier is critical. Vanessa said they have received comments on this and they will take it into consideration. They would like to show it as a potential node location.

A commissioner asked if Transit will redo the chicanes? Vanessa said the neighborhood is in favor of the parking. Introducing more traffic calming devices is one way to help. It is on Union Pacific Rail Road property and they have standards including a 6-foot fence. We proposed a 4-foot fence to make it feel more open, we're going to go in with that negotiation in mind.

We have 6 candidate node locations, we have funding for three, we need to determine the highest priorities.

Some of the amenities that would be included are structural shade,

Our candidate locations, Santa Cruz drive, Southern Avenue, Alameda, 17<sup>th</sup> Street, 13<sup>th</sup> Street

How to prioritize area's visibility and how to keep it maintained, neighborhood access.

In some areas, they are constraints and they won't let us do overhead lighting

We'll do other lighting

We have environmental constraints as well as cultural resources to keep in mind.

If we do standard light, we will have to dig deeper, can impact cultural things, we are looking at solar lighting for culturally significant locations.

A commissioner said the Kyrene zone is devoid of landscape and shade. This seems like a great opportunity to do that instead of little man-made shelters.

Our preliminary estimate is to install trees 30-foot on center along corridor.

One challenge is culturally significant areas, we cannot dig, though we are going ahead with that goal.

A commissioner asked that instead of decorative paving, could you put in permeable paving?

Node would be located near major intersecting roadways

Photo of alameda crossing, two graphics are preferred concept and alternative.

SME For trashcans, changes there? We're not making changes.

Public participation process? Vanessa said they have not started the public outreach yet.

Any tree with seeds and fruit, transit is concerned about maintenance of it.

Future considerations:

- Address 30% design comment
- Potential for art integration
- Future Phase 2 – baseline to Knox road
- Cohesion with Alameda drive landscape project
- Public meeting process
- Wednesday, October 3, 5:30 pm culinary dropout
- Saturday, October 13, 9:30 Landings Credit unit
- Online comments Oct 3 – 27
- Looking for public input to better to understand:
- Understanding public priorities for nodes
- Understanding use of the corridor
- How frequently will they end up using it

It will be one of our longest/ low stress routes.

Vanessa can come back and talk to us, we are in deep conversations about 20-minute city  
And the performance measure. We know this route is not going to solve all our 20-minute city

We don't have that data but that's where we're headed

We're going through a baseline assessment, it's going to be a tool, so that allows us how to get a good ROI.

We discussed similar things, baseline assessment. I'm looking for actual usage data. (AW).

Some sort of doc. Strategy for ridership and pedestrian count.

A commissioner asked if at the public meeting do you have a way to get input? Use of survey monkey or phone to give data. Vanessa said we will have paper survey and survey on website.

Laura and her team did dock less bikes and they had lime bike send out link to the forum. We had 400 comments from lime users; depending on who is answering survey, the postcards for these meetings went out today. WE mailed priest to rural the entire length of the pathway. The survey will not be up until October 3.

Bike Tempe has data – report by Tempe bicycle action group.

We use the TBAG counts each year.

We don't necessarily do pre-construction counts.

Vanessa said she presented to the Transportation Commission and to this commission. We have another public meeting process that will occur at 60% review. It will be FY 2020 if it goes to planning phase.

A commissioner asked if this could be a candidate for a pilot project for sustainable construction and infrastructure.? Deputy Public Works Director Marilyn DeRosa said no, it is too early, and we want to give Craig an opportunity to talk about Ehrhardt park. This is a draft, not yet a tool to use.

Commissioners discussed if there is a way to measure a reduction of heat impact by measuring the impact of 25% tree coverage. There is a challenge of asking the designer to estimate the impact and go back and measure. Is there a capacity to ask the designer to collect data?

Braden said the city has official city targets for shade and urban trees but not for storm water capture or extreme heat which we hope to formulate in the next year.

There was discussion on applying the draft sustainable construction and infrastructure tool to this multi-use path project. The tool is not complete, and we would be asking for measurements on a tool that is not complete. Marilyn said there are similar elements for a park project and a transit project. If I'm doing a water line project, what targets do I need to ensure the infrastructure is sustainable? IT is going to be very different than a bus shelter, or a multi-use path or a park.

Maybe we don't talk about water line/ sewer line yet, but we look at above ground project.

Chair Hawkey said Vanessa requested an official recommendation

The commissioners discussed measuring shade, storm water for this project

We're asking her to test this matrix with the resources she has with a consultant.

Transportation will have the ability to push back and report out.

When we go out to pilot this fully, we make sure we're getting.

