



MEETING MINUTES

DATE: June 29, 2022

PLACE: Remote meeting via Zoom

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

MEMBERS ABSENT: Carlos DaSilva and Alyson Anderson

GUESTS: Brianna Bennett, Brenda Black, John Borger, Madison Collins, Virginia LeClair, and Tanya Bodell

ATTACHMENTS: Energyzt Road Map Document for Public Involvement

Chair opened meeting at 1907 hrs.

Chair read public notice with respect to the meeting being held remotely and meeting was being recorded. (Chapter 20 of acts of 2021)

1. Tanya Bodell & Virginia LeClair – Discuss status update of Greenhouse Gas Inventory:
 - a. Energyzt team presented a quarterly update June 28, 2022 to the Selectboard to advise the Town on the status of the carbon source inventory. The Selectboard seems very supportive of the effort. They look forward to hearing from the CAPC on a continuing basis.
 - b. The inventory task has developed basic information and the Energyzt team can proceed with developing supporting documentation.
 - c. John Malloy has looked at the CDC program and how it operates. He has identified the questions which must be addressed. The inventory asks for numbers only. Assumptions have been presented with respect to the questions and therefore there is a set of underlying assumptions for completing the inventory.
 - d. Energyzt will obtain certain Hingham specific data but will also rely on EPA generated information. There is data available for average, similar-sized towns such as Hingham. CAPC/Energyzt can use this data as well. There is also statewide data generated for comparative purposes which can be useful.
 - e. In response to a question from the committee about data collection and comparative analysis, Energyzt indicated that they will engage with other South Shore towns to provide the data collected and related inventory methodology to assure there is consistency in regional data. At this moment Hingham is ahead in methodology and data format of most of the South Shore towns. We should be able to establish the categories and methodologies.
 - f. Energyzt indicates that no magic bullet is available to obtain the necessary information required and a lot of work lies before the CAPC to collect and analyze the data.



- g. Questions from CAPC members and Attendees
 - i. (Madison Collins) How much of Hingham’s profile takes into account the affluence of the town and number of vehicles?
 - ii. Tanya: We can use statewide data and determine whether we see urban or rural emissions and miles traveled as an example.
 - iii. MC: I would like to know how you are computing carbon calculations?
 - iv. Tanya: we will let you know as we work through this. The availability of the underlying data will drive our method of calculation.
 - v. Brad: When do you think we could be in a position to have the committee make some basic decisions on numbers to use?
 - vi. Tanya: We are trying out the Transportation Section to see the effectiveness/reliability of the data and how we can use it once we determine the quality of available data.
- 2. Transportation Section: (Screen shared and Energyzt Transportation PowerPoint attached hereto) Tanya: The point of this transportation section is to look at the different approaches of analysis and feasibility that could be employed. We may put out a survey as to how feasible the various approaches are and make a decision for the approach to data development.
 - a. Nancy Wiley: You have pulled data on Hingham - oil v. gas on the buildings in Hingham.
 - b. Tanya: We have use of source on a square footage basis. We do not have usage by address. National Grid does not provide address specific data. We will need to look at the data and as long as the approach is consistent over time, we can determine use patterns. What type of recommendations this committee will make to the town is part of the effort of this overall study. There are several key areas of feasibility that must be addressed by the study.
 - c. Social Feasibility of our recommendations. What socially are people willing to do in order to achieve carbon reduction or neutrality.
 - d. Political feasibility – what are the political actions the town leaders are willing to do to accomplish carbon reduction goals.
 - e. Economic feasibility – For example, is it commercially feasible to use electric school buses even though Hingham citizens are willing to use such? How will these decisions be evaluated in terms of cost/benefit?
 - f. Brief Discussion of Breakout Sessions of the first public presentation of the CAPC held on June 15 and questions raised during the session:
 - i. Electric facility
 - ii. Automobile Alternatives
 - iii. Public Transportation and use of electric vehicles
 - g. Should these opportunities be promoted as feasible options for Hingham? Should Hingham have charging stations? Should Hingham have an electric vehicle municipal fleet? Should Hingham pursue grants for this carbon reduction effort and for such items as an electric school bus fleet or DPW work vehicles? Should there be charging stations in public and private parking areas? Should the Town favor vendors who use electric



vehicles for their transportation? Does the town want to provide an excise tax incentive for electric vehicles? Are these types of incentive options socially, politically or economically feasible in Hingham?

