



MEETING MINUTES

DATE: May 25, 2022

PLACE: Remote meeting via Zoom

MEMBERS PRESENT: Brad Moyer (Chair), Elliott Place, Beth Porter, Nancy Wiley, Thomas (Tom) Morahan, Gary Tondorf-Dick, Kathy Reardon, Henry (Bob) Hidell, and Maria Zade

MEMBERS ABSENT: Tom Roby

GUESTS: Tanya Bodell, Virginia (Ginny) LeClair, John Malloy, Brad Carr, John Borger, Paul Sprecher, Bill Ramsey, John Borger, Brianna Bennett, and Brenda Black

ATTACHMENTS: Energyzt presentation on the Public Outreach and Engagement Plan; Energyzt presentation on waste/recycling data, home heating data, and the Regional Greenhouse Gas Initiative; HMLP / Rob Dolan presentation on Property Assessed Clean Energy (PACE) program

The Chair, Brad Moyer, called the duly noticed meeting to order at 7:07 PM and presented the Virtual Open Meeting Protocol and Procedures as outlined in the Governor's Chapter 20 Pandemic Directive of 2021. Brad further explained that in order to provide an opportunity for all to provide input, participants should raise their hand to indicate a desire to speak. Once the participant is recognized by the Chair, they should keep the remarks to agenda, and be succinct and respectful. If the participant does not, they will receive a warning. If the participant continues to violate the norms, they will not be recognized to speak by the Chair and may be muted for the remainder of the meeting.

Introductions

Brad welcomed Bob Hidell as a new member to the committee who is representing the Hingham Conservation Commission. Brad reported out that Shannon Kacherovich, a moderator appointee, is no longer a member of the committee. The moderator has it on his appointment list to name a replacement. Carlos DaSilva did not run for re-election, so his appointment expired when he was no longer a member of the School Committee as of May 14th. The new School Committee appointment is expected to be made on June 6th.

Continued discussions with Energyzt on climate planning efforts, which will include review of, and possible votes on, the following matters:

a. Selection of a greenhouse gas inventory tool;

Brad turned the meeting over to Tanya and Ginny. Tanya summarized that some of the content that will be discussed has already been presented at previous meetings and may be ready to move to a vote. There will also be a couple of things that are new and some that are revised. LeClair from Energyzt led the discussion on choosing and using CDP, a greenhouse gas (GHG) inventory tool. Informational videos on the CDP tool were circulated to the CAPC for review in advance of the meeting.

Brad mentioned that it would be helpful to reiterate why CDP is a good option for the GHG inventory as opposed to the other tools. As a reminder, Brad said that MassEnergyInsight is the tool currently used by the Town to capture municipal data and this tool will work with CDP, not against. Ginny added that MassEnergyInsight is required for reporting GHG emissions for the DOER's Green Communities reporting, and CDP would not be replacing MassEnergyInsight.

CDP provides a baseline for every community to compare themselves to other communities and see their GHG emissions. The tool has three pathways that can be selected for reporting. The modules within the tool are set up to be basic and easy to understand. As someone goes through the document, it will populate questions based on governance, assessments, targets, planning, and action. Based on the answers it receives for governance under demographics, the tool will go to additional questions about population, oversight, type of government, equity, etc. For the assessment section, the tool wants to evaluate vulnerability, what kind of community is it, and what are the climate risks such as being a coastal community prone to flooding or a California community prone to wildfires. Adaptive capacity, emissions inventories, and all existing data are uploaded into the software. It does not need to be physically typed in.

ICLEI was the software that communities had started with before ICLEI merged with CDP and it is an international group that has been around for years. CDP was better suited for larger enterprises such as the international community and companies, but the two companies have since merged and now allow data to blend together. Brad shared a slide from a previous Energyzt presentation that showed all of the different GHG inventory tools. Ginny further explained that EnergyStar is more something that businesses use to track their corporate buildings. MAPC has a good tool but it is relatively new. The GHG inventory tool by the EPA is also a good tool, but there is a concern that there is bias going into that particular tool. Some communities, such as Somerville, use an excel database. CDP is very user-friendly and the questions are pre-populated which is better suited for communities that do not have a team of people working on sustainability. CDP covers targets in various sectors- energy, transportation, waste (e.g. solid waste data, waste management data, and the food sector), public health (e.g. COVID, air quality, and water supply), and water. And then the tool looks at targets- adaptation, mitigation, energy, planning, climate factors, climate action plans, etc. This is just a quick overview of what is in the tool.

