



CITY OF BOULDER
ENVIRONMENTAL ADVISORY BOARD MEETING AGENDA
DATE: July 6, 2016
TIME: 6 pm
PLACE: 1777 Broadway, West Conference Room

- 1. CALL TO ORDER**
- 2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES**
 - A. The [June 1, 2016](#) Environmental Advisory Board meeting minutes are scheduled for approval.
- 3. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION**
- 4. PUBLIC HEARING ITEMS**
- 5. DISCUSSION ITEMS**
 - A. Community Engagement Strategies (6-7 – Amanda Nagl)
 - B. [Boulder’s Soundscape Problems](#) (7-7:15 – Board)
- 6. OLD BUSINESS/UPDATES**
 - A. [Report Back on Planning Board Collaboration](#)
(7:15-7:30 – Brad Queen & Christina Gosnell)
 - B. Establishing Regular Annual Joint Board Meetings & Other Next Steps
(7:30-7:45 – Board)
- 7. MATTERS FROM THE ENVIRONMENTAL ADVISORY BOARD, CITY MANAGER AND CITY ATTORNEY**
- 8. DEBRIEF MEETING/CALENDAR CHECK**
- 9. ADJOURNMENT**

For more information call (303) 441-1931. Board packets are available after 4 pm Wednesday prior to the meeting, online at www.bouldercolorado.gov.

**CITY OF BOULDER ENVIRONMENTAL ADVISORY BOARD
MEETING GUIDELINES**

CALL TO ORDER

The board must have a quorum (three members present) before the meeting can be called to order.

AGENDA

The board may rearrange the order of the agenda or delete items for good cause. The board may not add items requiring public notice.

PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

The public is welcome to address the board (three minutes* maximum per speaker) during the Public Participation portion of the meeting regarding any item not scheduled for a public hearing. The only items scheduled for a public hearing are those listed under the category PUBLIC HEARING ITEMS on the agenda. Any exhibits introduced into the record at this time must be provided in quantities of eight to the Board Secretary for distribution to the board and admission into the record.

DISCUSSION AND STUDY SESSION ITEMS

Discussion and study session items do not require motions of approval or recommendation.

PUBLIC HEARING ITEMS

A Public Hearing item requires a motion and a vote. The general format for hearing of an action item is as follows:

1. Presentations

- Staff presentation (15 minutes maximum*) Any exhibits introduced into the record at this time must be provided in quantities of eight to the Board Secretary for distribution to the board and admission into the record.
- Environmental Advisory Board questioning of staff for information only.

2. Public Hearing

Each speaker will be allowed an oral presentation (three minutes maximum*). All speakers wishing to pool their time must be present, and time allotted will be determined by the Chair. Two minutes will be added to the pooled speaker for each such speaker's allotted time up to a maximum of 10 minutes total.

- Time remaining is presented by a green blinking light that means one minute remains, a yellow light means 30 seconds remain, and a red light and beep means time has expired.
- Speakers should introduce themselves, giving name and address. If officially representing a group please state that for the record as well.
- Speakers are requested not to repeat items addressed by previous speakers other than to express points of agreement or disagreement. Refrain from reading long documents, and summarize comments wherever possible. Long documents may be submitted and will become a part of the official record.
- Any exhibits introduced into the record at the hearing must be provided in quantities of eight to the Board Secretary for distribution to the board and admission into the record.
- Interested persons can send a letter to the Community Planning and Sustainability staff at 1739 Broadway, Boulder, CO 80302, two weeks before the Environmental Advisory Board meeting, to be included in the board packet. Correspondence received after this time will be distributed at the board meeting.

3. Board Action

Board motion. Motions may take any number of forms. Motions are generally used to approve (with or without conditions), deny, or continue agenda item to a later date (generally in order to obtain additional information).

- Board discussion. This is undertaken entirely by members of the board. Members of the public or city staff participate only if called upon by the Chair.
- Board action (the vote). An affirmative vote of at least three members of the board is required to pass a motion approving any action.

