

Meeting Notes
Community Involvement Advisory Council
February 12, 2008

Members Present: Dr. Bruce Allison, Robert Frederick, Dr. Jay Julis, Pamela Meitner, William E. Pelham, Donald B. Scholfield, Marvin Thomas
Seven Members present, quorum is met

Members Not Present: Janice A. Durham, Dr. Bethany Hall-Long, La Vaida Owens-White, Harold Truxon

Non Members Present: James Brunswick, Vicki Ward, Philip Thayer, Eric Dressler, Christina Wertz

I. Meeting Called to Order

Chairperson Bill Pelham welcomed the group and called the meeting to order.

II. Meeting Protocol Review

Bill drew the attention of the group to the back of their name cards where the mission of the Community Involvement Advisory Council is printed and reminded the group of the Council's purpose.

III. Approval of Meeting Notes
November 20, 2007
December 11, 2007

The meeting notes of the November 20, 2007 meeting were reviewed. Bob Frederick motioned and Jay Julis second the motion to approve the November 20, 2007 meeting notes. With no discussion, all approved and the motion carried.

Reviewing the December 11, 2007 meeting notes, Pam Meitner noted the typographical error on page one which had the name Jan twice. With the correction to the December 11th meeting notes, Pam motioned and Marvin second the approval of the notes. All were in favor, the motion carried.

IV. CIAC Meeting Schedule

- **November 11, 2008 meeting in place of December meeting.**
- **Larger location for June 10**
- **Attorney General Opinion on "Electronic Meetings"**

The Council reviewed the proposed 2008 meeting dates as found on the December 11 meeting notes on page two. There was a proposal to move the December meeting to November due to the difficulty of meeting around the holidays. Council agreed to eliminate the December meeting and instead hold a November meeting in its place. The November meeting would be on November 11, 2008 at the Smyrna Rest Area from 9:30 to 11:30.

It was also agreed a larger location would be sought for the June 10, 2008 meeting and the October 14, 2008 meetings. A larger location is preferred on these dates as they are scheduled to be CEPF Grant Project review dates and tend to have larger attendance due to presentations by the applicants. The Appoquinimink State Service Center, 122 Silver Lake Road, in Middletown has been secured for the October 14th meeting.

James reported he had received a verbal report from Bob Haynes, DNREC Hearing Officer, who had researched the electronic meeting question. The question was whether a conference call would be possible to count toward a quorum. The opinion, delivered verbally, is that it is fine to participate by conference call but a physical quorum must be present in the room. Restated, with the provision that a quorum is met at the public location, additional members may call in and cast votes via teleconference.

Pam Meitner stated that consideration should be given to the high cost of gas, and travel can be hard with inclement weather. It is astounding that a quorum cannot be met without participation by phone. This seems to be a case of the times has not caught up with the changing technology.

James stated that Bob Haynes is doing more research with the teleconference issue and whether that constitutes a public meeting. Pam requested a determination before October, as she would not be attending that meeting.

V. Community Environmental Project Fund

A. CEPF Funding Awards

B. Project Reports

- Final Septic Financing Report
- Wilmington Recycle Update
- Delaware City Branch Canal
- Ham Run Stream Restoration
- Grant Review Process Revisions
- Green Energy, Green Savings

James informed the Council that Secretary Hughes approved all the Council's Funding recommendations from the fall 2007 period. One project, the Asthma Action proposal involved the Northeast Alliance, Public Health and the Southbridge Civic Association. James asked the Secretary if the Council could be the sponsor, the logic being with active leadership from the CIAC and staff that the Council would have detailed knowledge of the findings and it could make new policy recommendations based upon them. The

hypothesis we are testing in the asthma action project test is whether short term exposure to high concentrations of these asthma related compounds may cause asthma. In contrast the air quality standards for asthma related criteria pollutants are based on exposures measures of eight to 24 hours of exposures.

Based on our findings, we will need to make policy recommendations that would reduce rates of asthma in these target communities. For example some communities are re-routing traffic, mandating anti idling regulations for school buses, alternative fuels for school bus fleets, etc. I would like to see the Council be the sponsor, because these would be powerful environmental justice policy statements.

