

**AIR QUALITY ADVISORY BOARD  
REGULAR MEETING  
MONDAY, APRIL 21, 2014**

**DATE:** MONDAY, APRIL 21, 2014  
**LOCATION:** Community Room, 215 N. Mason Street  
**TIME:** 5:30–8:00 pm

**For Reference:** Rich Fisher, Chair 970-221-4389  
Ross Cunniff, Council Liaison 970-420-7398  
Melissa Hovey, Staff Liaison 970-221-6813

**Present:**  
Rich Fisher, Chair  
Dave Dietrich  
Scott Groen  
Tom Moore  
Richard (Dick) Thomas  
Tom Griggs  
John Shenot

**Absent:**  
Jim Dennison

**Staff Present:**  
Melissa Hovey, Staff Liaison  
Dianne Tjalkens, Admin/Board Support  
Lucinda Smith, Environmental Services Director  
Ana Arias, Public Relations Coordinator  
Bruce Hendee, Assistant City Manager

**Guests:**  
Dr. Kevin Pass, Citizens Against Asphalt Toxins  
Dr. Lucy Troup, Citizens Against Asphalt Toxins  
Julia Macmillan, Citizens Against Asphalt Toxins  
Ken Ball, General Manager, Martin Marietta Materials  
Walt Wright, Environmental Engineer, Martin Marietta Materials  
David Stewart, President, Stewart Environmental Consultants  
Bill Seaworth, citizen  
Caroline Hoaglund, citizen  
Jonathan Carnahan, citizen

**Call meeting to order:** Rich called to order at 5:30pm.

**Public Comments:**  
None

**Member Comments:**  
None

## Review and Approval of March 17, 2014 minutes

Tom Griggs moved and Dave seconded a motion to approve the March 17, 2014 AQAB minutes as with modifications listed below.

Motion passed unanimously, 7-0-0.

- John Shenot: Item 3, bullet 2. Dave change to Dick—description of electric vehicles.
- Two item 6's. 2nd Item 6: Second reference to John is John Phelan not John Shenot.

---

### **AGENDA ITEM 1: Martin Marietta Materials Asphalt Plant**

*Representatives from Citizens Against Asphalt Toxins, Martin Marietta Materials, and staff presented information regarding the hot mix asphalt plant located at 1800 N. Taft Hill Rd. The board will consider information presented when reviewing the draft air permit to be issued by CDPHE for the facility during the 30 day public comment period. The board appointed a subcommittee to conduct the draft permit review and provide recommendations to Council.*

Melissa introduced herself and gave a presentation on the background of asphalt plants. Asphalt plants produce asphalt using a number of ingredients. Most are portable to move to the source of aggregate and major projects. They are permitted as portable sources, but after two years in one location must apply for a stationary permit. The one under discussion today is a drum plant that can operate more continuously and store asphalt. Asphalt plants typically produce hot mix, warm mix, and recycled. This plant creates all three. Emissions from asphalt production include CO (carbon monoxide), NOx (mono-nitrogen oxides), SO<sub>2</sub> (sulfur dioxide), VOCs (Volatile Organic Compounds), particulate matter, and HAPs (hazardous air pollutants). Sources include the dryer, tank and silo vents, heaters, vehicles, diesel generators (this plant uses natural gas, not diesel), materials handling and storage piles, and loading into silos and trucks. Regulations are at the federal, state and local levels. New source performance standards (NSPS) are standards for particulates. There are no federal standards for HAPs. The EPA determined most hot asphalt plants are not major sources of HAPs. CDPHE requires plants to file air pollution notices. There are also regulations for dust, odors, operations, etc. Air permits are construction or operating. The plant is considered a synthetic minor, and is located in an ozone non-attainment area. CDPHE will issue fixed or portable air permits. The permit may contain requirements for stack testing, and modelling for CO. The permit may include air dispersion modelling and emission inventory for all regulated pollutants. The MMM plant has had an air permit since 1997, at which time it completed stack testing. This facility has had several owners and has been in 3 locations. It moved to the current location in 2011. Martin Marietta is converting their Air Permit to fixed (stationary). CDPHE has conducted air dispersion modelling. The current permit is for 600,000 tons per year production and has specific limits of pollutant emissions. There is a chart of pounds per year of estimated hazardous air pollutants. In 1985 Larimer County commissioners had a special review approval for gravel mining, and the asphalt plant was created as an accessory use. Larimer County Department of Health and Environment conducts inspections and responds to complaints. The last inspection was July 2013. The plant is located in the City's GMA, just outside of the City limits. The City recently renewed a five year contract with Martin Marietta. 70% of the City's asphalt is purchased from Martin Marietta. Half of all asphalt produced at the plant is used by the City. The analysis conducted by City staff is available online. The City uses primarily warm mix asphalt which has lower emissions than hot mix. Over 2/3 of the Max project is concrete. Staff has been working on LCUASS (Larimer County Urban Area Streets Standards). The City began receiving complaints last summer and staff has visited the site, and engaged with citizens, operators, county and state. The City Manager has advocated

