



ENERGY AND CLIMATE COMMITTEE (ECC)

AGENDA

Monday, December 22, 2025

4:30 PM

City Hall, 2nd Floor Conference Room

Members:

Timothy Murphy, Chair
Paul Roth, Vice Chair
Maureen Nebenzahl
Gordon Leverage
Councilor Bryan Lake
Annu Joshi Bargale
Clair Oursler
Lisa Maxfield
Steven Larmon

Matthew Boulton, Alternate
Jake Pipp, Alternate
Chuck Redfern, Alternate
Rowland Russell, Alternate
Catherine Koning, Alternate

Staff:

Megan Fortson, Planner

1. **Call to Order and Roll Call**
2. **Approval of Minutes** – November 24, 2025
3. **Adoption of 2026 Meeting Schedule**
4. **C-PACER (Commercial Property Assessed Clean Energy & Resiliency) Program** – Continued Discussion
 - a. **Program Information:** <https://nhbfa.com/loans/c-pacer/>
5. **Work Group Report-outs**
 - a. Outreach
 - b. Policy
 - c. Resilience
6. **New Business**
7. **Next Meeting:** January 28, 2026 at 4:30 pm

City of Keene
New Hampshire

ENERGY AND CLIMATE COMMITTEE
MEETING MINUTES

Monday, November 24, 2025

4:30 PM

**2nd Floor Conference Room,
City Hall**

Members Present:

Tim Murphy, Chair
Paul Roth, Vice Chair
Councilor Bryan Lake
Maureen Nebenzahl
Steve Larmon
Lisa Maxfield
Gordon Leversee
Jake Pipp, Alternate (Voting)
Catherine Koning, Alternate (left at 5:36 PM;
Voting)
Matthew Boulton, Alternate (arrived at 4:33 PM;
Voting)

Staff Present:

Megan Fortson, Planner

Members Not Present:

Annu Joshi Bargale
Clair Oursler
Rowland Russell, Alternate
Charles Redfern, Alternate

1) Call to Order and Roll Call

Chair Murphy called the meeting to order at 4:32 PM.

Members of the public were present: Rachel Ranelli of the Monadnock Sustainability Hub and Bruce Norlund of Keene.

2) Approval of Minutes – October 22, 2025

Revisions: Lines 137–138, clarify that Carolyn Jones helped to run the ButtonUp event in 2024 and Dr. Leversee helped to run the 2025 event. Line 365, change “medium solar array” to “medium-scale solar array.”

A motion by Councilor Lake to adopt the October 22, 2025 meeting minutes as amended was duly seconded by Dr. Larmon and the motion carried unanimously.

25
26 **3) Commercial Property Assessed Clean Energy & Resiliency (C-PACER) Program –**
27 **Update**
28

29 City Planner Megan Fortson explained that this relatively new program in New Hampshire would
30 have to be adopted by the City Council through an ordinance process to before becoming available
31 to community members. Ms. Fortson hoped that either Frank Richter or Sarah Brock from Clean
32 Energy New Hampshire would attend the December 2025 Energy and Climate Committee (ECC)
33 meeting (in person or remotely) for a brief overview and to answer questions. Ms. Fortson said that
34 if the ECC wanted to pursue the whole ordinance process, it would take a few months to go through
35 City Council. She said there would be more to come.

36
37 Mr. Pipp appreciated the links to the webinar recording and called the C-PACER Program straight
38 forward and well presented. He thought the ECC should encourage the City Council to adopt it in
39 Keene. Mr. Pipp said it did not seem like there were drawbacks if anyone wanted to use it as a tool
40 on any future projects.

41
42 Chair Murphy said C-PACER seemed like something this Committee might be able to work with
43 because it exists already and the experts from Clean Energy New Hampshire could potentially fill
44 in the gaps. Then, he said it would ultimately move toward the ECC recommending the C-PACER
45 Program to City Council, which is partly why Chair Murphy thought the ECC exists. Ms. Fortson
46 agreed.