Bill questioned the potential for conflict if we recommend to the Secretary on proposals then we are the sponsor. Bob Frederick asked, we are making funding decisions; does that create conflict of interest?

Pam questioned who audits; if DNREC audits, it is awkward for Council to be in that position. There would have to be a designation of someone specifically to monitor funding.

Bill asked if the project specifically needed James as sponsor. James replied there will be specific Air Quality sponsors.

Bill stated and James affirmed the request is to get more hands on participation of the Council in environmental issues and policy.

Bill requested thought from Council members:

Jay Julius stated he didn't know why we could not sponsor but was not sure about the conflict of interest. In essence DNREC would bring the data to us (the Council), James is the lead person, and we would review the data, and make recommendations.

Bill questioned if the intent was for one time or to keep going?

James indicated the bigger picture is the role of the council. David Small has informed me there is some precedent established by the Governor's Environmental Advisory Board. It makes policy recommendations to the Governor through the Secretary. We can look at that Council as to how policy is proposed and their involvement in regulatory issues.

Marvin questioned what specific responsibilities would council have; when and how often, in terms of availability.

James said that he could not respond with specifics, but offered to research it and bring back examples of their studies and policy recommendations to the council.

Bob Frederick noted that he and Pam are original members and questioned the authority within the law and the CIAC charter to branch out in that respect. If we look at the key points of our charge, some other entity is to sponsor projects; we are to make the resources available to the public.

Marvin questioned if the procedures just explained could happen without council sponsorship?

Christina Wirtz, Ombudsman for the Division of Air and Waste Management, suggested the help of the UHELP organization.

Bill suggested a contact at Neighborhood house could take on the project; this gives them more of a stake in the community. Marvin agreed as long as the institutions knew there would be a (potential) funding source.

Bill suggested giving the project to Mr. Boswell in Neighborhood house.

Jay questioned in terms of the sponsor, would they have to have technical expertise? James informed the technical expertise would come from the Department. He stated that he would work with the asthma Action Steering Committee to find a Sponsor.

Bruce stated James has a valid point, it is not our sole objective to just review projects and let them go, we want to be more proactive, so when reports come back we take and suggest policy, and channel out to DNREC. When we receive a mid year report or a final report can become more proactive with it.

James agreed he would like to explore ways with the council on being more hands on.

Project Reports

Final Septic Financing Report

Bob informed the coordinated tour of Sussex county provided a great hands on experience, we learned about septic systems and that all helps, for example as James just informed us of the asthma action problems tied in with the traffic.

A handout of the Power Point presentation presented by Swati Thomas of the University of Maryland, Environmental Finance Center was distributed.

James pointed out highlights of the recommendations from the presentation. On page 2 and 3 of the Power Point presentation – Regulation must be passed first. This has been a big challenge. There must be a regulation in place with appropriate enforcement standards to justify demands on the General Assembly or Sussex County government to find money to finance septic repairs and upgrades.

The Pollution Control Strategy is moving through the regulatory process. Compliance inspections, standards for enforcement, buffers, are all controversial issues. It is possible that the General Assembly could step in again as it did in June, last year. Water Resources would like to see regulation passed. Funding this project to bring attention to the financial needs of low, fixed and moderate income communities has helped to move the Pollution Control Strategy closer to passage.

Septic systems near the bay and water will need advanced treatments. Another recommendation addresses the need for a study that would help determine what would be the most effective combination of wastewater disposal systems; central sewer, community systems, septics, etc. We'll have to look at where the central sewer in the County will be located. Identify the small unincorporated areas. They might utilize community systems; need to figure the best mix for cluster, and central systems. If central septic is within 5 years it will not require the advanced systems. We estimated additional funds for the next leg of the study, looking at banks, and community investment action funds. Looking at a few approaches; a principal approach is leveraging – take federal dollars, a revolving loan program received by states from the federal government at 1%. At the Feb. 20 meet we looked at leverage money by investing in bond dollars and earning 5% interest. The 4% profit spread (profit) would be used to provide grants. This figures into the states bonds ratings etcetera and is very complicated.