for a public hearing in front of the agency that will be issuing the permit. Staff at the City and County has been in communication regarding possible alternatives for the permit. The Air Quality Advisory Board's role is to review the draft air permit, evaluate CDPHE's analysis, consider information from CAAT and Martin Marietta, provide a recommendation to Council, and possibly form a subcommittee. The consultant can run some models and scale for other hazardous air pollutants. If a subcommittee is formed staff will work with the subcommittee.

### **Comments/ Q & A**

- Rich asked the City's plans to annex land in that area. Bruce said there are no immediate plans for annexation of that area.
- Tom Moore asked about the upper limit of asphalt production being 600,000 tons. Martin Marietta said production for last year was slightly less than 200,000 tons. Melissa said a different production limit is requested in the draft permit.
- John asked if the dispersion modelling was not looking at particulates. Melissa said only CO, but scaling can be done from CO results. There may be other receptors we want them to look at and focus on meteorology for those sensitive areas.

Ken Ball, General Manager for Martin Marietta gave a history of the site. There is one mining operation and one asphalt plant on Taft Hill Road. Asphalt plants are usually in close proximity to aggregate operations. It is across the street from the mining operation. There are five asphalt plants in Larimer; three on Poudre River and two on the Big Thompson. They are committed to health and safety and to being a good neighbor, are in full compliance with all regulations, and this site has never had a citation. Some community involvement includes employing 100 people in Larimer County, and nearly \$5 million to the community in taxes. They hold quarterly public meetings on site. At these meetings they discuss operations and neighbor concerns. Mining at this location started in the early 1950s. The plant is regulated by CDPHE, EPA and Larimer County. After mining is complete, they conduct extensive reclamation/restoration of the land—creating lakes, water storage vessels, and wildlife habitat. Once the aggregate is gone at that location, the asphalt plant will close. They anticipate remaining at this location an additional 10 to 15 years. Asphalt plants have been operating at this site for four decades. Martin Marietta Materials acquired these assets in December 2011. It is one of the most environmentally advanced asphalt plants. They supply asphalt to the City, County, CDOT and private customers. Their current production cap is 600,000 tons. Some operating restrictions include Monday through Friday only operations. Production follows the demand of the economy.

Jeremy Runner, Asphalt and Construction Manager, discussed operations and improvements. All new environmental technology that comes up, this plant has it. A flip of a switch allows changing from HMA (hot mix) to WMA (warm mix), with a change of 30 to 70 degrees. The warm mix system is a foaming, water injected system. It is high pressure and water is injected into liquid AC. The plant has fewer emissions due to lack of contact with the oil and the wrap of the burner. He showed a diagram of a basic asphalt plant and explained the use of each component. The liquid asphalt cement is the black liquid that binds the product. Fine particulates are collected through a two-part process, with 99% efficiency. There is duct work that reintroduces the particulates to the production cycle. 20% of asphalt produced annually contains recycled asphalt. Odor abatement actions include odor inhibiting additives that are not a masking agent. It has a molecular action that acts as an oxygen scavenger. They will install vent condensers by the end of second quarter 2014. These contain the vapors and drop them back into the production cycle. By end of fourth quarter this year they will replace the current horizontal tanks with vertical AC tanks which will reduce surface area of liquid asphalt cement. He showed a "nasal ranger" that detects odors by volume. They have two certified employees that are also trainers. They respond to odor complaints

within 10 minutes. He typically responds to them himself. They have numerous employees trained in opacity and odor. They are going above and beyond now and in the future.

