*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: March 9th, 2021

Time: 6:00 – 9:00 p.m.

Location: Virtual by Zoom

Contact: Shelley Bayard de Volo, [sbayard@larimer.org](about:blank) or 970.498.5738

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| MEMBERS |  | STAFF |  | GUESTS |
| Rodger Ames | X | John Kefalas\* | X |  |
| Daniel Beveridge | X | Shelley Bayard de Volo¥ | X |  |
| John Bleem | X | Steven Decatur§ | X |  |
| Jim Gerek - Chair | X |  |  |  |
| David Lehman – Vice-Chair | X |  |  |  |
| Allyson Little | X |  |  |  |
| Kirk Longstein | X |  |  |  |
| George Rinker | X |  |  |  |
| Travis Rounsaville | X |  |  |  |
| Catriona Smith | X |  |  |  |
| Katrina Winborn-Miller |  |  |  |  |
| Chris Wood | X |  |  |  |

X = present; \* = Commissioner Liaison; ǂ = Speaker; ¥ = ESAB Liaison; § = Larimer County Office of Emergency Management (OEM)

Call to Order: 6:00 p.m.

1. Amendments or additions to the agenda – None.
2. Introduction of members, staff, and guests – Jim noted that there were several attendees that were not observable, but present and listening into the Zoom webinar.
3. Public Comment – None
4. Discussion Items
   * Colorado Greenhouse Gas Pollution Reduction Roadmap – John provided a summary of the State’s efforts to reduce greenhouse gas (GHG) pollution. He asked the Board to consider two primary questions (1) What's the appropriate role for Larimer County once the state roadmap is implemented, (2) What would the County’s alignment with the State Roadmap look like? John’s presentation is a summary of a lot of the State’s work, much of which is from the State’s Energy Office, House Bill 1261, the Electric Utilities GHG reduction Plans, and the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), Energy Information Administration (EIA), and International Energy Agency (IEA).

Colorado House Bill 1261 has used 2005 levels of GHG emissions as the baseline from which to target GHG reductions. Those targets are reductions of 26% by 2025, 50% by 2030 and 90% by 2050. To meet those targets the State is developing rules and policies to reduce GHG through the Air Quality Control Commission (AQCC), Air Pollution Division of the CDPHE, and the Public Utility Commission (PUC). In terms of publicly regulated electric utilities, they have committed to an 80% GHG reduction by 2030, and electrification of transportation, buildings, etc. is key to achieving this goal. Energy intensive manufacturing is a difficult area for GHG reductions, but the bill notes using 3rd party audits and best available control technologies (BACT). Some other important details include working with landfills, waste reduction/diversion, and climate equity. There will be tracking and reporting, and the bill commits $280,000 to support a couple staff FTEs and legal services.

The timeline includes public engagement, which occurred in 2020, with the public comment draft of the Roadmap released in Fall of 2020. The Final roadmap document was released in January of 2021. Accounting of GHGs has revealed that the largest two emission sources, electric power generation and transportation, have flipped their positions since 2005, with transportation now the number one source in 2020. Oil and gas production, and buildings hold their place as 3rd and 4th. John then showed several graphs that presented economy-wide emissions trends. MMT is used here as the short form abbreviation for “million metric tons of carbon dioxide equivalent (MMT CO2 Eq)”.

* *Electricity* - 32 MMT GHG reduction by 2030. To be achieved through clean energy plans, electric resources plans, incorporating the full social costs of carbon emissions into strategies and portfolios, among other incentives and reduction strategies. The primary utilities that generate power in Colorado are Xcel Energy, Holy Cross Energy, Black Hills Electric, Colorado Springs Utilities, Platte River Power Authority and Tri-State G&T.
* *Oil and Gas* – 12 MMT by 2030. Through rulemaking, reducing leaks, emissions data tracking, COGCC implementing new rules to eliminate flaring, emission reduction and pre- and post-production air emission monitoring.
* *Transportation* – 13 MMT by 2030. Low and zero emission rules, fleet turnover to zero emission vehicles (ZEVs), GHG pollution standards for transportation plans and large employer trip reduction programs. Also, land-use policies that encourage housing near jobs, clean trucking strategy, and several others.
* *Residential, commercial, and industrial fuel use* – 5 MMT by 2030. Set carbon reduction targets and requirements for gas utilities to use biogas. Improve energy efficiency programs, expand access to financial programs for building retrofits, and actions to reduce industrial emissions.
* *Other Category* – 8 MMT by 2030. Reducing methane emissions from landfills, sewage plants, promoting waste reduction and diversion, and protecting, restoring, and enhancing natural and working lands.