A second question revolved on the need for the county and state to work together. The County has a program for hookups, but it could be a loan and grant program for the county. DNREC does not have the capacity to: hire inspectors, do the paper work and make the loans. The County has the infrastructure. So a task force to work toward this with the County is needed, with quarterly meetings with Water Resources, Financial Assistance Branch and the County to discuss the recommendations in this report.

A third objective is to keep the communities involved, through community meetings creating broader involvement with more outreach talking to more groups. Politically the County is where it will all be resolved.

Bill asked about drinking water and bad septic systems. James informed there are a lot of wells. Public Health will produce a report for the tested wells in the area; there are not many drinking water problems. One area of Cool Springs did have fecal chloroform. Water Resources will produce a report members could access from the web.

Bill questioned and James replied CIAC funds for this project \$20,000 from CIAC, \$10,000 from the penalty fund, \$20,000 from Discover Bank. The total project was \$50,000.

Bob stated he had attended the first session at Del Tech and the Maryland Finance Center was a great help. James added that having an academic institution with a record of providing public policy analysis for other state governments helped to give the recommendations credibility that it might not have if done in house.

Bill asked about the next step for funding?

James stated the Clean Water Advisory Council (CWAC) would meet on February 20. He will present a summary of the recommendations for the Council. The CWAC is already investigating the possibility of “leveraging” state revolving fund dollars. The project is completed with the completion of the final report and the final payment of the remaining CEPF funds to the University of Maryland.

Overall, passage of the Pollution Control Strategy regulation is the essential next step for septic financing issue to move forward. There would be no demand for financial assistance without the compliance inspection process, or higher standards for septic systems. Some additional fact finding is needed. Groundwater Discharges and Sussex County Engineering have agreed to meet more frequently to coordinate planning. The Final Report calls for a DNREC and Sussex County to conduct a study that would identify the most efficient mix of central sewer, community systems and On-site (residential) septic systems. Then there must be some determination about the financing mechanisms. We mentioned leveraging. The most promising financing strategy reviewed was a Responsible Management Entity that could be county operated, and could charge a watershed -wide or even county-wide septic utility fee.

The slide on page 15 of the presentation shows a range of possibilities for annual fees from \$10 to \$40. The questions here are what level of fee, and whether the fees should be imposed on all users in the Inland Bays watershed, or county-wide. Water Resources staff seems to prefer a county operated Responsible Management Entity. A county-wide fee of just \$30 per septic annually, would generate enough funds to meet financial assistance needs throughout the county, I believe. Once we figure this out; we have developed a template for septic financing for the remainder of the state.

Wilmington Recycle Update

Handout provided of a Memorandum from Alfonso Ballard, Operations Director of the Department of Public Works of the City of Wilmington.

Update is from the City of Wilmington asking for an extension by Al Ballard City Operations Director will have more accurate date within a week or so. Ask for an extension, unable to complete by January, but need extension through April. 13 receptacles purchased at later date, city finance committee haggling over city’s contributions. Five “Big Belly” units ordered, ordered 2,200 receptacles for Southbridge. They anticipate by April will be able to get request through council for the additional 13 receptacles.

Bill questioned if was on line yet. James responded that the receptacles had been purchased but not distributed yet. We need to be more skilled in evaluating these kinds of questions in the future.

Delaware City Branch Canal

Handout – Memorandum from Jennifer Bothell, Enforcement Coordinator RE: U.S. v. Motiva Consent Decree.

James indicated that Pam had requested a copy of the legal opinion regarding the funds for the Delaware City Branch Canal Project. The handout provides this background.

Del City Branch Canal project is our largest community environmental project ever at \$1.3 million... Funding for the project came together over several years and from several different funding sources; \$1.3 million from the CIAC, \$100,000 in penalty funds, \$250,000 in Greenways Grants, \$295,000 from the New Castle County Conservation District and \$350,000 from Delaware City, for a total of \$2,295,000. Finance Direct Bob Zimmerman asked for an assessment to confirm that the funding from all the different sources is consistent with the CEPF project. before we could move forward with drafting a Project Agreement. In addition to our 1.3 million, all the other grant proposals are consistent with one another, and consistent with the Del City project.