Walt Wright, Environmental Engineer for Martin Marietta, shared information about regulations and permits. He explained that this is a highly regulated industry. They are regulated by EPA, MSMA, OSHA, US Army Corps of Engineers, CDPHE, DRMS, SEO Colorado Division of Water Resources, and Larimer County. The State of Colorado is a delegate state, meaning the EPA does not have to oversee the state because CDPHE has been delegated to do so as they have stringent regulations. The Clean Air Act requires permits and enforcement. The Clean Water Act requires permitting as well. He showed the relocation permit dated December 1, 2010. A new Permit Application and Air Pollutant Emission Notice (APEN) does not need to be submitted since the portable permit was already in place; the relocation document was sufficient and the air permit moves with the plant. As the permit moves, there is no gap in permit coverage. Due to the plant being on the site for two years, Martin Marietta submitted a conversion request. The model has been released and they are waiting on the draft permit. He showed the conversion permit application and air pollutant emission notice. Once the draft permit is issued, there is a 30 day public comment period, modifications will be done based on regulations and requirements, and an initial approval permit will be issued, which will show requirements. The documentation will be submitted within 6 months. The state reviews the documentation to see if they can comply consistently with the permit, at which time final approval will be issued. The stationary permit is not a permanent permit: it is for the equipment, not the land. He showed the front page of the current construction permit. The CDPHE takes time; it could be six months from submission before issuance. The EPA removed hot mix asphalt from major polluters in 2002. To be a major source you must emit more than 10 tons of HAPs or 25 tons combined. Martin Marietta is permitted to emit less than 10% of that. The industry has been studied by the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services in 2005 and 2007. The finding in 2005 was that VOCs, PAHs, and respirable dust were all below health guidelines and no adverse health effects were anticipated for all age groups. In 2007 they found no acute or long term health concerns. He showed a chart of annual emission in tons per year comparing a typical asphalt plant with CSU, residential fireplaces, bakeries, breweries, cars, etc.

David Stewart, President of Stewart Environmental Consultants, is reviewing the draft permit and modelling. He said this is a state of the art facility that is trying to cut their emissions. AP42 is an EPA document that gives emission rates for various activities. They are very conservative, so actual emissions are frequently 10 times lower. The consultant team will review the permits and modelling and give input.

Ken Ball said one of the main concerns they hear is about the proximity to schools. They plotted all asphalt plants from Fort Collins to Pueblo. In Northern Colorado there are 21 schools within 2 miles of an asphalt plant, and 50 for Denver Metro. They have been in the communities without issue due to the regulations they work within. Martin Marietta will continue to operate within state, federal, and local permit requirements. The state Air Permit will continue to ensure operations are safe. They have heard concerns about emissions and odors and are addressing them.

- Scott asked about fixed cost to tear down and move the plant. Ken said  $\frac{3}{4}$  of a million dollars. Scott asked how much it would increase product cost to move the plant 10 miles. Ken said \$2 per ton haul each way for 10 miles, which is \$5-6 per ton mile.
- John Shenot asked how often the phone rings with concerns or complaints. Jeremy said this year he has had two calls and he has met with a county inspector to address each call. Last year he had around 8 calls. John asked if complaints or odor concerns are things that persist for a long period or are here and gone. How often do you go out and find an issue? Jeremy said they have never been able to detect an odor and

have never been in violation. One call this year was in the morning when they were not running and the other was on the weekend, also when the plant was not running.

- Dave asked if there was negative pressure at the load out facility. Jeremy said no.
- Rich asked the consultant for the City versus Martin Marietta. Air Resource Specialist is working with the City; David Stewart is working with Martin Marietta.
- Melissa asked if Martin Marietta has voluntarily requested CDPHE put changes they are making to the plant as permanent conditions in the air permit. Walt said not at this point. Some projects are ongoing during the permitting process.