Commissioner Milam-Edwards made a motion to evaluate Multi-use path spur project with the matrix and report back to the Sustainability Commission what is difficult and what is easy or achievable or non-achievable prior to the 60% design.

Vanessa cautioned that this project is a joint effort with the Union Pacific Railroad. Marilyn said we are trying to enculturate staff to embrace these goals. First thing to identify is what is practical in terms of what we're asking staff to do?

**Motion:** Commissioner Milam-Edwards

**Second:** Chair Hawkey

**Decision:** Approved 8-0, all present approved

Voted to Approve:

Corey Hawkey (Chair)

Kendon Jung (Vice Chair)

John F. Kane

Arnim Wiek

Gretchen Reinhardt

Alix Monty

Stephanie Milam-Edwards

Ryan Mores

### **Agenda Item 6 – Sustainable Construction and Infrastructure**

The first part was discussed in north spur path

Craig Hayton said our goal is to align as many of these projects as we can to maximize benefit and minimize impacts. We spent last 2 years gather data. Another piece that we look at is equity. The Mayor and Council said every park should each have at least:

- Playgrounds
- Equipment
- Tree canopy coverage
- Enhanced amenities

The amount and size is dependent on the size of the park or neighborhood it serves.

Before we add a dog park, or another amenity is enhanced, soccer fields, splash playground, etc.

Craig showed a map of Ehrhardt park and said they just finished the design process. You can see the sustainable elements, improved pedestrian mobility, the park plan is the best way to look at this.

We have a playground with sand and currently not ADA accessible. We will provide ADA access to the playground, it will be:

- Full rubber surface, no sand
- Will meet inclusivity standard
- Every kid regardless of ability can play together
- Pathways, rubber surface, inclusivity index, if there is a pinner, one can sit in it, one could hold on
- Intersecting on access to improve shade
- Within this park, there are few trees, we expect to hit 25 trees per acre at maturity
- There will be a shade structure as part of the playground.
- A Ramada and a shade canopy over playground will add shade
- Friendship village wants to add community garden.
- It is a basin, so we're ensuring that the drainage swale, still maintains a storm retention. From a sustainability standpoint, trees would need less water and can use run off.

- Replace exiting lighting with LED lighting, will look at adding additional lighting in the future.
- Water runs with 25 stations, 360 sprinkler heads; we plan run it at midnight until 8 am, our goal is to narrow it down to 8 hours.
- Using that at our basis, and using master valves and flows, helps with reporting back.
- Low precipitation sprinkler heads
- Drip irrigation on new and existing trees (to ensure it reaches the 25% coverage)

Braden said that Craig just mentioned four technologies to reduce potable water consumption reduction.

Commissioners asked about metrics, ingress/egress from Friendship village into the park, if seniors could access the equipment and if there was public outreach done.

Craig said there is fitness equipment and open space and that there would be public outreach next weekend.

Commissioners requested information and asked if this project could be measured using the matrix tool. Braden said what we want to do is keep working on the matrix, we want to identify and prioritize these strategies, this is a living document. He said Erhardt is at 100% plans. Marilyn said she thought it would be helpful for the commission to understand the process that Craig is going through and that we are not asking for recommendation on this project, we are asking for input from Craig and to give insights into Craig's process when designing parks.

Commissioners said to Craig as you look at this matrix, and you look at your project, you've done these projects before, you can give us advice on sprinklers and drip irrigation, etc. The commissioners said they want to understand from staff's point of view what is a hard target to hit

Marilyn and Braden said that the tree canopy coverage is 25% per acre. Craig and his team have been working on this for five years, they now have a clear target and strategy and know how to reach the target and close the gap. Marilyn and Braden reiterated that Craig gave this park example to show a parks project and transit project and that they are not asking for comments or feedback on the park design. They are intended to show the process.

Chair Hawkey said he could help Braden identify items to come back and talk about how parks can use this or elements of the matrix for upcoming infrastructure projects. Need to identify the gaps

Chair Hawkey made a motion to adjourn at 6:45 p.m.

**Motion:** Chair Hawkey

**Second:** Commissioner Monty

**Decision:** Approved 8-0, all present approved

Voted to Approve:

Corey Hawkey (Chair)

Kendon Jung (Vice Chair)

John F. Kane

Annim Wiek

Gretchen Reinhardt

Alix Monty

Stephanie Milam-Edwards

Ryan Mores

### **Agenda Item 7 – Housekeeping Items**



None.

**Agenda Item 8 – Future Agenda Items:**

None.

A motion was made to adjourn.

**Motion:** Commissioner Kane

**Second:** Commissioner Monty

**Decision:** Approved

The meeting was adjourned at 6:45 pm.

Prepared by: Grace DelMonte Kelly

Reviewed by: Braden Kay