Marvin questioned the 2nd paragraph of the confirming letter and why only \$100,000 was specified. James indicated that the issue about compatibility of the project funding was raised over primarily over some language in the Consent Decree that awarded the \$100,000 to the project.

Jay confirmed that now all funds can be put into one big pile now. James confirmed, yes, and a project agreement is being drawn up now. James will share when complete.

Bill asked about a timeline which James informed that Paul Morrell had indicated the project would be implemented in two distinct stand alone phases. We don't have the project completion date yet. James will meet on Feb 13th with Bob Zimmerman, the Water Resources Administrator and Dave Small and Paul Morrill of Delaware City. They will provide a projected date of construction completion and we will have a projected construction schedule.

Bill stated the schedules for the draw down and project completion should be given in writing.

Bob asked how much federal money was involved. James responded Federal and other funds were around \$1.4 million... James said that to the best of his memory the project would total about \$2.8 million when completed.

The committee requested this project be keep in the forefront and monitored.

Marvin questioned the interest on penalty funds, once they are obligated to a project, will they continue to accrue interest for the fund? James replied, yes, they are obligated through the creation of a Purchase Order (PO) but the funds remain in our account drawing interest until the funds are distributed for the projects

\$526,262 is the non obligated balance on the CEPF spreadsheet.

Ham Run Stream Restoration

Handout of a memorandum from Steve Williams, project sponsor of the Ham Run Stream Restoration Project dated December 5, 2007.

On behalf of the Ham Run project Steve Williams requested an extension to Oct 31, 2008. He outlines the challenges in meeting the deadline and securing additional permits. Steve anticipates getting the permit from the US Army Corp of Engineers will take an additional six months to get approval.

Pam questioned and James replied they would go door to door and write the property owners to attend a meeting to gain their approval of the plan and access to their properties. It was not seen as an obstacle.

Jay addressed the question of whether to give an extension, making the motion to give the extension.

Bill called for a second and discussion on how we want to handle requests for extensions? Is a memorandum an acceptable way to request an extension; what direction do we want this to go?

Pam stated she did not feel strongly about either a personal appearance or a letter. She would prefer to have things in writing for the records. I don't feel presence is necessary. One, if people show up and we have no quorum this is embarrassing and two, if we deny the request they may be happier they are not here.

Marvin questioned if the applicants tell us about anticipated delays. James informed that the starting and end dates are required in the application and they become a part of the Professional Services contract with the applicant. He keeps a spreadsheet which he reviews regularly and then calls applicants for updates.

The consensus was an explanation is needed but the applicant does not need to make a personal appearance every time, a letter is fine. It was also noted if the explanation is not sufficient the council has the right to ask for more information.

Pam noted a vote was needed on the allowance of the Ham Run extension.

Jay motioned and Marvin seconded the motion to allow Ham Run to extent the date of completion. All in favor the motion carried.

Green Energy Green Savings,

I met with Keith Lake and Brenda Gunter from Peoples Settlement/UHELP because there were major changes in the project implementation plan. The most significant was hiring a contractor to do the household energy audits.

Marvin asked the identity of the new contractor, and James replied that the contractor is Energy Savings Group (ESG). ESG provides audits for the state Weatherization Assistance Program. The company is doing business locally, providing energy audits for the Weatherization Assistance Program at the Neighborhood House. There will be 25 households in all. There will only be 10 homes to get the audit from the Energy Savings Group at \$705 each.

Bill questioned, weren't the original numbers \$75 for 100 houses, now its 10 houses? James replied yes. Originally they planned to train local people to do the audits. The Grant Review Subcommittee questioned this and had other concerns. They were asked to re-work the application. This second submission and now professionals will do the energy audits.