Dr. Kevin Pass, Citizens Against Asphalt Toxins, said the 2005 study was done in the winter in Utah and it was uncertain the plant was operating. The second plant had an operation of 48,000 pounds per year. Last year he finished a house near Solar Ridge. He said there were many inspections during construction. Comparatively, the asphalt plant is lightly regulated. The asphalt plant appeared without people knowing until they noticed the noxious fumes. When the neighbors got the smell, they started trying to find where it was coming from. The plant is too small and in the wrong place. We have been told there have been asphalt plants there all along, but according to state and county records there has not been one there until 2011. The CDPHE's mission is to protect the air quality in Colorado. It's important for the board to understand that if the watch dog has no teeth it is just a poodle. They put in a records request to CDPHE over two months ago. After a couple of weeks it came from the attorneys, and they were told the records were complete, but they later received more. There were letters about getting the permit, not about protecting the public. In the permit itself it says that inspections are required every three years. The permit renewal is required every five years. The records do not show this happening. The plant has been moved many times. He showed the various locations of the plant, and said it was reissued out of state in 2007 and was not inspected. No new permit was issued until October 2013, at which point it had been operating for 3 years. It was not inspected from 2000 to 2013. When it was inspected, it had been operating for 2+ years, but it was not to be in one place for more than 2 years. He believes it was inspected because of neighborhood complaints. He requested production records for the plant, and the state and county have no production records for 2000 to 2013. These are necessary to determine pollution. The plant was moved next to schools and neighborhoods without the people knowing, and it operated for at least a year without a valid permit. The EPA has recommendations for schools and says to avoid locations in close proximity to pollution sources. Lincoln Middle School is less than 1000 feet from the plant. It was built in 1974 in an environmentally ideal location. Asphalt plants were considered major polluters until 2002. Minor polluters are still polluters. He said this plant will produce 15 tons of VOCs, 16.5 tons NOx, 11.4 tons CO2, and 7.4 tons SO2. On hot sunny days VOCs plus NOx create ozone which forms at ground level and triggers asthma in otherwise healthy people. Ground level ozone is a health hazard to everyone, especially young and old. 25 million Americans have asthma, with 10 million lost school days, 14 million lost work days, and 2 million ER visits per year caused by asthma. Natural Resources Defense Council's advice to reduce asthma is to avoid exposure to pollutants. In 2007 Fort Collins became an ozone non-attainment area. Inversion is warm air sitting on top of cool air, which traps toxins at ground levels. This is not included in the modelling. The plant is in a hollow, which creates an inversion area for the plant, bike path, and school. The modelling does not address wind direction, overall inversion effect from the foothills, and the model says that there is not to be public access within 87km of the baghouse stack. Six feet further than this includes the bike path. He asked the audience if they would let their children go to Lincoln Middle School. He said if you would not feel comfortable with this, we need to recommend they move a few miles down the road. They make \$100 million profit per year. It would be a drop in the bucket cost-wise to move the plant.

Lucy Troup, PhD, discussed air pollutants as related to child and adolescent development. Risk factors include proximity to schools, sports fields, and high density neighborhoods. Children engage in activities that increase likelihood of exposure. They are smaller and experience a greater physiological risk. They are still developing. She said the prefrontal areas of the brain are slowest to develop and determine emotional responses, behavior, and judgment. She is concerned a cause of ADHD is exposure to toxins. VOCs can travel up to 4.8km for up to 4 days. Children are significantly more vulnerable to respiratory conditions. Their lungs are still developing as well. She discussed a study showing mild exposure to VOCs through inhaling causes cognitive impairment. There has been an increase in diagnosis of Autism Spectrum disorder. Nasal passages are a route for toxins to reach the brain. When you smell something it is entering the body and being absorbed. Research shows that neurofibrillary tangles are caused by VOCs and can cause dementia. 25 years after the Camelford disaster (aluminum sulfate into water supply) significant neurotoxic effects are emerging including Alzheimer's, ADHD and schizophrenia. Long after Martin Marietta has changed the asphalt plant into a nature reserve, there will be people continuing to be affected by the pollutants. This risk is being imposed on her, as she lives near the plant.

