

**MINUTES  
CITY OF FORT COLLINS  
AIR QUALITY ADVISORY BOARD**

**Date:** Monday, October 19, 2015  
**Location:** Community Room, 215 N. Mason Street  
**Time:** 5:30–8:00pm

**For Reference**

John Shenot, Chair  
Ross Cunniff, Council Liaison 970-420-7398  
Lucinda Smith, Interim Staff Liaison 970-224-6085

**Board Members Present**

John Shenot, Chair  
Jim Dennison  
Rich Fisher  
Vara Vissa  
Gregory Miller  
Tom Griggs  
Mark Houdashelt

**Board Members Absent**

Robert Kirkpatrick

**Staff Present**

Lucinda Smith, Environmental Services Director  
Dianne Tjalkens, Admin/Board Support  
Lindsay Ex, Environmental Program Manager

**Staff Absent**

**Councilmembers Present**

**Guests**

Chris Wood, citizen

---

**Call to order:** 5:37pm

**Public Comments:** Chris Wood is considering applying for the board. Works in environmental field with Platte River Power Authority. Strong interest in air quality and environmental stewardship.

**Staff Updates:** None

**Review and Approval of Minutes:**

Rich moved and Tom seconded a motion to approve the September 2015 AQAB minutes as amended. Motion passed, 5-0-2. John and Jim abstained as they were not present.  
Corrections: Change Melissa Hovey as liaison to Lucinda Smith.

---

**AGENDA ITEM 1: Transportation Air Quality Impacts Guidance Manual**

*John Shenot, Board Chair, led a discussion on the scope and elements to be included in the RFP to solicit qualified contractors to complete a “Transportation Air Quality Impacts Guidance Manual.” The board discussed their preference for their role in reviewing project work once the consultant has been selected.*

Lucinda explained that this project is supportive of continuous improvement of air quality (City Plan) and City Strategic Plan objectives including built environment, reducing GHG, reducing mobile source

emissions, and implementing leading edge practices. Challenge the board encountered was that when they heard about transportation planning projects, it was difficult to determine air quality impacts. \$35K was funded through BFO, and staff is hoping to be under contract by end of 2015. Additional \$10K will be available in 2016. Range of benefits: greater ability to differentiate air quality impacts of project options, may lead to more consideration of mitigation actions, supports grant applications to be more competitive, funding requests to FTA require air quality impacts. Pilot project that if proves beneficial could be applicable to private sector projects. Schedule is to quickly get RFP completed, have a City team review responses, conduct interviews if necessary, finalize the contract by end of year, and complete project by August of next year. Which firms should be on notified vendor list?

John added that this is last opportunity to discuss before staff issues RFP. Purchasing would like it this week. Members have been provided first draft of substantive content. Opportunity to have input on the services being bid on: scope of service, specific elements to include in proposals, and role of the board.

### Comments/Q&A

- How will having the product in hand actually work? ESD and Transportation would work together with this product as a tool to facilitate reducing air quality and climate impacts from transportation projects large and small?
  - Cooperative project between ESD and transportation. Part of objective is to provide input on what scale of project requires analysis. Help staff determine what should be doing to analyze air quality impacts. Small improvements could have some type of screening model, but focus is to provide guidance on appropriate tools to use. For large projects, what approach should be used? What are minimum expectations? Only being considered for City projects at this time.
  - Does it make sense to recommend to the City that the manual be used for City projects initially? Consultants should understand that being used by City staff. Or could be broader. Could suggest that City analyzes impacts of large private sector projects. Makes sense with limited budget and staff to apply to City initiated projects above a certain size or impact threshold.
    - Agree to limit scope. What might CSU be doing along these lines with huge capital construction projects they have? Ex: stadium.
      - Can't imagine they would be doing anything since use of stadium is episodic.
      - City and CSU considered intergovernmental agreement regarding traffic and noise related impacts. They are not required to do any modelling or follow City codes or guidelines. They have transportation, multimodal and parking planning. City wanted CSU to address impacts of stadium.
      - Air quality not a large discussion at time of stadium discussions.
      - CSU is one example. They are island of own, but within the City. Determine threshold. If the development is a strip mall, school, or church, have a questionnaire on volume, frequency, lanes, stop lights, idle time, etc. to know what projects look like.
        - In favor of having project have guidance for private projects.
      - Not clear on split between CSU and City. Improvements to Prospect and College, including bike underpass. Should the consultant tell us what the size of the project should be for analysis?
        - Up to staff to make policy recommendations. Total impacts to air quality from transportation are sum of public and private projects.
          - City is involved in laying out transportation networks, but as development evolves it should fit with City zoning and structure. Hard to separate impacts from, for example, mall construction. Gets to question of scale.
  - Public-private scope. The City will ask contractor to write a how-to manual on assessing air quality impacts. The consultant needs to know who is using it. How the developer gets data is different between public and private.