The state has an aggressive timeline for 2021 with many action items to accomplish throughout the year. John came back to the questions posed at the beginning of his talk and presented some ideas that he and Kirk discussed. How does the County fit into the State’s plans, and how is that determined? Specific areas where the County may have a role in the Roadmap include:

* Landfill operations
* Land-Use Code – agriculture, transportation, indirect sources,
* Efficiency Codes (buildings, etc.)
* Others?

Secondly, what does County alignment look like?

* GHG inventory and accounting – data sharing funding and other support.
* Identifying similarities and differences between the CSLC and the Roadmap.
* Ongoing alignment of potential future county policy or other formal directives.
* Coordination and collaboration with State entities, especially to seek funding and leverage resources.

John then ended his presentation and took some questions from the Board members. Kirk asked about carbon sequestration and carbon sinks, and how the State is incorporating that. John noted that there is a task force being convened now to look at that. Kirk noted the CSU has done a lot of research in this area. Commissioner Kefalas noted that the Agricultural Advisory Board is looking at the topic of carbon sequestration in agricultural lands. John then asked for discussion on how the county might fit into the Roadmap, and how would that be determined. There were questions of whether the County has a legislative liaison who tracks what is happening at the State level. Commissioner Kefalas said that there was not, but that various staff track legislative items that affect their specific areas. As well, the County’s participation in Colorado Communities, Inc. keeps him informed on State legislative matters. As a current example of how the County is impacted by the Roadmap, they are looking into how to implement the Large Employer Trip Reduction Program. They are also aware of the two current bills relating to battery storage and transmission line legislation to help with renewable energy. The Board continued to discuss these topics and Jim wrapped up the conversations, noting follow-up include reaching out to Will Toor, Director of Colorado Energy, to see if he can come and present, reaching out to researchers at CSU regarding sequestration, and thoughts on tracking legislation that may come up in the next several months. Jim noted that the County is taking the right steps with the CSLC and the GHG inventory and thinking more seriously about bringing on additional staff resources to support its role in climate and GHG reductions. But the Board still needs to really address the primary questions that John presented at the beginning of his presentation.

* + County Oil & Gas Regulations Amendments – Jim summarized the past work that the Board had been involved with in terms of the Oil and Gas regulations. The county had established their regulations last year with the intent of revisiting them once the State went through its updates. That has now occurred, and the County is looking to review its regulations and make sure they meet the State’s standards. They are incorporating their review and update as part of the Land Use Code 2020 Phase 2. Last month, the Board selected a subcommittee to track that work (Ally, Chris, Katrina and Catriona) and Jim shared a few items with them over the last month including information on several work sessions. Originally, the plan was to have the update finished by end of April, but now that has been extended to July sometime to give the community more time to participate. Additionally, there is a March 10 work session with PC-BOCC to set a deliberate timeline. The Planning Dept also has a questionnaire on their website that focuses on what are the most important elements of the harmonization between the County’s regs and the State’s. Setback regulations are probably one of the more important items that will be discussed, as well as air quality, water quality and long-term financial assurances to protect the County and community against transient oil developers that leave sites without proper shut down and reclamation.

The ESAB Oil and Gas sub-committee has participated in the ongoing work sessions and Jim asked whether they had additional comments/takeaways. Ally noted that she agreed with Jim’s assessment and that most of the public comments at the sessions focused on whether people supported or not oil and gas development. There were not a lot of productive comments on the actual regulations. Some folks commented on setbacks, and one person noted the need for an additional public comment period after the new rules are in place.

