LARIMER COUNTY | ENVIRONMENTAL AND SCIENCE ADVISORY BOARD

P.O. Box 1190, Fort Collins, Colorado 80522-1190, 970.498.5738, Larimer.org

The role of the Advisory Board is to advise the Board of County Commissioners and appropriate departments on environmental and science-related issues that affect Larimer County.

MINUTES

Date: April 12th, 2022

Time: 6:00 – 9:00 p.m.

Location: Rm. 150 Carter Lake, 200 W. Oak Street, Fort Collins, CO and Virtual by Zoom

Contact: Shelley Bayard de Volo, sbayard@larimer.org or 970.498.5738

MEMBERS		STAFF		GUESTS
Rodger Ames	X	John Kefalas*	X	
Daniel Beveridge	X	Shelley Bayard de Volo¥	X	
John Bleem	X	Heidi Pruess§	X	
Jim Gerek - Chair	X			
Ted Hendrickx				
David Lehman	X			
Allyson Little	X			
Kirk Longstein– Vice-Chair	X			
Kaitlin Rainsberger	X			
George Rinker	X			
Travis Rounsaville	X			
Shelby Sommer	X			
Catriona Smith	X			
Katrina Winborn-Miller	X			
Chris Wood	X			

X = present; * = Commissioner Liaison; ǂ = Speaker; ¥ = ESAB Liaison; º = Facilities;
§ = Environmental and Sustainability Program; ᵠ = Fleet

Call to Order: 6:00 p.m.

1. **Amendments or additions to the agenda** – None
2. **Introduction of members, staff, and guests** – The members introduced themselves
3. **Public Comment** – No public comment.
4. **Discussion Items**

- Climate Smart Larimer County – Heidi discussed two items 1) The Climate Smart Engagement Summary and 2) the internal County Climate and Sustainability Draft Plan (*hereafter* Plan). She noted that the Plan is currently being reviewed by the County's Department heads and senior leadership teams.

The Climate Smart Engagement Summary is a summary of the Series-1 and Series-2 community engagement process, in which there were about 600 respondents. The focus of Series-1 was to get the pulse of the community on where people stand on the issue of climate change. The focus of Series-2 was to get feedback from the community of how they want to address climate change. In both cases the series included a questionnaire that allowed participants to express their opinions and concerns. The Engagement Summary synthesized the answers to the questionnaires and will be used to guide recommended actions that will be presented in a report to the BoCC this June.

The Engagement Summary used word clouds to show the relative strengths of the responses to questions. As well, participants were asked through a series of questions, how the County should take action in terms of advocacy, education, expenditure, incentive, partnership and rule change. One observation from compiling the participant data from the outreach efforts was there was a low rate of participation from underserved communities and youth. Recommendations included continuing community engagement into the summer months when there is more opportunity for outdoor in-person events.

Heidi then went through the Plan, which she referred to as the "Walk-the-Talk" Plan because it's focused on how the County's own operations will engage in sustainability and climate action, as well as how County services, codes and regulations can better align with the goals of sustainability. This Plan has morphed from the CSLC Framework in that instead of focusing on the seven County service areas, it is based on four overarching areas:

- Buildings, Energy, Waste and Economy
- Mobility, Delivery, and Information Services
- Natural Areas, Working Lands, Water and Wildlife
- Wellbeing and Resilience

Extending over and throughout all four areas is Leadership – Collaboration, Education, Equity, Diversity, and Inclusion. Heidi then went through some of the goals and noted that some had short term (3 years) timeframes where others were long term (20 year). She also noted that each focus area was not "owned" by only one department, but rather several different departments would be responsible for implementation. Some questions that members had included: How would implementation by multiple departments work? Would one department be the lead? How would funding work? Some noted that Heidi should consider goals that have a mid-range time frame as there is a lot of time between the short and long-term timeframes.

Heidi ended with a request that ESAB members provide feedback on the Plan, ideally by the end of April. Jim noted that the ESAB could not provide a consolidated response by the end of April because it would have to be developed, reviewed, and then approved by vote at the next regular meeting May 10th. The Board members agreed that they would provide comments individually by emailing them back to Heidi before the end of the month.