47
48 Councilor Lake noticed a lot of agreement about the C-PACER Program from the Committee. He
49 mentioned recently attending the monthly New Hampshire Energy Committee work group call, at
50 which Sarah Brock from Clean Energy New Hampshire provided another overview of C-PACER
51 and answered questions from that group. Councilor Lake said the Program was well received by the
52 New Hampshire Energy Committee work group. He said Ms. Brock mentioned knowing that Keene
53 was working on C-PACER and noted that it could be the first municipality in New Hampshire to
54 implement it. Based on Ms. Brock's comments and the ECC's indications of agreement, Councilor
55 Lake wondered if the ECC wanted the extra time for the experts to present in December or if the
56 Committee had reviewed the materials and felt comfortable moving forward with a recommendation
57 at this meeting. He added that Ms. Brock and Mr. Richter are very busy, so if not necessary to have
58 them come, he would hate to take up their time. Councilor Lake also did not want to rush the
59 Committee if others felt they needed the month to ask more questions.

60
61 Mr. Pipp said that in thinking back to his earlier comments, he was in favor of making a
62 recommendation to Council (i.e., now), stating that whenever this happens it should come as a
63 recommendation from the whole ECC. He did not want to rush anyone who still had questions
64 though. However, he added the next ECC meeting was scheduled on December 22, 2025, when the
65 Committee might struggle to establish a quorum right before a holiday and might not be able to
66 secure Ms. Brock's and Mr. Richter's attendance. Ms. Fortson said it sounded like they would be
67 available.

Dr. Larmon said that between the notes and listening to others, he did not see a downside to the Program as another source of funding that might make projects feasible. He asked if anyone knew of a downside or a reason to wait and bring in Ms. Brock and Mr. Richter. Dr. Larmon felt like he knew more about the C-PACER Program this month compared to in October and was unsure what questions he would have for the speakers in December. It seemed to him like a good Program available to the City and Dr. Larmon thought the Committee should move ahead. He asked if anyone else had learned of any downsides. Vice Chair Roth said he also received the presentation and did not see a downside. Councilor Lake said he specifically asked Ms. Brock about downsides because this would be discussed amongst the City Council and that she was hard pressed to come up with anything. She only suggested that maybe the municipality would have to take on a burden of managing the plan, but that is easily disputable because the municipality has to do very little and the state really manages the plan.

Councilor Lake also felt like it was a “no brainer,” but acknowledged there was something the Committee could be missing. He said the C-PACER Program is not a new one, with many states across the nation having similar programs. Councilor Lake said the only issues had been municipalities taking on the actual burden of human implementation. Dr. Larmon said that if nobody on the Committee saw a downside, there could be an advantage to trying to get involved early because of the funding that might be available; he thought that may be a reason for the Committee to move ahead. Otherwise, that advantage could be delayed for a few more months due to the timing of Committee meetings around the holidays.

Vice Chair Roth noted that *towns* have to vote on whether to implement the C-PACER Program, but *cities* do not, so Keene has an advantage of not having to put it up for a citywide vote. Chair Murphy said that while a town like Dublin would require a whole Town Meeting vote, the Keene City Council could approve the C-PACER Program by ordinance. Vice Chair Roth agreed, calling it a significant difference.

Chair Murphy heard a lot of favorable comments from the Committee and really appreciated the enthusiasm. For the sake of conversation and discussion, he presented a counterpoint. He said the C-PACER Program was new to New Hampshire, with no municipality having adopted an ordinance for it, although it is a tried-and-true Program in approximately 35 other states. However, if the ECC were to discuss it with the City Council and be put on the spot, Chair Murphy wondered if the Committee would be in a better position to have done its due diligence and be able to say it had an audience with a state-level agency, like Clean Energy NH or the NH Business Finance Authority (NHBFA), which administers the C-PACER Program; NHBFA works with commercial lenders make the Program work. Chair Murphy said he had not spoken with NHBFA or heard from it specifically other than the pitch at the webinar. He presented the question for the sake of conversation: If able to tick off boxes about what the Committee did for due diligence, would it be in a better position to send a recommendation to Council?