Elliot Page commented that it is his understanding that the Energyzt team is recommending CDP and that it can integrate with MassEnergyInsight. Elliot also reflects on a discussion from a previous meeting that the Global Covenant of Mayors for Climate & Energy (GCoM) would also be a good group to look into. Ginny responded that the GCoM is a fantastic organization to join and that it supports CDP by promoting the 'good things' that are being done in a community. It provides milestone badges for achieving steps in CDP which can then be used in social media or any outreach. GCoM also provides a framework of support with other communities, which CDP also does. CDP provides free technical assistance and the tool is free. GCoM requires a commitment from the Town to join the network to fight climate change and meet the agreements of the Paris Accord. A letter to join would need to be signed by the committee and the Select Board. Ginny can send the letter to the committee if that is of interest. Elliot asked a clarifying question if all three tools work together and Ginny confirmed that they do.

Brad had a couple of questions, one of which was whether CDP was free and Ginny had confirmed that it was. As a follow-up, Brad asked where will the funds come from to maintain and sustain the tool despite its free application. Since the committee is going to be deciding whether or not to include waste in the Climate Action Plan (CAP), Brad asked if the modules in CDP will be flexible to allow the committee to track what they want in the climate action plan rather than being forced into a certain framework. A final question from Brad is whether other towns in Massachusetts and particularly the Greater Boston area are using the CDP tool and if Hingham will be able to compare itself to those communities. Ginny responded that she is unsure of how exactly CDP is maintained and how the funding comes in besides it being a free tool, but she knows it is a non-profit and can look into this further. Ginny speculated that CDP may charge corporations and not communities to fund itself. Ginny also added that if CAPC decides not to include waste or another category in the CAP, the tool is very flexible. CDP recognizes that every community is different and it is very adaptable based on the responses that are put into it. This is just a tool to help benchmark emissions in a way that is comparable across the board with other communities. Responding to Brad's final question, Ginny said there is a great tool on CDP's website that assists with this and can show all of the communities that are registered. Ginny will retrieve this list for the committee.

Bob raised his hand and asked if after a baseline is established whether the program will be treated as a living document that will be updated. Ginny replied that it is going to be a living document and CDP has a staff that will 'nudge' the community to provide information. They send periodic reminders that a report is due soon and then follow-up with calls and technical support to make it as user friendly as possible. It will be an annual reporting mechanism that continues after Energyzt is gone and allows the Town to continue to track this information. Bob asked how long would it take to develop a reasonable database in this format. Ginny responded that Tanya has been working to get data from National Grid and John has been working to get data from the Town's assessors office and other reports. Ginny added that the hardest part is getting the data, but this process is already on its way and should not be a problem. Tanya added that as a part of Energyzt's assignment, they are pulling together the initial GHG inventory which will help set targets and assess different approaches, and understand how different recommendations may impact the trajectory of GHG emissions over time in relation to the stated

goal. Going forward, Hingham will need to invest in the effort to maintain that data and track it. Tanya believes this will be a recommendation in the CAP and this would fall under the role of the Town's Sustainability Director to oversee the ongoing updates of that data and allow Hingham to track how it is doing. Bob asked an additional question as to whether there is a functional AI learning curve that could assist in creating some level of predictability over time for the analysis. Tanya responded that she needs to know what they would be looking to predict. Bob clarified that over time AI captures data, learns the trends, and then issues predictions for the future. He has found it useful in other areas, referencing the medical field's use of this technology in case studies for cohort behavior. Tanya said this is a level of sophistication that she believes has not been applied to GHG inventories for the municipal sector or free software. Moving forward, Hingham can choose to supplement the program with something more sophisticated, such as AI. Ginny said that the benefit of CDP is that it provides a framework with a score and feedback on how the local government is doing. It is flexible, voluntary, and free. It is a tool that is available and can help make the process easier once the CAP is completed. Elliot commented that the inventory tool and process will be simpler than needing AI because it is establishing benchmarks and accountability. The tool will be able to help Hingham set benchmarks and then stay accountable for meeting those benchmarks. Elliot further agreed with Energyzt that the Sustainability Director will need this tool and CAPC will have to follow through with it. Tanya said it is a goal to make sure that someone can maintain the tool going forward.

