

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

Date: Monday, July 18, 2016
Location: Community Room, 215 N. Mason Street
Time: 5:30–8:00pm

For Reference

Mark Houdashelt, Chair
Ross Cunniff, Council Liaison 970-420-7398
Cassie Archuleta, Staff Liaison 970-416-2648

Board Members Present

Mark Houdashelt, Chair
John Shenot
Gregory Miller
Chris Wood
Jim Dennison
Vara Vissa
Robert Kirkpatrick
Tom Griggs

Board Members Absent

Rich Fisher

Staff Present

Cassie Archuleta, Environmental Planner/Staff Liaison
Dianne Tjalkens, Admin/Board Support
Lindsay Ex, Environmental Program Manager

Councilmembers Present

None

Guests

None

Call to order: 5:36pm

Agenda Review: Moving asbestos and radon discussion to later in the meeting.

Public Comments: None

Review and Approval of Minutes:

Robert moved and John seconded a motion to approve the June 2016 AQAB minutes as presented.
Motion passed unanimously, 5-0-0. Jim, Tom, and Vara arrived after vote.

AGENDA ITEM 1: Board Recommendations

Mark Houdashelt led a discussion on possible submittal of recommendations to Council related to:

- *The West Elizabeth Enhanced Travel Corridor*
- *An allocation of General funds for CAP appropriation.*

Mark drafted statement in support of West Elizabeth plan as it has some positive GHG and air quality impacts. Suggest that staff use transportation air quality impacts manual as implement projects within the plan.

Board gave suggested edits and Cassie recorded changes.

Comments/Q&A

- Unsure what suggestions the board gave at last meeting are being incorporated into the draft West Elizabeth Plan.
 - No new GHG or air quality impacts data.

Tom moved to accept the draft recommendation as amended. Rob seconded.
Motion passed unanimously, 8-0-0.

Utilities does not have funds available to be able to continue to provide energy efficiency program rebates through the end of 2016. Council discussed using general funds to continue funding of business and residential energy efficiency programs until the end of the year. Council will have second reading tomorrow. Staff is not supporting this decision due to impacts on the BFO process. Energy Board has sent a recommendation supporting funding. Mark drafted a recommendation on funding energy efficiency programs. Costs the City money, but saves businesses money. Energy Policy requires the City to increase efficiencies annually. Need to increase funding to meet Energy Policy and CAP goals. Board gave suggested edits, including suggestion by John Shenot to add bullet point emphasizing AQ benefits of EE programs, and Cassie recorded changes.

Comments/Q&A

- How quickly did the money get used? How many businesses are on the waiting list?
 - Fully committed by May 20. Up to 200 additional projects that could be executed with these funds.
 - Not meeting the demand the market is telling us they want. Local businesses want to save money and reduce carbon emissions. Need to provide this service.
- Rebates or loans?
 - Vast majority goes to business rebates.
 - Solar is separate. This program is for upgrades to indoor and outdoor lighting, refrigeration, AC, etc. Incentivizes choosing a more energy efficient option.
- Get more bang for the buck spending \$1.5M on something else? Businesses would do this anyway if it has a two year payback. Just impacting their bottom line. Would there really be fewer energy efficiency upgrades without the rebates?
 - Can't say what the trade-offs will be since the City is early in the BFO process.
 - Councilman Horak is making a business case that for every dollar the City invests the businesses invest \$3-4.
 - City investment decreases payback period, which may increase number of businesses participating.
- One Board member studies these programs—well designed energy efficiency program is designed to overcome the barriers that make beneficial projects not happen. When invest own money require certain payback period and may not happen without City investment. Fort Collins Utilities has been shown to have one of the best efficiency programs in the country.
 - Ex: Make choice to buy more expensive/more efficient product with incentives.
 - Programs are designed so utility itself over the long run spends less money than if it hadn't given out the incentives. Over the life of the unit, it lowers the utility costs.
 - Power plant can be smaller when have lower peak demand.
 - Definitely a consideration when looking at next resource needed by a utility.
 - Incentive for utility as population grows. Lowers investment costs into energy infrastructure.
- Impacts on BFO process? Staff concerns?
 - \$1.46M out of reserves. Current BFO process had made available everything in reserves. Reduces amount available for one-time funding. Staff BFO teams have already provided recommendations to Budget Lead Team.
- When invest in energy efficiency, putting people to work, freeing up funds for additional projects, etc.