- If private projects, City has little impact. If don't have alternatives, it is a moot point. Would like private included. Start with City using this to work out bugs with intention of including private development later. Is it a lot more work to do a proper manual to do both kinds? Do we have the funding?
  - Inclined to think no. Could build RFP to seek proposal on what they would include. City won't build mall, but does transportation planning.
  - City permits go through development review process.
  - Very big deal to require analysis for private projects. Controversial and difficult. Could be provided as guidance.
  - Ask those bidding on project to give opinion on how it would have to change to include private projects.
- If have a vendor who has written impact evaluation guidance for another city, they would be way ahead of the game. Has one been done for any other city?
  - Mark Jackson was not aware of any. Part of scope is best practices review.
  - Cambridge Systematics wrote a series of papers on GHG impacts of transportation projects, showing what data is needed for baselining and post-project, and how to collect the data.
  - Format should include all projects, but could be less detailed due to financial restrictions.
  - RFP should give clear indication of what resources the City already has in order to determine what other data should be collected. Analysis basics are fairly well developed.
- Include language about being a model for potential use for future development, without reference to public or private. Set of metrics to evaluate impacts becomes the model for evaluation of other projects.
  - Demonstration project.
  - Broaden application. From ozone perspective, we have been modelled at regional scale. Project scale rather than regional scale for this. Value added here is it is a design tool to work to find ways to design transportation infrastructure to reduce emissions—avoidance, speed, flow, number of stoplights and stop signs, etc. What we initially had in mind was that Lincoln and Harmony corridor discussions had no air quality analysis. How can you work with Transportation to make a project better?
- What is second year funding earmarked for?
  - Training for City staff.
  - Could it be used for a second generation of the manual to include private projects after pilot year? Ask consultant if feasible to write the second section. Don't have a private party have to do the analysis—have all project analyzed by same people in a consistent manner (City staff).
- Feel strongly that the consultant needs to know the audience, and it should be for City staff. Staff might assess impacts of private projects. Can be more vague about what types of projects would be covered. Developers don't have the expertise.
  - Agree. Don't define project as private or public, but who will use the manual first. The goals are not public or private.
- What air pollutants should be covered? Some or all criteria pollutants, hazardous air pollutants, particulates, GHG?
  - Has to include ozone precursors and GHG. Should address particulates. Hazardous air pollutants tend to be released in smaller quantities, more difficult to assess.
  - If project is going to create CO, if know relative proportion to other pollutants, can extrapolate.
    - Not always true. Diesel, non-diesel, truck, car. Diesel should be addressed.
    - Seasonal differences in particulates?
      - Whether windy, road dusts, etc.
      - Mag chloride used on roads in winter.
  - Can consultant make recommendations?
    - Yes.
    - Not just tailpipe emissions, but also dust from the road. Particularly in the spring.