Brad commented that the CAPC may vote tonight to accept CDP as its inventory tool and then later decide it wants to use a different tool. He remarks that it would be fairly simple to select another tool and then input the data, despite the tediousness of needing to start over. Ginny agrees with Brad that the committee would not be locked into this tool and the Sustainability Director may decide in the future that they want to use a different tool.

Brad calls for any further questions or comments, to which there is no response. Brad moves that the committee adopts CDP as the GHG inventory tool for the CAP and for Energyzt to begin the GHG inventory. Elliot seconds the motion made by Brad. A roll call vote was taken, and the motion was passed unanimously.

b. Consideration of including waste as a component of the climate action plan;

Brad summarizes that at the last CAPC meeting, a quick presentation was made by John from Energyzt to show waste's applicability to Hingham. The materials presented at that meeting were provided in advance of tonight's meeting. Brad asked if anything has changed on the Energyzt side of things. John Malloy from Energyzt clarified that their position remains the same and there is not much more to add. He says since the last meeting they have tracked down a few additional programs, including the pay-as-you-throw program that other MA communities are engaging in. There are also different grants available from the state to help support programs. John says there are a number of different options to consider in terms of waste in the climate action plan.

Kathy asked if pay-as-you-throw is more or less effective in towns like Hingham that have a self-drop-off program. John responded that he has not done that comparison but would take a look at

what other communities are doing. Brenda recalled a Select Board meeting from 2011 where they did not recommend a pay-as-you-throw program because there had recently been a large expenditure for the transfer station to reconfigure its recycling system. Brenda remarked that pay-as-you-throw does reduce waste and an increasing number of people are using separate trash pickup companies. Brenda believes there are eight or nine different companies operating for trash pickup in the Town and producing GHG emissions separate from the actual disposal of waste. John agreed and said that there are other means too for people. Tanya said there is already a pay-as-you-throw charge built into certain services already in Hingham depending on who the provider is. Brad said this is going to take time to solve but the question at hand is whether this produces GHG emissions and can it be inventoried. Brad asked the committee to consider whether it is truthful to ignore waste in the plan if it is knowingly contributing to GHG emissions and the committee decided to not count it. Maria agrees with Brad and says that emissions from waste should not be left out simply because it is difficult to inventory and that the plan will be incomplete without it. Gary added that he also believes that waste should be included and a potential strategy is to measure the volume of trash that is being transferred out via truck to Rochester, where waste in Hingham ultimately goes. Maria added that putting this in the plan puts waste and its associated challenges in the lap of the Sustainability Director where it may be better solved. Elliot said that out-of-sight out-of-mind with waste is not a solution, and added that he supports starting with the waste being created in Hingham that is generating emissions. Bob added that it is very important to include waste, such as methane, in the calculations.

Brad asks if there are any additional comments or suggestions. Following no response, Brad asks if there is a motion to include waste in the CAP. Elliot makes the motion. Beth seconds the motion. Brad moves the motion to a roll call vote which is approved unanimously.

c. The proposed Public Outreach and Community Engagement Plan;

Elliot presents the Public Outreach and Engagement Plan, which was distributed to the committee in advance of the meeting. It is a working document that Ginny has worked hard at presenting, and Maria, Beth, and Elliot provided extensive comments on. Those comments were incorporated, and the document will continue to be an ongoing process.

Following the table of contents, the introduction summarizes what the committee has done so far and its charter established at Town meeting to meet a set goal for emissions by 2040. Elliot highlights that stakeholder engagement is an important part of the plan. Engagement is not just telling people stuff, but engaging them in the work. Elliot proceeded to read through portions of the document.