MATTERS FROM THE ENVIRONMENTAL ADVISORYBOARD, CITY MANAGER, AND CITY ATTORNEY

Any Environmental Advisory Board member, City Manager, or the City Attorney may introduce before the board matters which are not included in the formal agenda.

ADJOURNMENT

The board's goal is that regular meetings adjourn by 8 p.m. Agenda items will not be commenced after 8 p.m. except by majority vote of board members present.

*The Chair may lengthen or shorten the time allotted as appropriate. If the allotted time is exceeded, the Chair may request that the speaker conclude his or her comments.

**CITY OF BOULDER, COLORADO
BOARDS AND COMMISSIONS MEETING SUMMARY**

NAME OF BOARD/COMMISSION: Environmental Advisory Board

DATE OF MEETING: June 1, 2016

NAME/TELEPHONE OF PERSON PREPARING SUMMARY: Sandy Briggs, 303-441-1931.

NAMES OF MEMBERS, STAFF AND INVITED GUESTS PRESENT:

Environmental Advisory Board Members Present: Tim Hillman, Brad Queen, Karen Crofton and Christina Gosnell.

Environmental Advisory Board Members Absent: Morgan Lommele

Staff Members Present: Lesli Ellis, Kara Mertz, Brett KenCairn and Sandy Briggs

MEETING SUMMARY:

❖ **Boulder Valley Comprehensive Plan Update**

- A board member asked about the future of resilience staff at the city and how this might affect plan implementation.
- The board agreed that the energy efficiency references in the land use section are vague and will benefit from the planned restructuring to make them more congruent with the Climate Commitment.
- It was suggested to better incorporate energy efficiency modeling that not only utilizes land use snap shots, but scenarios tracking trends in resource consumption and related emissions.
- The board received clarification that the environmental metrics related to the proposed land use changes will be mostly additive, but will also be measured on a per capita basis when appropriate.
- The board was reminded that implications are not just local since Boulder's programs have regional impacts.
- There was interest in including more detail regarding the Citizens Science Data Collection Program, and how it fits in to the BVCP Update picture.

❖ **Universal Zero Waste Ordinance Update**

- The board received clarification about current city diversion rates by sector and type of material and why the ordinance requires haulers to bring all recyclables to the Boulder County Recycling Center.
- As it has traditionally been challenging for special event organizers to garner volunteers to staff zero waste stations per ordinance requirements, the board suggested offering more incentives and asking other organizations like the CU E Center or the Boy Scouts for help.
- The board suggested obtaining load tracking data and tying compliance to the hauler's billing processes to more formally encourage involvement and compliance.
- The board agreed hosting community forums may not be the best format for maximizing participation to gather community input regarding the effectiveness of UZWO implementation. Instead, they suggested using surveys and webinars, going to where

people already are, meeting during business hours and administering mobile surveys while zero waste advisors and community partners are already on the ground at businesses and in neighborhoods.

- Board members suggested including a line item on the Rental Housing Licensing Application Checklist and a section about UZWO in the model lease to inform the public of the ordinance requirements.

❖ **6400 Arapahoe Development Plan Update**

- One board member feels it is not easy to find the current locations and services in place to properly sort and recycle various recyclable items.
- Smaller “transfer stations” were suggested as a way to make recycling of these items easier. This could be done internally in the Recycle Row area, or by setting up drop off points at places around town like Home Depot (similar to Best Buy for electronics).
- It was suggested a website where users could enter a type of item to find out where to take it and facility availability would be a useful tool.
- Other suggestions, like the ability to return borrowed tools to locations other than the ReSource Tool Library, were offered.

1. CALL TO ORDER

Environmental Advisory Board Chair **T. Hillman** declared a quorum called the meeting to order at 6:01 pm.

2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

On a motion by **B. Queen**, seconded by **K. Crofton**, the Environmental Advisory Board voted 4-0 (**M. Lommele** absent) to approve the May 4, 2016 meeting minutes.

3. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

None.

4. PUBLIC HEARING ITEMS

None.

5. DISCUSSION ITEMS

A. Boulder Valley Comprehensive Plan Update (Ellis)

- Comprehensive Planning Manager, **L. Ellis**, updated the board of the current stage of the Boulder Valley Comprehensive Plan with emphasis on the Natural Environment, Climate and Energy, and Resilience policies as well as information about land use scenarios and criteria for evaluation.