Bill informed that ESG is a very professional group. Three to four people go into a house, set up fans, at different speeds, with cameras and film, and they know where air is coming from. Once they get data, they analyze and report. I can see the \$700 cost.

Marvin questioned if a local utility could not be considered like Delmarva? James indicated that was a concern was a concern raised by the Grant Review Subcommittee. They asked Peoples Settlement/UHELP to get Delmarva Power involved in the revised project. Delmarva printed posters and handouts for workshops.

Marvin asked – in terms of an audit? Delmarva will not do audits; a pamphlet is the extent of their involvement? James stated that he was not aware whether Delmarva was asked or whether it could provide audit services.

Marvin questioned how this affected the bottom line, and James replied that with other adjustments to the budget, this does not affect the bottom line.

Marvin questioned the distribution of goods with the 10 houses. There are two other organizations providing doors and windows Marvin stated. I need addresses so there is no duplication. I know the address for façade program and for St Paul Methodist Church and would like to check for coordination. James indicated he would ask Keith Lake for the addresses.

Otherwise James reported that he happy to see progress on the project and some significant work completed. The 25 households have been identified, from a list of Peoples Settlement clients that are eligible for emergency assistance with utility bills. In order to select the group of 25 required 4 meetings with 100. Many people could not believe they would get something for nothing.

At this point they have completed 4 workshops. The project steering committee meets each month and Keith Lake has extended an invitation for me and/or members of the CIAC to attend... An additional item that was unclear to the Grant Review Subcommittee was regarding the use of funds for the University of Delaware, College of Energy and Environmental Policy. Funding is dedicated to three students who will use the NEEP software to compare utility bills for the past year, before and after the weatherization, and give final readouts on the energy savings for each household.

Bill asked and James replied the information was distributed on the east side. James replied that the information is to be distributed city-wide through the network of community centers and at a year ending conference.

Process Revisions:

James suggested a proposal to suspend the next funding cycle of the CIAC fund in order to get new monitoring and administrative pieces in place. On Feb 4th he was called to a Division Director's (DD) meeting for one project approved, the Bear Babe Ruth Little League. When we initially reviewed the Bear Babe Ruth application, we found no DNREC sponsor and asked them to contact Parks and Recreation Director, Charles Salkin to find a sponsor.

When they appeared before the council in October, a representative said they had an agreement from Mr. Salkin, to serve as Project Sponsor. Letters were signed by the Secretary and went to the applicants with copies to their Project Sponsors. When the letter reached Charles Salkin, he had no knowledge of the project. . We were told by the applicants had an agreement for a sponsor, but there was not a sponsor.

This sent up red flags to DD's and they have asked us to establish safeguards before we approve additional projects. I've reviewed grant-making programs in the department: 1) there is a pre-application process in the Parks program for the Parks and Greenway Grant program. Applicants send in a summary with essential information, it is reviewed by a committee of project sponsors who determine the feasibility of the project.

In reviewing the Parks funding criteria and process, I discovered some of the parks projects we have considered and funded would not meet bare criteria for a feasible park development project, if it was evaluated in the Parks grant program.

There are many criteria for planning and coordination required for a feasible park development project. We had no idea of these requirements when awarding CEPF funds to applicants for parks projects.

For example, the Bear Babe Ruth project is a part of the Valero Parks Complex. It is one of several outdoor recreational facilities being developed in coordination with the Division of Parks and Recreation. First of all, The Bear Babe Ruth League would have

been required to have at minimum a 25 year lease on the park. The lease must assure unrestricted public access. The project involves; lighting, parking lots, bathrooms, seating areas. The design and placement of all these facilities must be consistent with the overall plan for development of the Valero Park Complex. Development has to be consistent with the New Castle County Land Use Plan.

We reviewed the Wilmington Senior Center project. Although we denied it funding, we gave it serious consideration. It would never have received serious Parks and Recreation consideration. The project could not document a lease, maintenance agreement, funding commitments, or show any of the required planning and coordination... The group went to Parks after the CIAC turned it down. The best that Parks is willing to consider giving is a \$5,000 – \$10,000 planning grant. We are not always aware of all implications of a project.