Brad asked if Elliot could clarify the term stakeholders and how the plan will capture various stakeholders in the Town. Maria mentioned that there is a list of stakeholders in the document which can be found in the appendix. She also added that she presumes relevant stakeholders to be people who are in decision making positions through their job, office, or ability to capture an audience. This may include municipal employees, faith leaders, people who have foreign affairs organizations in town, media, contractors, and architects. Beth said that we want to find the naysayers and make sure that they are engaged as stakeholders in the process. Bob highlighted an

experience he had with the Hingham CPC for stakeholder engagement and mentioned that the engagement process can be long and strenuous, and that it happens in small meetings, not just announcements. Bob also said that the committee utilized a video presence for its goals and for explaining what net-zero means to people. Ginny said that sending out an introductory letter, establishing goals, determining who to target, and developing questions was something she discussed with Carlos for the schools. Gary asked how do we bring this down to a smaller scale and said that we want to raise the consciousness level of residents and incorporating the thinking of new property owners, for instance, into the vision for Hingham. Give people a sense of history for their house and how they might approach change in a way that is consistent with their character. The boards and committees review plans but they don't have a hand in making them. Gary remarked that we need outreach materials so that people have a better understanding of this. John Borger says that the key to getting to net-zero is likely not new construction or architects, but rather, the everyday HVAC contractors who are driving through the town and replacing heating and cooling systems. John echoed that engagement is not simply statements but rather two-way conversations. And he believes this must include pulling in the contractor community to advance their knowledge of where the profit opportunities are and how critical it is that the built environment is weaned off of fossil fuels. He strongly urged that there be a special strategy put in place to engage these contractors which could range from briefing them on where we are going to HMLP adjusting their incentives to include contractors. Every year, a certain number of homes are replacing their heating and cooling systems and it is essential that the contractors are a part of that process. Gary had a follow-up comment that he agrees with John about getting contractors on board but that in his own home he had difficulties in converting to an air system. People have to upgrade their electrical panels and capacity since the power for the house in the past has only been for lighting. Gary's experience is that contractors are important but so is an overview of the scope upgrades that need to happen to put in a heat pump system. Gary asked how do we get to the point where we can do an air-to-water system that can be easily installed in an old home? He recommended that we show people a plan that can help them do that. Elliot said there will need to be a paradigm shift with contractors and residents.

Discussing roles and responsibilities for the various Hingham entities, Elliot explains that this is a crucial time in preparing the roles and responsibilities for the CAPC to take this plan on and asks for a committee member to jump in and act as a point person. Maria volunteers to step-in as the point person. Bob adds that he will help with this part of the process. Gary adds that he will help with this as well. Brad recommends that this becomes a standing item at CAPC meetings because these tasks will likely be spread around and there is value for all committee members to participate and engage the community. Elliot continues that the CAPC has two working groups- Hingham Community Engagement and Regional Engagement- which have been merged. Carlos, who is on the working groups, is also no longer a part of the committee. Both of the groups consist of Maria, Beth, and Elliot at this time. Brad added that the two working groups were established by the committee in October 2021. Since they work in tandem, Brad recommends that the committee considers reconstituting the groups at a future meeting. Elliot continues that the Town Staff also needs to identify a point person. Ginny said the committee could send an email to Michelle Monsegur asking if she is the right person to fill this role. Maria said that Art Roberts would likely be the point person because he is the assistant town administrator of

administration whereas Michelle is finance. Brad adds that Art Robert has informally been the CAPC liaison since he came to Hingham. Maria will reach out to Art to confirm if he will be this point person. The Hingham Municipal Lighting Plant (HMLP) point person is Brianna Bennett as HMLP's Sustainability Coordinator. Tom Morahan is also a point person for the committee as HMLP's General Manager and a member of the CAPC. Elliot continues that Ginny is the point person for the Energyzt consultants.

Next, Elliot goes into the Public Outreach section of the document. Outreach meetings are expected to start in June. There will be additional outreach through traditional media, social media, etc. Elliot mentioned that John had sent an email about sending information to traditional sources of media and this will be developed further. There are also key connections with committees that will need to be expanded through liaisons and engagement. Elliot continues that there are several different options for public meetings that the CAPC could pursue. Bob commented that there are different dynamics in different areas of the town that are important to consider in planning. Bob elaborates that he had an experience with the downtown association where they were very active, helpful, and organized in the planning process, but the town is not equal. He said that South Hingham can play a large role in the CAP but has a different dynamic than another area such as downtown that needs to be considered. Gary follows-up that potable water and waste water infrastructure is one of the biggest constraints in South Hingham and one of the things he has learned from certain property owners is that they are reassessing market research based on code changes and COVID-19 changes. Gary also highlighted that there is new ownership for the shipyard as well, which entertains about 1,400 units of multi-family housing in the Town. Finally, Gary suggested that the Master Plan should be one of the committees included in outreach. Due to time constraints, Brad asked the committee to hold further comments until Elliot completes the presentation of the engagement plan. Elliot continues that a revised version of the survey has been developed by Ginny, Maria, and himself following the Eco-Fest. Individual outreach will also include stakeholder interviews with custom questions and focus groups. Elliot went through the stakeholder list and kinds of groups that CAPC wants to make sure are engaged. Elliot adds that CAPC should utilize traditional media, social media, mailers with the HMLP bills, Harbor media, etc. This may be a key to showing folks how they can get started. Harbor media can provide information, educational videos. Social media has various channels and sites that have been identified. The format for a functional, working webpage is up in the air at the moment as logistics are worked out with the Town.