- Should manual tell City how to assess impacts of construction and after it is complete, with new traffic patterns?
  - Some overlap with dust control manual.
  - Should be all inclusive.
    - Include how to determine post-project impacts and how to monitor those, in order to see how well using the manual works.
  - Do we monitor for any GHG?
    - We don't monitor, we calculate.
- What role would this board like to have in regard to the contractor? Draft includes up to two meetings with the board to obtain input on the draft, and a round of review of final draft.
  - Have visit from consultant early on with results of their search for pre-existing documents. Answer questions on which pollutants they think should be included.
- How will the consultant structure the manual, in terms of options under different constraints: funding, data, etc.? That could be part of staff training. But could also be levels of analysis in manual.
- What major City project on horizon do we anticipate this being used on?
  - In retrospect, Downtown Plan and West Elizabeth Enhanced Travel Corridor would have been good candidates.
  - Mountain Vista area may get a new subarea plan. Assessing alternatives from safety, ability to transport pedestrians, etc., but have not yet looked at air quality impacts. Vine/Lemay intersection might be a good project.
  - Staff will decide how it will be used: evaluating for measure or alternatives.
    - Analysis for project is different than for corridor. Would need consultant help in that area.
    - Looking back at projects over last few years will give the effort more context.
    - Paragraph in introduction will give contractor background.
    - Can break down for consultant types of projects we want analysis on: corridors, smart growth, etc.
    - Under project applicability there is language on considering a full spectrum.
    - Activities: landscaping project at school, transport itself has air quality impacts.
      - That will be addressed in Dust Manual.
    - Helpful if RFP tells story of how project got funded and give specific examples.
    - Transportation staff is enthusiastic about this project.
      - Needs to be clearer about what types of projects are included in the transportation scope.

ACTION ITEM: Board members can send individual comments directly to Lucinda within the next two days.

---

## **AGENDA ITEM 2: 2016 Work Plan Draft**

*Members discussed a draft work plan for 2016, to be finalized at the November meeting for submittal by November 30, 2015.*

First of two discussions on 2016 Work Plan. Due end of November.

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

- Does format work? Layout/headers.
  - Yes.
- Purpose as stated is short and usable, but much shorter than purpose described in bylaws. Suggest using bylaws text instead.
  - Some of bylaw purposes are covered in the focus section of work plan.
    - The focus is about what will be done this year.
  - Keep the part about advising Council and add, "and other functions as defined by the bylaws"
  - Who writes the bylaws?

- Air Quality Advisory Board was created by City Charter. Bylaws are fairly old. Don't have Air Quality Action Plan or Policy Plan anymore—those are now one document.
- The Strategic Plan objectives are for 2015-16, so suggest leaving them as is.
  - Board agreed.
- Specific areas of interest, suggest adding note that not prioritized.
  - They are redundant with areas of focus.
  - Add train/train-derailment issues.
    - Decide if will be an area of focus first.
- Major Focus for 2016 addresses things that will be accomplished. What should they be? May keep some of 2015 goals.
  - Add follow-up on 2015 goals.
  - Are these prioritized?
    - No. Can make note of that, or change to prioritize.
    - #1 is highest priority.
    - Once have full list may decide top two and leave the remainder un-prioritized.
      - Continue this discussion next month.
    - Audience is City Council. Want to focus them on certain issues.
    - A lot of what board works on is brought up by staff with a specific timeline. There might be a few vital items that are mandatory, and a list of lower priority goals.
      - Useful to find a way to capture fact that some items are presented to the board and may not be in the queue when the Work Plan is drafted.
- Specific work areas?
  - Have to update the Air Quality Plan.
    - Options: Do it next year, or wait to complete with Plan Fort Collins update. Could leverage public outreach and transportation modelling.
    - CAP Implementation Plan set for completion next year.
  - Recommend keeping goals 5 and 6 as catch-all categories. Did not accomplish #7 (collaboration with other boards). If not going to do it, take it out.
    - Should have one or two meetings per year with these boards.
    - Next month will begin our discussion on annual report, which tells how we did on these goals.
  - Add lack of compliance with asbestos and train derailment emergency response.
    - #5 addresses fugitive dust, which became a large project, and rail emissions.
    - Would like to see recommendations to Council by end of next year on these issues.
  - Fugitive Dust guidance manual goes to Council in November. Should draft recommendation. If not adopted, it should remain an open item.
  - Add commenting on BFO offers and Ozone SIP update.
  - Is there any work to be done around the Clean Power Plan?
    - Add to list. Consider recommending Council make comment/take position on the CPP.
    - Bylaw says can advise North Front Range NPO.
      - Can make recommendations directly to them.
  - Add waste diversion. Will be in implementation phase of CAP. Should be tracking to see if tasks are being accomplished.