Ally asked how the sub-committee will be able to get access to the emails from Matt Lafferty since Richard Alper is no longer the primary contact? Jim noted that he and Shelley, are now on the email distribution list. Catriona also listened into the meeting and agreed that the additional public comment period was a good choice. Jim said the public comment period is a 3-4 week period, and we will have to see how that fits into the ESAB meeting schedule.

Commissioner Kefalas provided some updates and confirmed that they extended the review period and that the BOCC recognizes that they need to provide the public the opportunity to comment after the draft rules are written. They are also bringing on an attorney to assist with the legal aspects, who has worked on the same issue with other jurisdictions. They are also bringing on a consultant to work on the more technical aspects of the rule.

There will be an Open House March 28th where the Planning Staff will present a side-by-side analysis of how the County’s regulation compares to those of the State and other regional jurisdictions. Catriona noted that she would like to see that document and that it would be helpful to people evaluating the County regs. Commissioner Kefalas noted that the comparison document will be a public document and available for people to review and help guide the discussion at the work session March 22nd. So, it should be available the week prior sometime.

Ally noted that the sub-committee should meet and review the updated regs and provide formal comments back, and Chris and Jim agreed.

1. Approval of Minutes – Approval of the February minutes deferred until the April meeting.

1. Updates and Round Table
   * Commissioner Update – A few items that Commissioner Kefalas wanted to discuss, that were not already discussed, included Spring recruitment for openings on Boards and Commissions. Please let people know of potential openings, especially diverse candidates, as the County is committed to equity. Commissioner Kefalas then asked Catriona about PFAS and described the ground water issue at the landfill. He noted that he informed staff at the landfill, as well as Planning staff, that the ESAB had been reviewing this issue and that they would be a resource that staff could draw on, and he asked Catriona if anyone reached out to her. Catriona said that she had not been contacted. Shelley noted that she did share Catriona’s presentation slides with County Manager Linda Hoffman and Public Works Director Laurie Kadrich, and she offered to share the video of the presentation as well. Catriona noted that she did not think her presentation addressed the issue of PFAS from landfills, and the EPA might be a better source for identifying how such matters were addressed.
   * CSLC - Community Outreach – Commissioner Kefalas started the conversation. The team has updated the 12-page document that summarized the 80-page report. They also made some more substantive changes to the 80-page report. They allocated funds to contract with Clay Pot Creative to do the graphics. They will print 150 copies and translate to Spanish language. Currently, the 12 pg summary and 80 pg report are on the website, in their current form, but will be updated with the new versions when they are finished. The next phase is to kick off the community engagement and they will contract consultants to help lead that process. Steven Decatur has been involved in developing an RFP for that contract. He noted that the process of the development of the CSLC has been led by a team of people throughout the process, and for effective community engagement it would be good to have a more formalized process that includes a steering committee. Stephen noted that as the Cameron Peak Fire (CPF) repairs kick off, and the 2021 fire season comes on, he will have less time and will not be able to lead the efforts. He will be working with Cailea to draft the RFP for the Community engagement, and he hopes to involve the steering committee once it’s formed. If any ESAB members would like to participate and help with that process, they should contact him. Katrina noted that she had some interest in this.

Commissioner Kefalas then discussed the importance of inclusion and diversity when selecting members of the steering committee. He asked if the board might have ideas of how to do that and where they might reach out. David suggested that the Spanish translation of the 12-page summary may need to be reviewed for scientific accuracy – e.g., was the translation done by a person competent to translate climate science accurately? Steven will follow-up and several board members said they had contacts that could assist with a review of the Spanish translation. Commissioner Kefalas made some suggestions of who to reach out to regarding diverse candidates for the steering committee. Kirk commented that there were a couple different ways to run the steering committee. You could make it a competitive process using an application. You could do invitations to key people in the community, making the position more of an honorary role. It's important to have key bullet points of what the committee is to accomplish. The group agreed that one of the tasks in the scope of work for the consultant would be to lead the steering committee, so to include that task in the RFP. Last, Commissioner Kefalas noted that he has been working with the County Manager to develop staff capacity like a program manager and sustainability officer.