Further on the Engagement Plan, a list of questions will be developed that are more specific for each stakeholder, as opposed to the general survey that has been discussed previously. Maria is working on getting a table at the farmers' market. There are other events that have been identified and are upcoming to engage people on what the climate action plan is about and why it is important to each individual stakeholder. It is unclear what the public meetings are going to look like. Elliot said they are considering how to hold them with COVID and whether they should be in-person vs. online among other considerations.

Elliot continues onto the Timeline and Key Milestones portion of the document. There are hard targets and soft targets. Elliot also says that it is important for the committee to stay focused on getting going and what's next.

Regarding the appendices, Elliot comments that the Media Contacts page will change a bit. He said that John Borger recommended that the names and contact information be removed. There are additional contacts for the Hingham Journal that will be added. He showed the stakeholder list again and concluded the presentation.

Brad said the document was comprehensive and opened the floor to other comments on the engagement plan. Bob asks if the deadlines were arbitrary and capricious or if they were thought out. Elliot said that timeline was from Ginny and turned it over to Maria to clarify further. Maria said the goal is to deliver the plan or recommendations in time to go through the necessary processes before Town meeting next year, so they worked backwards from a presentation to Town Meeting. Tanya recommended a quarterly update to the Select Board from the CAPC and that the committee could use materials that have been presented and make sense. She said this will go a long way for stakeholder engagement and avoiding any last-minute naysayers. Tanya mentioned that Judith Hamm issued an invitation for someone from CAPC to report on the Sustainable South Shore meeting upcoming. Elliot will not be able to attend. Tanya will be there for the Cohasset Alternative Energy Committee and offered to also report out on the CAPs progress for Hingham. Maria nominated Tanya to present the CAP work on the meeting. Tanya accepted and will present the information on the meeting on the 31st. Tanya also emphasized the importance of CAPCs members, who are members of other committees, continue to report out to their other committees. Bill Ramsey said that he was thrilled with CAPCs hard work, especially in pushing for the Sustainability Director position to receive funding, and will continue to support the CAPC as the Select Board liaison.

Brad recommends a motion that the CAPC adopt the public outreach and community engagement plan as presented to the committee on its May 25th meeting and authorizes the engagement working groups to make whatever updates they deem necessary from time to time with notification to the CAPC of such changes at the next possible meeting. Elliot makes the motion. Gary seconds the motion. After a roll call vote, the motion is passed unanimously.

d. The final public input survey for submission to Town constituencies; and

Maria provided an update on the survey. When the committee switched from pick four options or so to rank order questions, the survey went from 7 questions to 70 questions. This made a lot of people at eco-fest start filling out the survey and then move to 'I'll finish it later'. Maria also said there was resistance and hesitancy with the QR codes. Maria believes the survey changes are meant to make the survey faster, easier, and more efficient. Also, she believes that this would be easier to hand-tabulate the responses as opposed to rank order. Elliot added on that he and Maria adapted the survey for an hour and a half or so to make the survey more succinct. It was then passed along to Brad and Beth. Brad made a few comments which were accepted. Maria asked the committee if they would prefer a detailed survey that gets all of the information desired but less respondents versus a higher-level survey that doesn't capture all of the desired information