- Environmental Stewardship Awards – Chris led the discussion of the Stewardship Awards. He went through the sub-committee's evaluation of each nominee and the reasoning behind whether or not they recommended an award. In the end, five of the eight nominees were recommended for an award. The reasons for those that were not recommended focused on a lack of information in the application or that the project was in the very early stages of implementation. In the case of the latter, the sub-committee recommended they re-apply in subsequent years when the project had more years of accomplishments.

Chris moved to approve the sub-committee recommendation and Daniel seconded. The motion passed with all voting in favor. Shelley will inform the BoCC of the ESAB recommendations and once they have provided approval she will move forward with writing letters to the awardees as well as those who were not selected. She will also encourage those not selected to re-apply next year and provide them feedback on how they can improve their application. The awards ceremony will likely be in June.

5. **Approval of Minutes** – Shelley displayed the March minutes on the screen. Daniel had some redlined edits in the section on wildfire related legislation. David asked about the section of the Commissioner's update that read "Office of Just Transition". Shelby noted that was her reference and Kirk noted it was a new office at the State that focuses on equity. Commissioner Kefalas said they also focus on employment transition for people in the fossil fuel industry. The reference does not need to be changed. Commissioner Kefalas noted that the definition for the acronym SWIMP needs to be corrected to read "Solid Waste Infrastructure Master Plan". Shelley made the corrections. Rodger noted that he emailed Shelley some corrections just prior to the meeting. Shelley will make those corrections for the final draft.

   John moved to approve the revised March minutes, and Kirk seconded. The motion passed by acclamation.

6. **Updates and Round Table**
   - Commissioner's Update – Commissioner Kefalas noted that he had participated in a tabletop emergency preparedness exercise at the new Office of Emergency Operations in Johnstown. There will be a series of these exercises focusing on different scenarios. This scenario was a major power outage during a time when temperatures were in the 90s. Second, Commissioner Kefalas has reviewed the many bills and legislation this legislative session that is focused on wildfire mitigation. There is a legislative Wildfire Matters review committee that is also reviewing the bills. Next, April 13 there is a joint worksession with the BoCC and the City of Fort Collins Council that will discuss regional air quality and potential collaboration between the City and the County. There will be a presentation, and then the goal of the meeting is to decide on whether there is support for City and County staff to explore ways to develop formal agreements to share in air quality monitoring and inspection efforts. As well, is there support to develop a regional air quality monitoring advisory committee? At the recent BoCC Administrative Matters meeting Ken Cooper presented on the new Fleet Campus building. As part of the design process, they are exploring roof top solar. The costs for the proposed 196 Kw system is projected to be $660K with a return on investment of 27 years. The generated electricity would power the campus, including the EV charging stations. One question is the cost-benefit analysis only looked at the economics of the proposed plan, but what about the environmental and social aspects? How do you bring into the cost-benefit analysis those aspects (i.e, reduction in GHG emissions). John asked if the analysis includes any tax credits? The County can't take the tax credit, but there are entities out there that can. Something may be facilitated through a purchase power agreement and there could be a significant savings. Commissioner Kefalas said the building contractor is using a solar sub-contractor to do the analysis and he is not sure if that considered such options. Commissioner Kefalas noted though

that he is interested in exploring indirect benefits like reduced emissions. Cat and John both noted that they could inquire around about Commissioner Kefalas questions and get back to him. John noted that the beauty of a purchase power agreement is that the County would not have to put up the capital. Another entity would do that, take the tax credit and then there would be a payback agreement with the County to buy back the infrastructure over time, at a lower cost. Kirk noted another way to look at energy use is to consider building performance instead of just considering solar. The better cost-benefit right now might be to build with energy efficiency and then when the cost of solar comes down 10 or so years from now, install it then. Commissioner Kefalas said they are designing the building to near LEED certification standards. Jim said that John would be the best person to follow-up on Commissioner Kefalas questions. Commissioner Kefalas asked John to follow up directly with him and said he will provide John the solar proposal for review. Shelby noted that she has been talking to several other community groups about similar power purchase agreements and energy performance contracting and mechanisms. She could also look into some ideas for Larimer County. Shelby and John will work together to provide Commissioner Kefalas some feedback on his questions.