* + State Climate Equity Framework – Jim reminded the group of Lauren McDonnel’s January presentation on climate equity and her offer to review the CSLC report. She indicated that the State’s draft Climate Equity Framework would be out briefly for public comment, and that period was later extended until April 5th. Kirk agreed to review the framework and will present some comments here tonight.

Kirk noted that he struggled to see how the state level efforts support local initiatives. The work is still ambiguous at the State level, so understanding how it can be applied locally still needs to be fleshed out. It’s likely the State will not inform local governments of what they need to do, so that will need to be worked out ourselves.

Takeaways include the process, and the discussions tonight about the community engagement, and ensuring that the process is transparent and equitable. Ensuring diverse communities are part of the conversation is important. Looking at how these communities are impacted is important from an outcome perspective. Other things to glean from the framework include thinking about community engagement more intentionally, looking around the table and asking is everybody here and are all the voices represented?

Kirk noted he would like to know more about the health connections, and how people in marginalized communities are being disproportionately impacted, and it's not clear if that condition is being conveyed. Kirk included in the chat a link to the equity data viewer, which is a GIS storyboard:

Test drive the BETA Climate Equity Data Viewer - <https://storymaps.arcgis.com/stories/be558ce8cb1f49f98a18d35d36d8156b>

There was discussion of the State’s incentive program which pays people to attend meetings. Kirk noted that strategy might introduce bias. Shelley noted that offering childcare in leu of payments might be a better option.

Jim questioned whether this topic should continue to be something the Board takes up. Is there something there for the Board to pass onto the BOCC? Kirk noted that access to State data could be better and there could be more advocacy in terms of being able to get access to data. For example, the North Front Range Metropolitan Planning Organization recently updated their GIS data sets for demand Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) and that data was not previously available when the County Climate team developed their GHG inventory. So, it would be great to get more support from the State in terms of data sharing.

Jim closed out this topic by reminding members that the State Climate Equity Framework is currently out for public comment and if members would like to comment as individuals, he encouraged them to do so. But as things stand, the Board has enough on its plate, so they will not take up the issue any further.

* + Stewardship Awards - select subcommittee – Jim reminded the members about what the stewardship awards are and the ESAB’s role, which is to review the nominations and make recommendation to the BOCC. The nomination period is open until March 28th, and there are currently three nominations that have been submitted. He encouraged members to get the word out and to consider doing some outreach to diverse community members.

Jim asked if members would like to participate on the recommendation sub-committee. They will have to present their recommendations at the next meeting April 13th. Ally, Rodger, and Katrina volunteered, and they will choose the subcommittee chair among them.

Jim brought up the suggestion that there be a special or honorary award for those who participated on the response to the Cameron Peak Fire. What would that kind of award look like, and how would you do a blanket award? It might be a symbolic recognition to all that fought the fire? There were huge impacts to the environment of Larimer County and without their efforts it would have been much worse. Ally liked the idea but questioned how you would single out one organization. Most liked the idea and agreed it should be a local group. John asked about the environmental aspect of that, and shouldn’t it be someone doing the recovery work? Jim noted that he expects to see many award nominations in the future for that kind of work. There was much continued discussion on the matter and Jim closed out the conversation by encouraging the board members to give it more thought and get the word out about nominations.

* + Periodic Review – Shelley reminded the members of their participation in the Boards and Commissions questionnaire and asked that members return theirs to her by the March 12. She noted that members should be honest in the answers including what they like and dislike. She will summarize the key points, without member names, and that will go to the BOCC. She and Jim will then meet with the BOCC in worksession and address any questions the commissioners might have.

* + Members with Expiring Terms – Jim reminded the members that there are six members whose terms are expiring this year. Debra Unger sent out information on how to reapply to those whose terms are expiring, so members that did not receive an email are good for another year. He encouraged all six to reapply to the Board no later than April 18, and to also reach out to colleagues who might be interested in joining the Board. He also offered private discussions with any members that had questions about continuing.

1. Issue Index – Was updated with tonight’s discussion.
2. Agenda Topics for Future Meetings – Next meeting is April 13th, 2021. Topics are TBD.
3. Adjourn –The meeting was adjourned at 9:10 PM.