but gets a lot more respondents. Bob says that he has used survey monkey and recommends careful consideration of the questions asked. He also asked how they intend to get the responses? Maria says they've been looking to utilize the events listed in the Public Engagement document such as Christmas in the Square, the Hingham Farmers Market, Homecoming, etc. She adds that they want to make the survey available in paper copies and a QR code, a news flash through the Town's email, HMLP bill mailers and website, social media, appropriate stakeholders, etc. Elliot says they are trying to push it out in every way possible, but if it went out as an HMLP bill mailer, for example, residents would have the option to fill out a paper copy or a QR code. Bob said that a bill mailer from HMLP would be lucky to get 10%-15% of the surveys back and that it is important to consider the consumers. Elliot agrees and says this is one of the main questions being discussed. Tanya adds that by asking people to fill out the survey, even if they don't, they were invited to be a part of the public process and it is not on the committee if they choose not to answer. Elliot continues to walk through the survey questions which had been reworked from the original survey. Brad asked if the 'select 4' or 'select 2' questions were 'up to 4 (or 2)' or if Survey Monkey will require that number of selections. Ginny said that they can make it so that people have to answer the questions or else it will send them back and the people have to select the four or two. Elliot says it should be 'up to' a certain number and Brad agrees. Kathy says that requiring survey responses may create a negative response and people may not want to complete the survey at all if it bounces them back to unanswered questions. Ginny suggested that questions be required so that when people get to the end of the survey, they know if there are any questions that were not filled out in-case they missed them or it didn't collect their response. Maria recommends adding a 'none' option for the survey. Bob says a 'yes' or 'no' will be more desirable than something longer. Brad adds that the committee is going to be working on this survey for a while and potentially going back and editing it to get more responses. He also recommended having the committee take it as an initial response. Elliot said he and Maria had discussed sending it out to amenable groups such as Hingham Net Zero. Bob recommended sending it to the Conservation Commission and seeing what their reaction is. Ginny adds that the survey has multiple 'outs' already such as 'other', 'I don't have any concerns', 'this doesn't affect me', etc. Maria says she agrees with Brad on the idea of approving the survey and then sending it out soon to test. Elliot added that Ginny will incorporate the survey and changes into Survey Monkey and then send out a link. Bob then said he will send it to the Conservation Commission.

Brad asked if there was any further discussion on the survey. Following no response, Brad asked if there was a motion to approve the survey. Bob moved to approve the survey. Elliot seconded the motion. Brad moved the motion to a roll call vote which was passed unanimously.

e. Date and objectives for a public meeting to be held on or about the end of June as part of the public engagement process

Brad introduces the next agenda item of choosing the CAPC's first public meeting for the CAP. Brad asks Energyzt if they have any recommendations. Ginny recommends that the public meeting be scheduled for the later part of June that there is enough time to notify the public about the meeting. Depending on everyone's schedule, Ginny recommends the week of the 13th

or the week of the 20th. Brad adds that even the 13th may be challenging at this point because in addition to picking the dates, the committee will need to come to an agreement as to what the public meeting is going to look like. He contemplated whether it would be a zoom engagement session with polling questions or online commentary or physically at Town Hall and potentially mimicking the Master Planning Commission meeting with dedicated tables, whiteboards, and small group discussions, or a Town Hall with small group discussion and white boards.

Maria asked if the committee can discuss next meetings for the CAPC now to inform when the public meeting can be. Brad said that there was a proposal presented by Energyzt that was a robust outline of when the committee should meet. That schedule was a minimum of every two weeks for the time being. Looking at just two weeks, the next meeting would be June 8th. There may be a need for additional meetings before the public meeting.

Tanya mentioned that there are multiple types of public meetings such as having the Chamber of Commerce or key people in the community to join a moderated session with working groups. The first public meeting is not necessarily going to be a large-scale, robust, Town-hall style meeting. Tanya recommends a 'big hurrah' of a meeting taking place after the summer, likely in September when there are more targets to discuss. Kathy agrees that this time of year is going to be difficult to get attention for. If people are invited specifically to come to something, it is more likely to get people to come. Brad agrees and says that he is hesitant to invite people to a meeting since he does not know what he is inviting them to.

Bob reflects on his experience and says that until people understand what we are talking about and that the CAPC exists, there needs to be some initial outreach to inform people as to what the CAPC is doing. He says that we need to engage whoever shows up so that they have a meaningful understanding of the context.

Elliot says he hopes the committee meets again on June 8th and recommends the meeting be closer to the end of the month. Bob suggested moving the public meeting to the beginning of the following month. Elliot said that the further they push the meeting, the further it may push into vacation time. Tanya recommends bringing the 'friendly' groups together and putting them to work on the four categories. This will make them a part of the process, voices heard, and allow CAPC to prepare for what advocates and naysayers may think and then see both sides by the time a future, large meeting takes place in the fall for final public feedback.