Julia Macmillan, citizen, said Fort Collins has taken strides to be at the forefront of greener growth, environmental stewardship, and instituted programs to reach these goals including climate wise, social sustainability, lead green building, platinum level bike community, and Keep Fort Collins Great. In light of the legacy, the asphalt plant a half mile from a public school and bike path seems hypocritical. She took it hard to learn that \$10 million of keep Fort Collins great tax is going to Martin Marietta. The current location next to the river does not fit with the goals and vision of the City. In the City's goals, one principle is to strive to improve the air quality. We are also seeking ozone compliance. This plant does not fit with these goals. We've only had a short time to look at the air quality impact analysis, but it finds that the plant model for 8 hour CO levels is very close to the NAAQ limit. She did not see any of the truck traffic of the plant included in the modelling. Trucks may number 200-300 per day. (Scott added that diesel does not emit CO.) If the numbers are that close, perhaps there are grounds for closer examination. Martin Marietta and the industry tout these plants as minor sources. If a minor source can pollute to within 93% of the limit that does not seem minor to her. Martin Marietta's shareholder report shows there are issues with plants being located near neighborhoods and the company frequently acquires large tracts of land so that production can be situated substantial distances from property owners. There is little discussion of the toxic soup created when these chemicals are released together. We are not addressing enough of the issues and are not looking at the long term cumulative effects on human health. We will not be protected because we don't know enough. The things they have discussed putting into play to reduce emissions, with exception of the condensers, are beneficial to the bottom line. There are other plants with these additional changes, and the neighbors did not have to ask as we have. She asked the board to use their expertise on air quality to keep citizens safe. The group asks for the plant to be moved away from a populous location; implement stack testing for all relevant pollutants including VOCs and heavy metals; limit hours to remove emergency hours; install an EPA compliance opacity monitor; create a publically accessible website with time-lapse video showing production because of issues with fugitive dust; all pollution control technology be required in the permits with specified timelines; and third party oversight of record keeping.

- Scott said we have had floods and that created an emergency need for asphalt to repair damaged roads. Julia said that was a permitted emergency use. She says she understands the need for asphalt and the need for emergency use. She would like the plant farther from the populated area. Melissa clarified that some of the emergency hours that have been requested have been for convenience, not emergency.
- A number of citizens said they smell the asphalt early in the morning and throughout the day.

- John Shenot asked about the frequency of when they have concerns, including the duration, and how often they call, as well as when they have a concern are they calling the company, city, county or combination. A citizen said she is process of communication with all parties and that started two years ago. It took time to identify the source of the smell, and they found last January that the plant would be permanent. She said there was a petition with 1000 signatures saying citizens are smelling the fumes.
- Tom Griggs asked to whom the calls are going and the frequency. The citizen said last summer they determined who to call.
- Kevin Pass said many people smell it, but feel they are getting nowhere with complaints, so they do not bother calling.
- Julia said she has been calling the County.

Bill Seaworth, farmer, lives on north Taft Road. He said the asphalt plant was out in the country, away from populous areas, when it was built. Solar Ridge was built after the asphalt plant. Aggregate Industries was a rotten neighbor; he has dealt with all of the asphalt plant owners. If the plant was that bad, would these intelligent, educated people work there? The EPA comes to his property frequently. If you built a house a year ago, you had to know it was there. Lincoln Middle School was built in a former mining area. There has not been a concrete batch plant, but there have been moving asphalt plants in the area for many years. When he was in high school, it was located at the bottom of the river. The bike path is there because it used to be train tracks. You have people who are responsible. He has had problems over the years, but he drives over there and finds they are pretty good people to deal with who are just trying to do a job. Asphalt is icky, but it beats driving on dirt roads. He burned his irrigation ditch to bring in water today. He called Martin Marietta and they brought over a water truck to help him. He gets tired of reading in the paper about complaints. There were Russian Olives on the property and Martin Marietta could not get a burn permit to remove them. They have to do twice as much as anyone else.

- A citizen asked if Bill has looked at aerial photos since 1997. Bill said he doesn't keep track of it, but anyone who buys a house or builds a house there must have grown up elsewhere because it has been a mining area for decades.