- <u>CSLC</u> – Shelby had no other updates on the Climate Smart process than those discussed earlier.

- <u>Update on Air Quality Monitoring</u> – Rodger requested that Shelley look for the link to the planned BoCC-City of FC worksession and post it in the chat. He will report back to the Board on that meeting. Rodger had not heard anything specific on the EPA grant, but it is still in the works. There is legislation in discussion - HB1244 – increasing air toxics monitoring. Rodger can provide an update on that once there is more information to share. Rodger will participate later this month on a listening session for the ozone non-attainment reclassification to "Severe" status and report back to the Board next month.
- <u>PFAS Update</u> – Catriona presented on recent regulatory updates for PFAS. There were four individual PFAS compounds added to the list of chemicals covered by the Toxics Release Inventory (TRI). These compounds need to be tracked which can be difficult for companies when they do not always know what mix of PFAS compounds are in their product. Another recent change is that perfluorooctanoic acid (PFOA) and perfluorooctane sulfonic acid (PFOS) were listed as hazardous substances under the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation and Liability Act (CERCLA). This change is going to have far-reaching implications for those that use these substances. It also opens the door for these substances to be designated as a Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA) hazardous waste. New Mexico has already petitioned the EPA to add PFAS chemicals to RCRA, but the EPA is only reviewing additions at this time. New Mexico went ahead added it to their own state list under their NPDES program.

  Fall of 2022 there will be requirements for testing PFAS that can meet detection in the range of parts per quadrillion. Then Public Water systems will be required to do increased sampling for PFAS compounds. Catriona went through several additional rulemakings having the goal of restricting the discharge of effluents containing PFAS chemicals. There is also a push to regulate PFAS in air emissions.

  For more local updates, Cat presented a timeline for the Colorado regulatory process. Proposed HB 1345 aims to ban the sale of products containing PFAS chemicals in the state. The bill would start banning some products in 2024 with an outright ban on all products by 2031. It is scheduled for a hearing April 14th.

- ESAB Team Building Opportunities – Jim sent out a save-the-date notice for April 30th to do some volunteer work at the Colorado State Forest Service Tree Nursery at the CSU Foothills Campus. Daniel organized the introductions for the group, and Jim is handling the logistics. The tentative time would be 9-12:30. The day would start with a tour of the nursery and then folks would be put to work. Several members said they would like to participate. Shelley will arrange a light breakfast. Jim will provide final details later.

- ESAB Bylaws Update – Jim reminded the Board of the past discussions on changing the bylaws. The change made last year was restricted to just increasing the number of members from 12 to no more that 15 to allow for more seats. At that time Jim held off on any more changes because the County was in the process of updating its Policy for Boards, Commissions, Councils, Committees, and Task Forces. Once that was completed then the ESAB would take the task up of updating its bylaws making sure it agrees with the newly revised County policy.

  Jim asked if any members would take on the task of drafting proposed updates. Kirk, Shelby and Ally had volunteered last Fall. Shelby requested that she be removed from the sub-committee. George asked to be added. Jim noted that he would look for the draft that was being worked on last fall and reconvene the sub-committee in the next few weeks.

- Recommendation for Topics of Discussion on Covid Issues – David presented several potential Covid-related topics for discussion at the next ESAB meeting. He requested input from the members on what they would like to focus on. The choices were "Snake Oil", Immune System, Vaccines, Viral Immunome, Dx Testing, Antivirals, and Epidemiology. There was some discussion on the topics. Katrina asked about long Covid and where that might fit. David said he could add that as another category. Travis asked about how governments responded regarding public health practices, vaccines, and masking. David took a poll for the ranking of each category and will use that to prioritize his presentation next month.

- Roundtable – Jim noted that there is one upcoming seat open on the ESAB and the application period closes April 21st. He encouraged ESAB members talk this up within their networks.

7. **Issue Index** – Was updated with tonight's discussion

8. **Agenda Topics for Next Meeting** – Next regular meeting will be May 10th, 2022. Discussion items include a Covid Pandemic follow-up.

9. **Adjourn –** Travis moved, and Shelby seconded. The meeting ended at 8:40 PM.