Elliot added that Hingham Net Zero is doing a live strategy meeting on Saturday, June 11th and this may be an opportunity to work together. John Borger added that there is always advisement to prep as much as possible before engaging the entire public, and he agrees with Tanya that drawing on known groups to work out the 'bugs' could be a good idea. He also pointed out that some people have no idea this is all going on, so public education has to be a big part of this. Otherwise, it will be the 'usual suspects' who show up. There needs to be widespread presence and generate buzz around this to attract a large number of people who want to participate.

Ginny mentioned that something to consider is the last day of public schools. Maria said it is June 24th. Ginny recommended CAPC do something before that- potentially June 21st or 22nd.

Some strategies in advance of the meeting could be flyers that encourage people to attend the forum and provide feedback.

Kathy mentioned that there are other groups outside of Hingham Net Zero that are not completely oblivious to the CAP but they are not completely focused on it either. Examples given were the Hingham Garden Club and the Conservation Trust. These groups would 'bulk up' available options. Maria added that CAPC can utilize a list of groups that has been curated to see who beyond HNZ is a 'friendly'. For dates, Maria recommended the week of the 13th due to holidays, school conflicts, etc. She does not believe there would be a huge response after this week. Bob added that people do not know what net-zero means, and that is why the issue of education is how CAPC can bring people together.

Brad called for any other thoughts on this subject. Following no-response, Brad asked for a show of hands of those who are available on June 1st. Ginny, Tanya, Maria, Kathy, Gary, and John were available. Elliot, Maria, Ginny, Tom, Beth, John, and (maybe) Kathy were available for June 8th. Brad recommends the next CAPC meeting to be Wednesday, June 1st for the CAPC to discuss further communication on the first public meeting further.

Brad continues on to say that since CAPC typically meets on Wednesday due to availability and other Town obligations conflicting with other nights, so Wednesday June 15th may be the next best date to hold a public meeting. Elliot says that HNZs general meeting will be taking place that evening. John further elaborates that HNZ is having a strategy meeting the Saturday prior to determine where they should go next. HNZ may be amenable to engaging with CAPC on the 15th rather than holding its general meeting that week. Kathy asked if CAPC wants to advertise this as a joint meeting and then include some targeted invitations. John adds that all of the constituencies that Maria listed earlier would have an interest. Elliot agrees with Kathy that a joint meeting would bode well and he believes it would be a good opportunity for HNZ to share the results of their strategy session. Tanya adds that bringing friendly groups together is a good idea and the public may come in more as 'observers' in this particular case.

Brad says that in light of things, the session will likely be on Zoom. John mentions that CAPC could conduct the meeting in-person, zoom, or hybrid. Elliot asked John if he would run this by HNZ, and John says he will write up an email to send out the following morning. He adds that HNZs current mission is to support HMLP and CAPC as primary institutions in the Town that are pursuing climate action.

Vote on whether to endorse the Property Assessed Clean Energy (PACE) Financing program, which was reviewed at the April 27, 2022 meeting

Brad asks Brianna Bennett from the Hingham Municipal Light Plant (HMLP) if the committee can delay discussion on the PACE program to June 1st due to a lack of time. Brianna said that it will be fine if the committee delays until their next meeting and provides a brief update that the PACE program has been endorsed by the Energy Action Committee and Municipal Light Board since CAPC's last meeting.

Updates from the work of the various Working Groups created by the Committee

This topic is not discussed this evening due to a lack of time.

Review of the previous meeting's minutes

Brad asks if everyone had a chance to review the minutes in advance of the meeting and if there are any questions to discuss. Upon no response, Brad says they will postpone discussion and approval of the meeting minutes until the next CAPC meeting due to a lack of time.

Discussion of possible agenda items for the next meeting and scheduling of that meeting

Brad asked if there are any final comments before the meeting is adjourned. Bob asked that 'other business be added to the agenda for future meetings and Brad says he will do so.

The next CAPC meeting is scheduled for 7 PM, June 1, 2022. Meeting adjourned at 9:44 PM.

Respectfully submitted, Tom Morahan