- Cannot continuously sustain these types of incentives.
 - Councilman Horak suggested that if demand remains strong, may decrease amount of rebate over time.
- Is it possible to determine the economic value of the incentives to the city?
 - Constantly analyzing this. Have dropped other incentives where the market has caught up. Can get a presentation from John Phelan to learn more. Rigor in approach to when to advance, remove, etc. incentives/programs.
 - Quantitative data to show benefit to utility, customers and community.
- Board member will need to read motion at public comment at tomorrow's Council meeting.
- Affirmation of what Council is already supporting.
 - Two Councilmembers were absent at first reading and are ones more likely to oppose.
 - Investment opportunity into local businesses.
- Should continue education piece, promote concept of energy efficiency, even when no longer funding rebates.
 - City will continue to have rebates beyond this year. The question now is only around continuing business efficiency rebates through the end of the year.

John moved to accept the draft recommendation as amended. Greg seconded.
Motion passed unanimously, 8-0-0.

AGENDA ITEM 2: Asbestos & Radon Board Discussion

Jim Dennison led a discussion on issues related to asbestos and radon, and gathered board feedback on possible future action related to these items.

Asbestos

High level of not following regulatory requirement. Asbestos rules have been in place for a long time. Two categories for where testing is called for:

1. Demolition of buildings (remove load bearing members or whole building)—state permit must show tested and abated.
2. Remodels and renovation—compliance rate is very low. Threshold for commercial size is larger than residential.

Does the board recommend the City do something to enhance compliance on remodels? No age cutoff date for testing materials. Incidence of new materials containing asbestos has decreased significantly, but may still contain some. City permit request form says must perform asbestos assessment if built before 1975. Asked building department about this issue. They feel asbestos mitigation reports should be required for demolition because can release asbestos into environment. However, concern with remodels is not abating and having exposure to future occupants and contractors to the building. Suggest making changes to the City permit application to increase compliance verification. Some cities require submitting the asbestos reports. As Jim has a conflict of interest in this matter, due to his business, he will recuse himself from all votes on asbestos related issues.

Comments/Q&A

- Suggest providing a chart so people can understand whether they need to test or not.
 - If just for remodels, could provide a synopsis on the form.
- Bring City staff and/or other experts in to present?
 - Straightforward technical issue.
 - Keep topic on board agenda; agree with bringing in outside expert and City staff person.
- Collaborate with Building Review Board. Happening a lot that people are removing finishing and disturbing a lot of materials when do remodels.
- Is this referred to in City code? Is it just a matter of changing a form? Can the City not approve a permit based on this?

- State regulation. Problem isn't the state; it is that local compliance doesn't match state requirements. Asbestos exposure could have large impact on families living in these homes.
- If working as remodel contractor, should be aware of requirements.
- Homeowner can get around the state regulation if doing the work themselves. Otherwise not optional.

ACTION ITEMS: Cassie will reach out to Building Review Board liaison and invite City staff to present. Jim will provide name of outside expert who can present.

Radon

EPA offers a course on radon. Also found document that gives background levels and says that smokers are at much greater risk of lung cancer with exposure to radon.

Less than 25% of people in Fort Collins who find out their homes have radon do mitigation. People do not understand the radon issue - Not tangible, invisible, odorless. Can read all the information and still not do anything about it—matter of choice for owner's place of residence; different story for commercial buildings and rental housing where exposing others to the hazard. Consider a requirement that test rental housing and mitigate and/or disclose before lease signing.