The BVCP is an evolving document that is updated every five years and includes undertaking a series of steps to further the understanding of where we are and where we need to go as a community.

The early stages of public engagement began last summer and continue with numerous events planned throughout 2016. The aim is to present a draft plan in the late fall or winter, then start the adoption process in early 2017.

One of the focus areas of the BVCP is addressing changes to the land use plan and the impacts this could have on environmental goals.

There are two chapters of particular interest to the EAB – Chapter 3-Natural Environment

and Chapter 4-Climate, Energy and Resilience. New language has been suggested around these topics, with numerous clarifications and a focus on emerging issues. The BVCP will also be “tightened up” to better align with Boulder’s Climate Commitment. This will include addressing ecosystem management and the wild/urban interface to identify needs across natural areas in addition to creating green infrastructure and biodiversity within city limits.

B. Universal Zero Waste Ordinance Update (Mertz)

Local Environmental Action Manager, **K. Mertz**, updated the board regarding implementation of the Universal Zero Waste Ordinance (UZWO) and asked how the EAB would like to be involved moving forward.

She provided statistics regarding past and current waste diversion rates from different city sectors and explained that the city’s zero waste goal is 85% diversion from landfills by 2025.

There is a two-stage implementation plan for property owners and businesses, including special events requirements, and there are City Manager’s Rules that provide the details for implementation. It was noted that for the first year, the city will manage the ordinance to encourage compliance, not punish noncompliance.

She informed the board about the rebates, grants and exemptions that are available and provided a high-level overview of hauler reporting, compliance tracking and the potential for self-reporting requirements if voluntary compliance proves unsuccessful.

After one year, she will return to City Council with a report on compliance and implementation progress in order to determine if a different approach might be necessary.

C. 6400 Arapahoe Development Plan Update (Mertz)

Local Environmental Action Manager, **K. Mertz**, informed the board of the 6400 Arapahoe site’s history and current status, asked for their feedback on the Phase II Site Review amendment and for ideas for Phase III development. She further requested advice about how to best sequence the process in order to provide City Council with a broad array of options and a robust analysis of these options in advance of Concept Plan submission. Since it is not currently clear how much the nonprofits will be able to contribute to the development, it may be difficult to do a cost-benefit analysis.

While there is currently no funding available for either project, City Council was asked to approve staff’s proposal to allow application for a minor amendment to the originally approved 2011 site review for Phase II and to retain ownership of the subdivided parcel in order to flesh out Phase II options. They voted 6-2 in favor; Mayor Jones abstained as she is the Executive Director of Eco-Cycle.

Since it’s purchase in 2008 as a permanent home for community partners Eco-Cycle and ReSource, the idea has been to provide longevity for zero waste operations and continue the “Recycle Row” concept to include other creative reuse and repair options. The Phase II Site Review includes expansion plans for both current tenants.

The following ideas for potential new activities on the property for Phase III development were presented:

- Art Parts
- Blue Star Recyclers
- Small business incubator space for start-ups wanting to up-cycle materials

- Satellite parking for downtown employees
- Office space
- Maker space, fix-it clinics
- Housing – homeless, on-site employees, second story living quarters

She also noted that using the site for construction and demolition waste processing was specifically prohibited in the annexation agreement.

She will return to the Board to flesh out the options analysis prior to returning to City Council at a Study Session later this year before development of the Phase III concept plan.

6. OLD BUSINESS/UPDATES

A. City/CPW Meeting Attendance by BBC (Briggs)

EAB Secretary **S. Briggs** informed the board that the BBC would not be allowed to attend CPW meetings with the city at this time and that Urban Wildlife Conservation Coordinator, **Valerie Matheson**, had been and would continue to be in contact with the interested parties regarding this issue. Hard copies of **V. Matheson's** written explanation of these answers and her actions were provided to the board members.