Dr. Koning felt better waiting until December to make the recommendation because she still needed more information and would be more comfortable having that before voting. She was in favor of a presentation by Mr. Richter or getting more information herself.

Councilor Lake thought that if there was any desire from the Committee to wait and Ms. Fortson was confident that Ms. Brock and/or Mr. Richter could attend the December meeting, then the Committee should discuss it more and decide next steps in December. Chair Murphy appreciated the enthusiasm because it sounded like a positive program and just one more tool that Keene was not currently offering. He thought the Committee could have more peace of mind about being in a better spot by having done its homework. Additionally, in anticipation of the visit from Ms. Brock and/or Mr. Richter, Chair Murphy asked the Committee members to do individual homework considering the potential downsides and any other questions they might have about the C-PACER Program for a robust conversation in December. Chair Murphy thought the Committee would be better prepared to collectively answer any questions that come from the City Council.

Ms. Fortson noted that the loan is secured through a special assessment of the property and she was unsure whether that would happen at the local level or at the state level by NHBFA hiring a third party. So, Ms. Fortson thought the potential biggest question was whether C-PACER would create more work for Keene's Assessing Department. Otherwise, she thought it seemed like a pretty great opportunity.

Discussion also ensued about which Committee members planned to attend the December for the purposes of ensuring a quorum. The December meeting was moved from its normal Wednesday date to Monday, December 22, 2025 because of the Christmas holiday. Mr. Pipp inquired about the ability for Committee members to attend remotely because of the meeting date's proximity to the holiday. Ms. Fortson said members are allowed to attend remotely with the Chair's prior approval, but a quorum (six members of the ECC) still must be physically present at the meeting location to hold a meeting. Chair Murphy said he did not see a reason why not to allow that plan, especially under the circumstances, unless the prevailing sentiment of the group at the time is that they do not want those participating remotely to have voting privileges. Chair Murphy thought everyone was feeling good about this program and wanted to understand some of the intricacies it had not yet.

Mr. Boulton noted that since the Committee's ultimate recommendation would come in the form of a letter to Council, another advantage to this course of action could be strengthening that letter based on the conversation with the guests in December. Chair Murphy agreed that the letter could address things like special assessment responsibility and Committee members' individual questions.

Mr. Boulton initiated discussion of how, with the excitement around this Program, there might be a strategy to intelligently expedite this through the City process once the Committee recommends it to City Council. For example, what are the next steps if the Committee approves the recommendation to City Council? Ms. Nebenzahl said the C-PACER webinar recommended having a template for the ordinance in advance, so she thought the Committee might want to discuss that further. Chair Murphy asked about the process. Councilor Lake explained the multi-week City Council process:

- Week 0: The ECC would submit a letter to the City Council, recommending adoption of the C-PACER Program ordinance. The Committee could attach the example ordinance the state provided for the City Attorney to review and build in the City's details.
- Week 1: At a City Council meeting, the Mayor would refer the C-PACER Program to a City Council Standing Committee for some amount of action.
- Weeks 2–6: That Standing Committee would probably recommend the City Attorney write an ordinance for the next Council meeting, one to two weeks later. That Ordinance would return to the Standing Committee again for public input, before final presentation to Council for adoption.

Chair Murphy thought it would be valuable to include the sample ordinance with the Committee's recommendation. He asked Ms. Fortson to send the sample to the Committee for its review and Ms. Fortson agreed. She added that Councilor Lake described the typical ordinance process, but she could also potentially first see the City Council authorizing the City Manager to have Community Development Department staff prepare an Ordinance, which would go through a very similar process. Community Development Staff would make any necessary changes to the ordinance, review it with the City Attorney, and review it with any relevant parties (in this case, probably the Assessing Department). Ms. Fortson said she would follow up with Senior Planner Mari Brunner to see what pathway she envisioned.