Comments/Q&A

- Could create a publically available database of all buildings that have been tested.
- Options for voluntary vs. required reporting. How do you verify? Many options to explore. Does board feel this is an important issue to pursue?
- This is a geographic issue. Complacency due to prevalence. Needs more attention. If program is not leading to a solution, need to revisit, look at barriers, etc.
 - Fort Collins has small radon mitigation loan program and testing kits. Most people find out about radon only from real estate disclosure brochure. Are there other places that have a more aggressive program? Call CDPHE and EPA Region 8 to ask about other municipalities that have done more to mitigate. May have more information on impediments.
- Can board ask staff to do more work?
 - Mary Pat is doing study with CSU on increasing mitigation rates. She could present on outcomes.
- Numbers are scary. Issue for city and in our charter. Should continue to work on this issue. Numbers within a home can change over time. Mitigation is costly, but important. Stay on issue for health and well-being of all Fort Collins residents.
- Will open a lot of issues and concerns and get pushback from parties selling properties, etc.

ACTION ITEMS: Cassie will ask Mary Pat for recommended steps to get more information. Mark will email case study documents to the board.

AGENDA ITEM 3: BFO Offer Discussion

Mark Houdashelt led a discussion on possible submittal of recommendations to Council related to climate and air quality BFO offers.

Mark provided air quality and CAP related offers to the board prior to the meeting. Received scoring from five board members. Mark drafted a recommendation for the board to complete with offers it chooses to highlight.

Board gave suggested edits and Mark recorded changes.

Comments/Q&A

- Few offers unworthy of funding.
- Offers tied to CAP total \$170M. Approximately \$165M is for ongoing offers. Enhancements are sorted into CAP-beneficial, CAP-driven, and CAP-accelerated.
 - One offer for indoor air quality did not have CAP impacts.
- Last time presented 10 offers in the recommendation to Council and did not rank them in priority order. Recommend not prioritizing. Thirteen offers ranked highest this time. Not an unreasonable number.

- Agree that submitting around 15 offers is reasonable. For those offers, total dollars close to \$10M.
- September 13 Council will review recommended budget.
- Include in recommendation that board may have a more refined recommendation at a later date. Preliminary effort.

Tom moved to accept the draft recommendation as amended. Jim seconded.
Motion passed unanimously, 8-0-0

AGENDA ITEM 4: Staff Updates

CSU Oil and Gas Study

Creating final report. Board can have presentation on summary of findings. County's Environmental and Science Advisory Board would also like to see the presentation.

- Get an abstract to see if want to schedule full presentation.

NCAR Ozone Monitoring Data Assessment Status

State has contracted with NCAR to do assessment summary. Pitched in to get a Fort Collins assessment of what data means to us, profiles of ozone, and suggested enhancements/changes to monitoring system.

- Assessment of PM monitoring network?
 - No. Just ozone. Will include ozone precursors, though.
- Informational only?
 - Will work results into air quality plan, slated for next year.

AGENDA ITEM 5: Other Business

Board Member Announcements

SIP

- In charter that board has input on SIP.
 - Cassie can present timeline.
- Fort Collins has participated in the past as part of other organizations.
 - Could be cooperation with NPO, but not facilitated as it was in the past.
- In early 2000s, asked designation to be downgraded to have longer time for compliance. Gave input directly to CDPHE.
- Local government coalition—communities work together.
 - Not happening this time.

Energy Board/CAP Modelling

- Energy Board special session on modelling CAP. Modelling everything to be done in a given year, not just what is new. All costs and emission reductions could be over-reported. Still working on modelling.
- Still reporting costs as gross, not net. Not taking savings into account. Giving impression things are more expensive than really are. Councilman Martinez would like to consider citizens vote on a tax to support CAP. Will have a special Work Session on messaging.

Council Six-Month Agenda Planning Calendar

- West Elizabeth Travel Corridor

Agenda Items for August

- Community Recycling Ordinance
- Air Quality Survey
- Work Plan

Meeting Adjourned: 8:03pm

Next Meeting: August 15