Caroline Hoaglund, PhD student at CSU, showed new technology she suggests citizens use to collect their own data, including sensors for benzene, hydrogen sulfide, VOCs, etc. She said when you want to do environmental monitoring in an area, you deploy a network. As each individual time-point is logged, it can be uploaded to the web and a disk. The devices and sensors are low cost, so they are not defensible in a court case, but can establish baseline conditions. Because they are programmable controllers, the equipment can take a sample for independent verification. This data can be used to create a map. Mining companies and industrial companies are using these for industrial workers to use on themselves so that if threshold levels are reached an alarm goes off. This technology is readily available. You don't have to rely on a modelled system that may not be accurate. Weather conditions and topography cause heterogeneous conditions. The local conditions at a house or school could be far out of compliance though the overall conditions are in compliance. The metal dioxide sensors measure parts per million, and the ionization models measure parts per billion.

### **Board Discussion:**

- John Shenot said he read the background materials before the meeting. We heard contradicting statements of "facts." He wants to resolve these issues before providing recommendations to Council. The one that jumps out is whether the asphalt plant has been located at that site in recent years. He hopes that can be firmly established. He was confused about the difference between asphalt and aggregate operations.

- Tom Griggs is concerned about the long term affects for whatever level the toxins are. He would err on the side of protecting the children in the nearby schools. He is concerned that the modelling was done based on winter weather. He would like to see a typical day.
- Dave said the models usually run a one year period. That may be a peak.
- Rich said that until the board is able to dig deeper in the details they will be hard pressed to make a recommendation.
- Dave said he appreciates all who spoke tonight.
- Tom Moore would like more information on how the zoning works in this area. There was discussion of the GMA. The land use has changed over time. He wonders what the loop is with the County on zoning. It seems like the rate of inspections is quite low. If the County is performing that under contract to the state, there might be additional opportunities for the City to get involved in that process. Inspections could be customized to exposure.
- Melissa responded that he asphalt plant was granted a special review approval by the Larimer County Commissioners in 2009. She cannot speak for the County on whether they are going to reopen or reconsider that. In 1985 they came up with several conditions, which were carried over in 2009.
- Tom Moore said with the boundary line, the plant and operations are in the County but the housing is in the City. Those considerations are not being integrated. We need to follow up with the County.
- Rich asked if truck emissions were included, including tailpipe and load, covered or not. Melissa said she has not seen the input for the model. That will be reviewed.
- Rich asked if there were upset conditions. How often would they occur? Melissa said it is in the general conditions that they comply with the Reg. 3 upset conditions. Walt Wright answered that it is built into the air permit.
- John Shenot said the unit was stack tested 17 years ago and it was not clear what was tested and what the emission limits were then. We may not really know what the unit is emitting. Melissa said the emission in the permit is based on sampling from other plants. The stack testing in 1997 would have only covered particulate matter.
- Rich said monitoring could be more aggressive. Camera monitoring could be added to the permit, or other forms of continuous monitoring.
- John Shenot said in his experience he did not find the AP42 emission factors were on a magnitude higher than the stack testing results that he reviewed when he was a compliance engineer. They were generally representative. Some plants tested a little lower than published levels, some a little higher. They are published with a rating, showing accuracy. EPA's emission factors are not conservative. Melissa said some HAP ones for hot mix have a rating of E, so they are not great.
- Tom Moore said Martin Marietta discussed their ownership, but there is a long period of time for which these plants have operated here. Maybe the City needs to take more ownership of tracking these operations, even though they are outside City limits.
- John Shenot asked if the City in its contract with Martin Marietta had any sway through its work orders when the outside of normal work hour requests would come. Is the emergency use going to be due to the City's requests? Melissa said yes. Some of those projects were due to Max last summer.
- Dick asked the board members if it makes a difference how long the plant has been there? Really, who cares when we are discussing air quality? John Shenot said it makes a difference to him because he likes to take what all parties say at face value and he is trying to understand how we have a new set of concerns that seem to be based on the placement of this facility on this site.

- Dick asked why there would be certain operating hours with no weekend hours if it is safe. Melissa said it comes from the 1985 land use decision from Larimer County. The gentleman who owns the KOA was concerned with noise at the campground on evenings and weekends.
- Tom Griggs said we have raised concerns and are facing a timeframe for responding to the City. Rich proposed assembling a subcommittee to review the draft permit and modelling. The subcommittee would draft a recommendation which would be shared and voted on via email.
- Dave asked if the subcommittee would be working with the consultant. Melissa said the consultant is shared with the County. The consultant will have reviewed information and can do additional monitoring that will be presented to the Environmental Advisory Board of the County on May 13.
- Rich, Scott, Dave, and Tom Moore volunteered for the subcommittee.
- John reminded the board that logistically if a subcommittee meeting has more than three members it must be made public.
- Melissa said the bylaws say the board may hold work sessions as needed. Notice of work sessions will be posted, but minutes need to be taken. Rich and Melissa will organize the meetings.