In order to have an adequate technical review, Parks has established a pre-application process involving technical experts from throughout the department. They have the know how to evaluate a project up front. The Departmental staff also checks within their own divisions to determine whether the technical expertise is available to provide assistance to the applicant group.

We need this kind of assessment up front. We need to know the expertise is available to assure that the projects we approve are technically sound.

I am asking the Council to consider suspending funding decisions until we have a pre-application process and technical expertise in place.

Bill questioned if they would look at proposals prior to CIAC? James replied that this is a pre application, screening by technical experts to see if they meet the criteria. If the project is feasible, then an application is sent out.

Pam suggested there are other ways to handle such as: 1) can't submit an application until they have a sponsor; or 2) Insist a sponsor be at the meeting.

James relayed that this leaves no up-front technical review to assess the project feasibility.

Pam asserted that it would depend on the project, a schoolteacher project vs. a permits project with the Army Corp of Engineers are diverse projects, we must recognize the difference. If we put projects on hold, simple projects will get kicked out. There is some other middle ground.

Bill stated that this to identify where funds are, but going back to the review of proposals, he asked if various segments could be put together. Would there be a delay?

James indicated there would be a delay; it will become a two part process, a pre-application with a grant review subcommittee with department expertise to comment on the feasibility and whether the timelines and other project elements are sufficient.

Bob stated the new news here is the extra layer of pre-application; the onus is on the applicant, to have the sponsor here and a point person.

Pam stated a problem has been identified; approval went out, no sponsor.

James indicated we have been approving projects that are more complex than we realized. In addition, as we make more grants there is more of a burden on sponsors and their divisions, another thing on their plate.

Jay stated we will ask for a signed letter from the sponsor.

Bob relayed that has been the goal and objective from the beginning. The issue is that the applicant came and lied; this is egregious, pull the funding.

Pam - This seems to be a new and complicated system. Now a pre-approval process, very complicated, requires a task force to look at with department heads and the secretary.

James informed that there were other issues to be re-evaluated in our monitoring process. For example, we have traditionally transferred responsibility for handling funds and monitoring of CEPF projects to the Division where their sponsors are located. The sponsors handle it according to their own division's procedures

When we do that, we do that, we have no idea of the amount expended, on what? I can't respond immediately to any questions about project funding or progress. To get the answers, I need to track down project sponsors who may each have different processes for monitoring project progress and expenditures.

I've met with Bob Ehemann who runs the Parks program; he has developed an Access database which tracks expenditures, and project reports. They recommend an access database to track the projects and funding.

Bob noted this has been evolving for years. David Small has been here, we need an advocate from DNREC.

Pam stated she was reluctant to put on hold all applications, this is not serving the public interest, a bandage, for the next time, when you present, and a sponsor should be there. There must be a better system, this is an interim. Let's look into this in more detail.

James informed: I have also been instructed by David Small to create a CEPF manual for applicants and a sponsor manual. This came out as an agenda item at a Directors meeting. All of the Directors throughout DNREC commented. They want to make sure staff time

is well invested and spent on solid projects. I was instructed to create manual, develop a pre-application process. In my conversations with Bob Ehemann in Parks, and Susan Love in the Coastal Programs grants and others, with the Access database it is possible better monitor spending and programs. With the Data base we will even have GPS capability. We can map proximity to violations and even automatically generate letters to sponsors, applicants and elected officials. They are recommending this approach.

Bill questioned any conflict of information. James informed that Access is a relational database, we have the outline, but we need to enter all our information into the system before linking.

Bob expressed frustration. It seems complex, with a middle person between the public. Our main obligation is to make funds accessible to the public. This seems to be heading down a bureaucratic road where the public is less accessible to projects.

Bill stated that this would provide more control.

Bob felt we called for that by asking for a sponsor. I would like David to come to next meeting. He has been here since the General Assembly established the CIAC.

Pam felt reluctance to let go.

Bill stated Pam doesn't want to skip the next grant period. That may be modest.