Discussion ensued about when "Week 0" might occur in December 2025/January 2026. Mr. Pipp asked how far in advance of a City Council meeting the letter would need to be submitted. Councilor Lake was unsure if there would be a formal City Council meeting to address this matter on Thursday, January 1, 2026 during or after the City Council's Inauguration or if the matter would wait until the Council's January 15, 2026 regular meeting. He was unsure how far in advance the letter needed to be submitted to the Council, but he anticipated just a few days prior. Chair Murphy asked how Community Development's role with the Ordinance, if at all, could affect the schedule Councilor Lake outlined. Ms. Fortson said it would depend, and she did not want to commit, but she envisioned it going one of two ways: (1) sometimes staff internally generate ordinance applications, which means that Community Development staff would submit it to the City Clerk's office and go through the same process as if the ECC were submitting it; or (2) the ECC would submit a letter to Council, the Council's would provide feedback on whether it wants to move forward with a C-PACER ordinance, and then have the Community Development Department work on an ordinance. She said that if the Council would want to review the Program before directing anybody to start working on an actual ordinance, it would be a longer process. Chair Murphy asked Ms. Fortson to report more on that process at the December meeting. Ms. Fortson agreed, noting she would consult the Senior Planner to confirm all the steps.

Dr. Leversee thought that if the Council approved of a C-PACER ordinance, they might ask about the practical benefits of moving expeditiously versus a more measured manner. In terms of money. He was unsure whether there was a good answer to that question.

Mr. Boulton pointed out that December 22nd–January 1st are not famously productive days and suggested the Committee plan how it would accomplish its letter to City Council. Discussion ensued. When distributing the sample Ordinance to the Committee, Chair Murphy also asked Ms. Fortson to share a few sample letters from the ECC to City Council recommending anything from the past.

Dr. Larmon wondered if Chair Murphy and Ms. Fortson could work on drafting a letter in advance of the December 22nd ECC meeting. Dr. Larmon did not think it needed to be a complicated letter, just one telling the Council that the ECC thinks this is a really important Program and recommends it be adopted into City Code through the Ordinance process. Chair Murphy was open to that recommendation, but having never seen draft letters to Council, he still requested that Ms. Fortson send some samples along with the sample ordinance. Mr. Pipp volunteered to start drafting the letter to Council if Ms. Fortson could provide sample letters from past recommendations.

Chair Murphy thanked the Committee members for their enthusiasm.

4) 2026 Energy Fair – Collaboration with the Monadnock Sustainability Hub

Dr. Koning said she was wearing both hats at this time as a member of both the ECC and Monadnock Sustainability Hub Board, and she reported on the 2026 Monadnock Clean Energy Fair in Keene. Every other year it is in Peterborough. Dr. Koning noted that every year the Fair had been in Keene, it had been at a different location. Most recently, it was held at the Dillant-Hopkins Airport and some individuals were unhappy with the outcomes of the event. Dr. Koning said the ECC's Outreach Work Group discussed how the Energy Fair could be an environmental wing of the City of Keene's annual Pride event, which attracts a lot of people. She noted a potential disadvantage was discussed, like attracting a lot of people who are not from Keene, so it might not be the best possibility. Dr. Koning said other ideas for the 2026 location included the Keene Recreation Center and the Keene Ice Arena. She noted that the Monadnock Sustainability Hub was seeking confirmation as to whether the ECC would be a co-sponsor and was also trying to figure out where the event would be held. Dr. Koning introduced Monadnock Sustainability Hub's Program Manager, Rachel Ranelli.

Ms. Ranelli said that for the previous year the event was in Keene, one of the problems was not having a strong partner organization; when the event is in Peterborough, the Monadnock Sustainability Hub works with Peterborough Renewable Energy Project (PREP). Ms. Ranelli said the Monadnock Sustainability Hub would be very grateful to have the Keene Energy and Climate Committee as a partner, in addition to hopefully the Clean Energy Team, for the 2026 Energy Fair. Ms. Ranelli explained that a big lift for the event would be calling contractors but that would not start until summer 2026, and she was unsure how much she would ask the ECC to do that work. Dr. Koning asked if Ms. Ranelli would be in the role of Program Manager again for the 2026 Fair and Ms. Ranelli said yes. Ms. Ranelli said the 2025 event was great. There were 26 exhibitors total.