### **AGENDA ITEM 3: Six-Board Committee on GHG Goals**

Rich gave an update on the six-board committee. The document was completed and passed on to the boards. It can be reviewed at the next meeting by AQAB. That committee has ended. The City Manager requested they not meet again. The Mayor and City Manager did not know about the meetings.

#### **Comments/ Q & A**

- Melissa said there was miscommunication and misinformation from a citizen, so it was unfortunate that it ended, but a citizen action board will be formed that may include members from the committee.

### **AGENDA ITEM 2: Update on Air Forum planning**

*AQAB members discussed progress on planning for the upcoming public Air Forum to be held on April 30, 2014.*

John Shenot said he and Tom Moore have an outline for the presentation from John Volckens. John Shenot read an outline of his introductory comments and shared the general agenda. He would like input on the feedback session. Should they seed questions or leave it open ended?

#### **Comments/ Q & A**

- Ana Arias said one thing helpful in outreach is to develop some postcards that allow people to comment on specific questions. Emily Wilmsen is helping with outreach. There can be spotlights on the website, internal and external, it can go on various calendars, and there can be press releases. She recommends having three burning questions at the ready to spur questions. You could provide FAQs to help people come up with questions, and ask for the top three questions.
- Rich said if you are asking someone to write questions on cards, there should be someone to hand out cards and someone to read them to determine questions to forward.

- Ana said you could take a limited number of questions and have the remainder answered online after the fact. Melissa added that all of the tables will have individual input methods. In that 15 minute period of open dialogue before the tables, how will you organize questions?
- John Shenot said he thought about creating a short list of questions, projecting them and asking people to comment on them.
- Tom Moore suggested saying the board has made a number of recommendations and making them available to the public. We could ask attendees to write down comments on recommendations during the presentations.
- Scott said fugitive dust, the asphalt plant and two-stroke engines could be possible topics.
- John Shenot said he is unclear the direction the board wants the open discussion section to go.
- Tom Griggs said it is about informing citizens about what the board does and general air quality issues. Give people a chance to ask questions about the board's relationship to Council, and relationship to other boards and commissions. It might be good to ask for some action.
- Tom Moore said we'd like to tease out topics we don't hear about. Melissa said we could ask what people care about in air quality that they haven't heard discussed. John read questions he has drafted.
- Tom Moore said you could hand out the questions beforehand. Nancy suggested putting the questions on a board, rather than on paper so people can view them throughout the presentations.
- Rich said 30 minutes is long for question and answer. Nancy said hearing from the people is the most important aspect.
- Tom Moore asked if the board should have a small gift for John Volckens. Members agreed to make a plan for this.
- Rich agreed to help John Shenot more offline. John said based on input he will create a few slides.
- Participating members agreed to come at 5:30 to help set up. Melissa will send an email reminder.
- The poster is available on the Air Quality website and on front page of fcgov.com

### **AGENDA ITEM 3: Election of Officers**

*Per AQAB By-laws, Board members nominated and elected a Chair and a Vice Chair to serve for a one year term, starting at the close of the April 21, 2014 meeting.*

**Dave nominated Tom Moore for chair. Tom Griggs seconded.**

**Motion passed, 6-0-1. Tom Moore abstained.**

**Dave nominated John Shenot for Vice Chair. Scott seconded.**

John said he wants everyone to know he has been missing about 1/3 of the meetings due to travel and that will probably not change.

**Motion passed, 6-0-1. John Shenot abstained.**

### **AGENDA ITEM 4: Announcements and Future Agenda Items**

Not discussed.

---

**Adjournment**

Meeting adjourned at 8:44pm.

Approved by the Board on May 19, 2014

Signed

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "D. Tjalkens", written over a horizontal line.

Dianne Tjalkens, Administrative Clerk II

5/20/2014

Date