Bob did not want to delay the application the process, let's make a determination based on project, and the subcommittee.

Bill questioned other reasons?

James indicated there are other concerns. Concerns from Finance that we have a better audit trail, more adherences to the Professional Contract requirements, and better reporting

Bob stated we have had meetings where people have expressed frustration on how the process works.

Marvin stated this won't be resolved today. I lean toward Pam's view; have a meeting prior to our next CIAC meeting to look at it in more dept to give the council a recommendation. Identify which members to choose to be a part of the subcommittee. Let's make the information available to them. Let's have David involved.

Bob, Marvin, Pam and Bill will be on the subcommittee.

A member of the public present, Philip Thayer also a past recipient of a grant, recommend that someone from the public be involved in the Grant process. We are excited we received \$10,000, I got letter from Bob Ehemann. I called. Issue of

accountability, no pre-application ever came up. I would find that cumbersome. We need input from other side too.

Marvin asked if James had a report from David, which James replied, no.

Marvin asked if there was any literature to make available to subcommittee members which James replied, no.

Bill instructed James to set up something with David Small. James advised he has a meeting with Finance, Bob Zimmerman and the fiscal office and he would call the members of the subcommittee to schedule something.

VI. Public Comments/Open Forum:

Philip Thayer and Eric Bressler –of the St George Civic Association.

James has been to our meeting. We are an unincorporated community, no source of revenue, so it is difficult to get funds. We are excited with the award. I don't know how to get the money yet. Tonight we have hometown overlay project voting. It allows unincorporated communities to have some control. We have no money. We have use of the school for a community center. We will lease it out to doctors to generate money for maintenance of other park areas and for possible further expansion. To make it cost effective, the school is only source of income. We need to zone the building and make it commercially viable.

Bill questioned who acquired the abandoned school. Philip indicated the school district still owns the property, applied for a grant and aid to manage the property for the first 3 years.

Bill questioned if they were set up as a 501 non profit? Philip answered the Civic Association is the non profit.

Bill questioned what was the energy or environmental benefit?

Philip stated the community suffered from neglect, this would be a hub for redevelopment and sustainable. There will be an overall vital impact on the ecological well being of the community.

Bill questioned the profit after the first year? Philip indicated it would go back into the community for a lot of things. We don't want to keep funds they will be used to provide additional services or turn back into the community.

Pam stated the need for an environmental nexus for CIAC projects, that nexus is a bit remote.

Christina Wertz stated there could be more; a recycle bank or a recycle center could be set up, energy savings, or audits or back direct environmental impact. It could be all rolled into the project.

Bill stated it would qualify in terms of being in the shadows of the refinery. Put an angle to it, of natural or environmental.

Jay stated in the past we had difficulty funding buildings; Habitat had previously asked which we did not fund.

James informed that in House Bill 192 specifies the term “project” to mean pollution elimination, minimization, or abatement within the environment or to enhance natural resources.

Philip stated the use would be for afterschool activities for children; baseball, or soccer fields.

Bill replied that we understand what you would like; we have certain criteria to meet.

Pam suggested: you might want to highlight the environmental aspects.

Philip informed that he had worked in that building for special needs, that boiler was placed in 1930 and pumps out smoke. Just replacing the heaters has a positive impact on the environment. The primary reason for being here is to thank you for the funds. We have a plan and are working with council for the development of the park, architecturally with the trail blend to blend together. JMC volunteered to help.

Bob thank Philip for coming and giving the preview.

Jay asked and James replied that the Secretary did not reject the Babe Ruth project. Kim Johnson did contact Director Charles Salkin and they came to an agreement.

Pam moved to adjourn, Jay second, all approved. The meeting was thus adjourned.

Respectfully Submitted,
Vicki E. Ward
Administrative Specialist III, DNREC

The notes of this meeting are not intended to be a verbatim record of the topics that were presented or discussed. They are for the use of the Community Involvement Advisory council members and the public in supplementing their personal notes and recall for presentations.

Next Meeting Date: June 10, 2008 9:30 a.m. Smyrna Rest Area