Dr. Koning said the Energy Fair has vendors trying to sell products (e.g., heat pumps), solicit clients, and more. She said it is a little less focused on climate specifically, but definitely focused on clean energy. Dr. Koning asked the Committee as a group whether it wanted to co-sponsor the 2026

Energy Fair and if Committee members had any thoughts on venues. Ms. Ranelli noted that the Monadnock Sustainability Hub has the budget for the event, so no financial contributions would be requested from the ECC.

Ms. Maxfield provided some background, stating that the Monadnock Sustainability Hub does a wonderful job with this event. Ms. Nebenzahl wondered if the event could take place somewhere at Keene State College (KSC). She was unsure if there was an Environmental Club there, but thought there were at least environmental classes. Dr. Koning agreed it was a good idea. She thought it could be more expensive at KSC; she was recently a part of another group that hosted the Monadnock Region Natural History Conference there and it was expensive, in addition to challenges because of KSC staff cuts. Ms. Nebenzahl also suggested the Keene Family YMCA. Dr. Larmon was unsure how many people would come to Stonewall Farm, but suggested it as one of the places that would attract people for some other reasons. Ms. Maxfield noted one of the benefits of using the Keene Recreation Center or the Blastos Room at Keene Ice would be they are free to the ECC as a City Committee, which has a limited Budget of \$800 per year.

Mr. Pipp recalled the previous Fair having a very robust turnout of electric vehicles (EVs) on display and the owners available to talk about them. He thought it would make sense to choose a venue with sufficient parking lot space to display the EVs in addition to attendance parking. Mr. Pipp thought the Recreation Center might be too small for that purpose and thought Keene Ice was more interesting. Councilor Lake thought the Recreation Center was interesting for different reasons and thought people would have to park down Washington Street, which would get complicated. He wondered if the Blastos Room would have enough space or if the whole event would have to be outside. Whereas he felt like the Recreation Center always had enough space for fairs and Washington Street would have plenty of visibility. Councilor Lake acknowledged that there is less parking at the Recreation Center. Ms. Maxfield recalled attending a job fair at the Blastos Room with more than 20 booths, so she did not think inside space would be an issue there. Dr. Koning was familiar with workshops in the Blastos Room. Dr. Koning noted the Fair also has workshops, so there would need to be one large room for vendors and some smaller classroom-type spaces. She was unsure whether that excluded Keene Ice .

Chair Murphy heard good feedback about the venue, but thought a vote on whether the ECC should co-sponsor the 2026 Energy Fair should happen separately. He also wondered about a timeline; the sooner the venue was decided, the sooner negotiations and planning could start. He asked if there was a point on the calendar by which the venue should be selected. Ms. Ranelli said in 2025, noting it would be confirmed by January. She thought it would depend on the venue's availability for a Saturday event.

Chair Murphy asked how the ECC felt about co-sponsoring the 2026 Monadnock Clean Energy Fair in Keene. He was unsure whether the Committee should formally vote on participation and Ms. Forton thought a vote recommending co-sponsorship would be appropriate. Chair Murphy repeated the description of the Fair. Mr. Pipp asked if the ECC co-sponsored the Fair last year. Vice Chair Roth replied that the last time the ECC co-sponsored was when the Energy Fair was at the Dillant-

Hopkins Airport. Chair Murphy asked if anyone was apprehensive about co-sponsoring. Since the ECC had co-sponsored before, the Chair thought it sounded like the Committee was generally comfortable and open to partnering with the Monadnock Sustainability Hub.

Mr. Pipp made the following motion, which was duly seconded by Ms. Maxfield. On a vote of 8 to 0, the Energy and Climate Committee voted to co-sponsor the 2026 Monadnock Clean Energy Fair in Keene with the Monadnock Sustainability Hub. Dr. Koning and Mr. Boulton abstained from the vote.