ACTION ITEM: Board members can share new focus area ideas via email before the next meeting, or bring to meeting.

---

### **AGENDA ITEM 3: Updates and Announcements**

#### **ESD Strategic Plan**

- Work Session completed: good feedback. Council said not their role to adopt department level strategic plans. Will complete it administratively. SSD will not take plan to Council either. EHO strategic plan was adopted. There are other departments that do environmental work as well. Will

continue to focus on outcomes. Once complete, will synthesize three department documents into a summary to show relationships between them.

### **Dust Measure and Control Project**

- When Council asked for pilot project, the goal was to implement some of the best practices on identified tasks to see what difference it makes. Result was great impact. Used dust meters to measure. Typically dust levels were 1/10 of what would have been without dust control measures. Cost impacts have been harder to get information on. Many pieces to cost equation. Idea to rank practices with dollar signs, but one-time/up-front costs versus long-term, proportion to job size versus not, etc. Work Group is comprised of staff and contractors; lacked balance. Work Group generally endorses guidance document, including landscaping companies, homebuilders and developers. Staff is incorporating feedback into new edition of document. They will bring to the board next meeting for recommendation. Progressive idea.
  - Manual has become better through input from contractors. Next steps include figuring out cost side. Working on graphic as how adding value rather than “piling on.” Also working on enforcement factor including training and education.
  - Next month will get quick overview from staff then make a recommendation.
  - May want a board member to make public comment at Council meeting (first reading).

### **Climate Action Plan**

- Work Session March 8, 2016: Sharing draft road map to achieve 2020 and 2030 goals. Had regional discussion with Boulder County and City to talk about collaboration on CPP and/or other items. Will solicit additional communities for regional coalition. Engaging community through advisory group. Will be announced publicly next week.
  - Boulder kicked off zero waste initiative last week.
  - Coordinating in programmatic ways. Unless work together to achieve goals at state and higher levels, cannot achieve local goals.
  - Regional waste forum last week kicked off discussions on regional waste streams.

### **New Ozone Standard**

- EPA has selected new standard: 70ppb. There will be a planning process to implement. We are working actively on an implementation plan for current ozone standard.
  - Still working on plan to meet less stringent standard plan from 2008. If areas do not meet the standard, they have to come up with a plan. EPA will designate non-attainment areas in 2017, based on monitoring data from 2014-16. Reason to believe city will be in non-attainment in 2017. Struggling to get to 75ppb now.
  - Seems like waste of time to plan for 75ppb, when will then have to create plan for 70ppb.
    - Administratively yes, but 75ppb is marker on way to 70ppb. Want to include options in plan which will make it easier to get to 70ppb.
    - Direct impact on public health.

---

## **AGENDA ITEM 4: Futures Actions and Agenda Items**

### **Review of City Council 6 Month Agenda Planning Calendar**

- Dec: Fugitive Dust

### **Agenda Planning—November**

- Finalize Work Plan
- Dust Control Manual/Fugitive Dust
- West Elizabeth Street enhanced travel corridor
- Begin discussion on Annual Report

---

**Meeting Adjourned:** 8:04pm

**Next Meeting:** November 16