- h. Does Hingham want to support electric vehicle-based public transportation? Bus/Trolley to service “downtown” for example to and from South Hingham? How much range should such a service provide geographically?
- i. The questions in Sections G and H were raised in the first public presentation in Hingham and were preliminarily discussed in this meeting.
- j. Nancy Wiley: Has anyone else seen this power point presentation?
- k. Tanya: No.
- l. John Borger: Hingham is a harbor town. Many boats still use 2 cycle engines which are inefficient and polluting. Should the town recommend 4 cycle engines which are more energy efficient and less polluting? Do we want to mandate such a requirement?
- m. MC: What is the equity aspect of the economics of what we recommend?
- n. Tanya: Yes, there should be social equity taken into consideration. There are various social demographics that must be taken into consideration.
- o. Elliott: I am wondering – should we voice our opinions about these sections now?
- p. Tanya: Yes.
- q. Elliott: I have three points: 1) Yes, we need to cost out any of these options. 2) We want to chase grants and 3) In regard to electric vehicles and HAVC on residences, we need to focus on incentives for residents. Should there be reduced excise tax for electric vehicles? We need to go for the low hanging fruit.
- r. Bob H: We need to be really careful about our recommendations because not all recommendations are going to be fair across the demographics. Some may not find electric vehicles appropriate for their lifestyle. A reduction of the excise tax could be a penalty in a sense to those who cannot afford or cannot reasonably use electric vehicle technology at this moment.
- s. Tanya: We are trying to create a roadmap of how to proceed with these types of decisions.
- t. Brad: Public transport. There is public transport we have complete control of and then there are other systems such as the MBTA where we have no control. From your standpoint should we make such a distinction?
- u. Tanya: this is presently a reason to have this conversation to see how these distinctions will be evaluated. However, perhaps in any case we should make such distinctions.
- v. G T-D: should we break our data into three basic demographics such as younger people, middle age and the senior citizens? There are significant distinctions and needs between these populations.
- w. Tanya: We need to look at the buckets of the subject of transportation but as we get deeper, these demographic considerations need to be evaluated. These considerations should also take into account access to public transportation such as bike paths to public transportation sites as an example.
- x. MC: Is there an affordable housing requirement within certain distances from public



- transportation? What infrastructure requirements should be considered?
- y. G T-D: We should consider a public transport system from say S. Hingham to downtown.
 - z. Tanya: This is being considered but this is going to require a greater in-depth study.
 - aa. Elliott: This concept will require a demand for service study.
 - bb. Tanya: We do not need to provide all of the answers to questions raised. We can make recommendations that such transportation study be completed or other such studies as may be required. Part of this document is to give the town direction.
 - cc. Nancy: (The Hingham Industrial Development Committee): We need to make this public transport a key goal. At the HIDC we have discussed this quite a bit.
3. Tanya: Is there anything that anyone believes is a non-starter in this Transportation Section that should be removed or softened?
- a. Brad: We should probably not use the word “mandate” it is not a good word to use. For example, “Vendor Mandates” is probably an issue. This could be “vendor preference.” “Would Hingham give preferential treatment to vendors who use electric vehicles” might be a better way to publicly pose the question.
 - b. John Borger (HNZ): We should be a bit more specific with respect to recommendations such as going from 2 cycle outboard engines to 4 cycle engines. Perhaps this should be softened. We do not want to have “draconian mandates.”
 - c. Elliott: Mandates with respect to charging stations should be softened by increasing a number as opposed to mandate.
 - d. Tanya: Encourage increased charging stations....
 - e. General discussion of charging stations took place.
4. Next Steps - Tanya: Do we need to put out a survey to get feedback from the CAPC members?
- a. HRH: We should do a survey to confirm what we believe we have heard.
 - b. Elliott: Yes, we need to do a survey. There should be an assessment of the cost/benefits for the electric school busses.
 - c. Brad: We need to take the components of our work and do a survey to the public presentation. We should be over-inclusive in our surveys. We had very good attendance at our first public meeting. These attendees could form a base for completing a survey.
5. Tanya: This has been a very good session and we can firm up our buckets. Do the survey and then build an approach for all buckets of consideration.
6. Brad: Preliminary results of the public engagement meeting. (Ginny)
- a. We had 205 people take the survey.
 - b. Most survey responses took five minute to take.
 - c. General discussion of the survey and the fact that people have shown great concern about climate change, coastal flooding and higher temperatures. The cost of implementation had a high rating. Equitable issues had a high rating of concern.
7. Tanya: We should have a QR Code to put the survey results and survey on.
8. Brad:
- a. Public Engagement Meeting – very successful; we had 39 participants. Good input



- from attendees
- b. Breakout sessions were very productive.
 - c. John Borger: HNZ, we were very pleased with the public engagement session. One concern people wanted to pass along was that if the Committee could find a way to increase “quick hit” public information sessions such as a one-page write up issued before the sessions it would be very helpful to assist people to think about the matters prior to the public engagement meeting itself.
 - d. Brad: we need to determine the next date of the public information session in July and then provide people with an outline of the subjects to discuss.
9. Brad: Selectboard mtg June 28th, we need to continue the public dialogue and we wanted to set the stage that the Selectboard wanted to have work completed. We will need to have the issues that may require a Town Meeting action. We have strong support from the Selectboard.
10. Brad: Committee approving the outreach in the public arena. Public engagement is extremely important! How do we win hearts and minds to build public support? We have talked about various tools for outreach. We should generate content in publications. We need to think about this now. We should layout a series of topics we want to get out there in the public domain by end of July.
11. Approval of minutes:
- a. April 27th meeting minutes: Approved
 - b. May 25th meeting minutes: Approved
12. Brad: Is there any updates from the working groups?
- a. Elliott: We would like electric vehicles to participate in the July 4th parade. We would like committee members are welcome to join the parade.
13. Brad: Next meeting – July 13th
14. Brad: Public Engagement Mtg – TBD
15. Meeting ended 2106 hrs.

Respectfully submitted,
Bob Hidell