Mr. Boulton inquired about the availability of Keene Recreation Center and Keene ICE for the September 2026 date as a next step. Chair Murphy agreed that having that information at the December 2025 meeting would help to tip the scales because Ms. Ranelli mentioned confirming a venue by January. Vice Chair Roth wondered if any weekend in September would be advisable based on conflicts in the City and asked Ms. Fortson to consult the City Calendar. Ms. Maxfield noted the Fair is usually a very specific weekend around Energy Week, which is usually the last week in September. So, she recommended the last Saturday in September.

5) Statistics from Eversource's 2021 & 2025 "Main Streets" Events

Ms. Fortson recalled the Committee requesting more statistics from Eversource's 2021 and 2025 "Main Streets" Events. She contacted Eversource to request more specific information related to both their 2021 & 2025 Main Streets Events. Ms. Fortson reported that at this time in 2025, Eversource had 12 projects underway in Keene, six projects were pre-approved (compared to three in 2021), and they completed 54 site visits in the City in 2025. She said Eversource puts information into their system and it then goes through a review process for approval. Ms. Fortson reported that LED lighting and controls were a heavily represented proposed change, followed by a few proposed refrigeration improvements for local restaurants. Eversource was unable to provide specific data on who was taking advantage of the program. They noted in 2021 (the last event), they did not categorize their data in the same way, so it was difficult to pull statistics from that event. Ms. Fortson said Eversource roughly compared numbers between the two events and noted that they had a lot more success with the 2025 event than they did in 2021.

Dr. Larmon said it did not sound like there was any better information than maybe having doubled the number of pre-approved projects (from three in 2021 to six in 2025). He asked if that was a fair assessment or if there were any other statistics the ECC could access from Eversource. Ms. Fortson replied that for 2021 in Keene, Eversource reported 13 project records, representing work done for nine individual customers. For 2025, Eversource reported 12 project records on file, but Ms. Fortson was unsure how many individual customers those projects represented. Ms. Maxfield said that from her perspective, working for an energy auditing company, a 20% response rate is amazing and noted that it is usually closer to 10%. Ms. Nebenzahl thought timing was also likely a factor, assuming a big difference between 2021 and 2025, noting 2021 was still during the pandemic. She was glad to see the increase. Ms. Maxfield added that 2021 was the first year Eversource did the Event, and a lot was based on word of mouth.

Dr. Leversee recalled that the ECC essentially “blessed” Eversource moving forward with these Events in Keene and asked if there was a more active role the Committee should have. Ms. Fortson said no, it is a project completed by Eversource, NHSaves, and Liberty Utilities. The ECC has no responsibility. The City would advertise the Events on its social media as with other projects. If hoping for continued improvement in the Events over the coming years, Dr. Leversee wondered if there was a way the ECC could add value. For example, he thought the Committee was a little concerned with not knowing how Eversource was getting the word out. He asked if the Committee was happy with how things were going or wanted to look at adding value to the next Event.

Ms. Fortson was unsure of the exact timing of their next Event in Keene and said Eversource would reach out a few months ahead of time to notify similarly to how they had for this year’s event; she thought Eversource could probably have a discussion with the ECC. She thought the biggest thing Eversource would be looking for that the ECC could provide the next time would be the City Seal because in 2021, Eversource sent a letter with the City Manager’s signature and the Seal. Now, the City has an official logo, which could help to provide City brand recognition to show legitimacy of the program.

Dr. Larmon wondered if the value added was simply the City’s buy-in to the program. He wondered if the ECC should send Eversource a letter congratulating them on the increasing number of projects and the Committee’s hope that it will continue; could that create more interest from Eversource? Ms. Fortson thought she had effectively done that in her emails with Eversource, communicating that the community was very excited to participate, and the ECC was very interested in program specifics. It was completely up to the Committee whether to write a further letter to Eversource.