7. MATTERS FROM THE ENVIRONMENTAL ADVISORY BOARD, CITY MANAGER AND CITY ATTORNEY

A. Continued Joint Board Open House Discussion (All)

The board discussed **B. Queen's** initial communication with Planning Board Chair **John Gerstle** and concluded that a different process was necessary to move forward.

The following points were discussed and decisions made to begin and continue collaboration with other boards:

- Schedule a standard annual joint board meeting.
- The objective is to help other boards understand how to consider environmental concerns in their processes and integrate Climate Commitment and environmental issues into their decisions.
- Determine those elements of other boards' charters that are in the EAB's purview and how to share advice about those specific items.
- Start with Planning Board as a "test case" to establish and develop the collaboration and engagement process.
- **B. Queen** will speak with PB Member **Leonard May** about processes and contact PB Chair **John Gerstle** with suggestions that two EAB members attend to speak about EAB collaboration during the public comment period or that a more formal inter-board subcommittee be created.
- **B. Queen** and **C. Gosnell** will attend an upcoming PB meeting and report back.

8. DEBRIEF MEETING/CALENDAR CHECK

S. Briggs reminded the board that Council Members Matt Appelbaum and Jan Burton have been officially invited to attend a meeting in 2016 but which meeting they will choose is still unknown.

9. ADJOURNMENT

The Environmental Advisory Board adjourned at 8:20 pm.

Approved:

Chair

Date

DRAFT

Briggs, Sandy

From: Connie M. <conniethecarpenter@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, June 29, 2016 1:38 PM
To: Briggs, Sandy
Subject: Re: EAB Boulder's Soundscape problems

Hi Sandy, these are some of my preliminary ideas. They are mostly related to transportation noise, which IMO makes up for the most harm to Boulder's soundscape. Occasional music and short term construction noise is not an issue because it is short lived and most importantly, predictable. I plan on coming to the meeting. Thanks, - Connie

Active enforcement of loud vehicles on Broadway, Foothills, Broadway, and Rte 36 and other major thoroughfares.

Find ways to communicate to out of town drivers, especially truckers without good engine mufflers besides the DOT road signs (there are only two or three) requiring engine brake mufflers to be used.

Design and time traffic lights to reduce hard braking on downhill slopes which causes truckers to use engine brakes, especially at night.

Sound barriers along roads in areas of most diesel vehicle and motorcycle impact (overpasses and where highways and road converge and cross - example would be Foothills and Rte 36 (near S. Boulder Road/Table Mesa PnR), Iris/30th St., etc. Maybe measure peak decibels in various locations like they do in Denver for the DIA airport noise monitoring. Interesting why vehicle noise mitigation was not included in the Rte 36 overhaul.

Rebates for low emission/low noise polluting landscaping machines.

Rebates for sound control windows with a minimum STC, which stands for Sound Transmission Class.

Work with regional recreational airports to minimize training, glider tow planes, helicopters over residential and park areas.

Looking at what other communities have done to combat daily noise sources (especially how they warn vehicles from out of the area ahead of time that do not have noise restrictions)

Alternative commuter bike and walking paths that do not parallel busy loud highways. Noise is one deterrent to use bikes/ped during rush hour for errands besides safety.

Train noise (being currently addressed)

Noise permit for loud night time construction projects.

On Thu, Jun 23, 2016 at 11:29 AM, Briggs, Sandy <BriggsS@bouldercolorado.gov> wrote:

Hi Connie,

This item is on the agenda for the EAB meeting on July 6 (see <https://bouldercolorado.gov/boards-commissions/environmental-advisory-board-meetings> for meeting details).

There is a short conversation planned, and it would be helpful to understand if you have any specific recommendations or considerations you'd like the board to discuss. Please let us know what solutions you are actively seeking and what you are asking of the board to help guide the conversation. You are also welcome to attend and speak during Public Participation, if you'd like.

Thank you!