Chair Murphy asked if there was a risk that Eversource would not return to Keene for the project, in which case a letter like Dr. Larmon suggested could put the City in a better position. Chair Murphy noted that something like the C-PACER Program—discussed earlier in the meeting, if approved by the City Council—could be joined with further Eversource Main Streets Events. Dr. Larmon was curious why there was the gap between 2021 and 2025. Vice Chair Roth asked if Eversource provided data on any other communities where it had been doing these Events. Ms. Fortson did not have statistics on other communities.

She knew Eversource ran a program in Manchester, New Hampshire in 2025, but did not know the success rates or number of projects approved. Vice Chair Roth wondered if there was anything other communities were doing to add value to or encourage Eversource’s Events. Ms. Nebenzahl agreed with Dr. Larmon that a proactive letter from the ECC to Eversource communicating support would not hurt. Ms. Nebenzahl said a letter might get Eversource to agendize Keene as a priority to pursue. Chair Murphy appreciated all the feedback and thanked Ms. Fortson for reporting back to the Committee.

6) Work Group Report-Outs
A) Outreach

Dr. Koning reported that the ButtonUp Workshop on November 5, 2025 at the Keene Recreation Center went really well for the Outreach Work Group.

B) Policy

Councilor Lake reported that the Policy Work Group (which includes himself, Mr. Boulton, and Ms. Nebenzahl) met with Senior Planner, Mari Brunner, about the Sustainability Coordinator position. The Work Group provided more feedback from the last few ECC meetings. Councilor Lake said Ms. Brunner already had a pretty thoroughly built-out job description, with requirements and everything, and would see how she could integrate the ECC's feedback and produce a revision. Councilor Lake told her the Committee could review the description again if City staff wanted feedback.

Councilor Lake discussed timing. Ms. Brunner would need to get the completed job description to Human Resources, who has evaluate which pay grade it will align with. Ms. Brunner had reviewed many examples from other communities around New Hampshire to build the job description and Councilor Lake said she was doing a great job. Councilor Lake said the position would go into the City's next Operating Budget process for Fiscal Year 2027–2028, which would appear before the City Council for approval in approximately May 2026. So, all the planning, including the funding, would need to be wrapped up by May 2026. Councilor Lake said there had been discussions about split funding for the first three years (a private-public kind of partnership) and it would need to be determined how to fund it past those three years. If the ECC wanted to write a letter if support to City Council, recommending that they create the Sustainability Coordinator position, Councilor Lake suggested submitting it in April 2026 once more of the financing was solidified.

Ms. Nebenzahl added that the Work Group decided with Ms. Brunner that the Sustainability Coordinator position would be full-time. Chair Murphy added that the position would not be combined with another subject matter area of an existing City job, like economic development; this position would solely focus on sustainability. Ms. Nebenzahl agreed.

Regarding split funding, Mr. Boulton said he and Dr. Koning had good leads on the private donation portion of the three-part split: private, local businesses, and the City. Before the December meeting, Mr. Boulton asked the Committee to consider recommendations for local businesses he and Dr. Koning should contact.

For context, Ms. Fortson noted that her understanding at this time is that the ECC was now less responsible for creating an actual job scope, since that was being done within the Community Development and Human Resources Departments. She thought the next steps for the ECC would be (1) specific individual tasks related to securing funding; (2) drafting the letter to Council either from either the Policy Work Group, the Chair, or the ECC as a whole in time for the April 2026 meeting; and (3) having an ECC representative attend the Council's Budget hearing. So, Ms. Forston did not think this was an urgent item for the ECC to handle, but rather something the City Manager would include in the Council's draft budget proposal, as Councilor Lake reported, and that timing took a

little bit of pressure from this Committee. Mr. Boulton said he would take that pressure and put it into the funding ideas Committee members would bring to the December meeting.

Ms. Nebenzahl suggested contacting the Chamber of Commerce; she wondered if a letter of support could help with donations from local businesses for the Sustainability Coordinator position. Mr. Boulton thought perhaps so. Dr. Koning noted that Zach Luse was no longer as active with the Committee as when he was first confident that he could secure funding. She said the Committee would need more help figuring out which businesses to approach. Chair Murphy agreed. Dr. Koning thought that if she were a City Councilor right now, she would be noticing the donations this year and wondering if those same donations would happen again the next year; she called it a bit of a risk for the City.

Chair Murphy appreciated Ms. Fortson's update and clarifications because it seemed like the Committee was on a different timeline trajectory. He asked about agendizing this. Ms. Fortson suggested waiting to agendize this item for the committee to discuss until March or April 2026. She noted that Councilor Lake was doing a great job coordinating, along with the other Policy Work Group members. Ms. Fortson and the Work Group would keep the Committee apprised.

Dr. Koning left the meeting.

C) Resilience

Chair Murphy reported that the Resilience Work Group had an email meeting in October to continue identifying candidate subject matter area topics the Work Group feels need to be vetted in order to arrive at a manageable number of topics. He said it was a good problem to have a lot of topics to choose from, so the Work Group was homing in on the timeliest and those they could manage most effectively. Chair Murphy said it was unclear when the Resilience Work Group would meet in December or January, but the conversation continued (member of the public, Carolyn Sweet, who helped with Resilience Work Group scheduling, was absent).

Vice Chair Roth reported the list of subject matter area topics at present: flooding, Ice storms, wind, wildfire, local fire damage, air quality, drought impact on food, increased fire risk, loss of power, small particulate air pollution, high heat days, vector-borne disease, Lyme Disease, West Nile Virus, Eastern Equine Encephalitis, invasive species, impacts on agriculture/forestry/ecosystems, loss of biodiversity, and the psychological impacts of climate change (especially on youth). Vice Chair Roth said that it was the working list the Resilience Work Group needed to pare down.

7) New Business

Ms. Maxfield noted that a huge force in the clean energy community had stepped back from the Clean Energy Team after 40–50 years. This important citizen had also attended all the ECC's meetings and was in a Work Group. Ms. Maxfield suggested that the ECC recommend a formal recognition from the City of Keene. Ms. Maxfield said this person passed a wealth of information

down to many ECC members, so the ECC could not be doing its work without them. Chair Murphy agreed. Ms. Fortson explained that the City has Proclamations—official recognition by the Mayor during a City Council meeting. Ms. Fortson offered to look into the process and report at the December meeting.

Mr. Boulton noted that recognition is very powerful tool and it struck him that the ECC could consider achieving its mission as a Committee by recognizing both individuals and businesses that show leadership in the community; perhaps press coverage and/or a prize of some kind. Mr. Boulton said one way that communities such as Keene get their work done is by thanking and recognizing people.

8) Next Meeting: Monday, December 22, 2025 at 4:30 PM

Ms. Nebenzahl planned to attend the December remotely. Chair Murphy did not want remote participation to become the norm, however, noting something tangible in bringing everyone together. Ms. Fortson encouraged the Committee to review its Rules of Procedure for remote participation. Remote participation requires some extenuating circumstance (e.g., travel or illness). Other members should confirm remote participation via email with Chair Murphy and Ms. Fortson, knowing all emails are subject to the Right-to-Know Law, RSA 91-A.

9) Adjournment

There being no further business, Chair Murphy adjourned the meeting at 5:45 PM.

Respectfully submitted by,
Katie Kibler, Minute Taker

Reviewed and edited by,
Megan A. Fortson, Planner



Energy & Climate Committee

2026 Meeting Schedule

Meetings are generally held on the fourth Wednesday of each month at 4:30 pm in the City Hall 2nd Floor Conference Room.*

Wednesday, January 28

Wednesday, February 25

Wednesday, March 25

Wednesday, April 22

Wednesday, May 27

Wednesday, June 24

Wednesday, July 22

Wednesday, August 26

Wednesday, September 23

Wednesday, October 28

Monday, November 23

Monday, December 21

*Meeting dates, times, and location are subject to change.