Sandy Briggs

Administrative Specialist III – Contracts & Program Support



O: 303-441-1931

BriggsS@bouldercolorado.gov

Department of Planning, Housing + Sustainability

1101 Arapahoe Ave | PO Box 791 | Boulder, CO 80306

BoulderColorado.gov

From: Connie M. [mailto:conniethecarpenter@gmail.com]

Sent: Thursday, June 02, 2016 11:10 AM

To: Briggs, Sandy <BriggsS@bouldercolorado.gov>

Subject: EAB Boulder's Soundscape problems

Hi, I am somewhat familiar with the EAB and attended a meeting a long time ago. Curious if anyone on the board is interested in addressing the deteriorating soundscape of Boulder? The noise pollution is getting worse every year and degrading the quality of life here and adding to people's stress levels. Obvious ongoing sources are diesel trucks, motorcycles, leaf blowers, lawn mowers and certain aircraft. Feel free to forward my email to someone who may be interested in finding solutions besides earplugs and closing windows in the summer ;)

Thank you,
Connie

Briggs, Sandy

From: John Gerstle <johnhgerstle@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, June 06, 2016 3:53 PM
To: Brad Queen
Cc: boulderplanningboard; Environmental Advisory Board
Subject: RE: Collaboration tactics between the EAB and Planning Board

Dear Brad, and Environmental Advisory Board members –

Thanks for Brad's email of June 1.

The Planning Board discussed the issue of collaboration with the Environmental Advisory Board during its most recent meeting, on June 2, with input from Staff and the Assistant City Attorney. (You can hear the details of the discussion and staff input near the end -beginning at 8:13 pm- of the Boulder Channel 8 recording of that meeting, under the "Matters" item on the agenda.)

In its discussion, the Planning Board concluded that the most effective and appropriate manner for it to obtain input from EAB is for EAB members (in their individual capacity) to use the Planning Board Public Comment procedures for oral and/or written comment.

The Planning Board is also receptive to a possible joint meeting if the boards agree on the desirability of jointly discussing specific issues related to planning policies and master plans. Any such meeting should take place with full understanding of the charters that govern our respective boards, and the associated responsibilities and objectives.

I hope that you find these comments responsive and helpful. The Planning Board certainly appreciates the work done by EAB, and looks forward to benefiting from its recommendations and findings !

Sincerely,

John G.

John Gerstle
 Chairman
 Planning Board

From: Brad Queen [mailto:sendthistobrad@hotmail.com]
Sent: Wednesday, June 01, 2016 9:46 PM
To: 'John Gerstle'
Cc: 'boulderplanningboard'; Environmental Advisory Board
Subject: RE: Collaboration tactics between the EAB and Planning Board

John,

The EAB did discuss the suggestions in my email in our May meeting. We repeated that discussion tonight. This time Brett KenCairn noted that the EAB is restricted per the following paragraph of the City code:

2-3-16.(d) The board shall not involve itself in any review under the land use regulations, title 9, "Land Use Code," B.R.C. 1981, unless its opinion is requested by the city council.

However, that does not mean the EAB can't collaborate with Planning Board to address the desire your members expressed in applying Climate Commitment and other environmental considerations to your process.

We concluded our discussion tonight with a renewal of my action item to contact you to request a dialog to seek clarification on what we can do to collaborate on this point. The options are:

- A) have myself and Christina Gosnell attend an upcoming planning board meeting under public comment to your entire board. or
- B) coordinate an inter-board subcommittee meeting
- C) whatever you suggest

It sounds like you will want to discuss this amongst the PB first. Please inform us how you would like to proceed.

Thank you,
Brad Queen
Environmental Advisory Board

From: John Gerstle [<mailto:johnhgerstle@gmail.com>]
Sent: Tuesday, 2016-05-31 11:12 AM
To: Brad Queen
Cc: boulderplanningboard
Subject: Collaboration tactics between the EAB and Planning Board

Hi Brad –

I would like to let you know that we have not forgotten your thoughts regarding communication/collaboration between Planning Board and EAB.

Staff has indicated that the full EAB has not yet discussed the suggestions made in your email, and they recommend that, to avoid confusion, this be addressed by the EAB in an upcoming meeting, prior to Planning Board discussion of your suggestions.

Given the tight PB schedule, this seems reasonable to me, and I hope, also to you.

Thanks –

John G.

John Gerstle
Chairman
Planning Board