CITY OF BOULDER
ENVIRONMENTAL ADVISORY BOARD MEETING AGENDA
DATE: March 19, 2014
TIME: 6 p.m.
PLACE: 1777 Broadway, 1777 W. Conference Room

---

1. **CALL TO ORDER**

2. **APPROVAL OF MINUTES**
   A. The **December 4, 2013** Environmental Advisory Board minutes and **February 5, 2014** Environmental Advisory Board Retreat notes are scheduled for approval.

3. **OLD BUSINESS/UPDATES**
   A. B&C coordination approaches considered by other boards.
   B. Specific topics board wants covered in facilitation/meeting management training.
   C. Board "point persons" quarterly goals based on Feb 11 City Council SS summary.

4. **PUBLIC PARTICIPATION**

5. **DISCUSSION ITEMS**
   A. Boulder Energy Challenge (formerly referred to as Market Innovations) Program Development Update: Jamie Harkins (Staff is requesting feedback from the board on the proposed program structure for Boulder Energy Challenge)

6. **PUBLIC HEARING ITEMS**

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

8. **DEBRIEF MEETING/CALENDAR CHECK**

9. **ADJOURNMENT**

For more information call (303) 441-1880. Board packets are available after 4 p.m. Friday prior to the meeting, online at www.bouldercolorado.gov, at the Boulder Public Main Library's Reference Desk, or at the Planning and Development Services Center, located at 1739 Broadway, third floor.

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: December 4, 2013

NAME/TELEPHONE OF PERSON PREPARING SUMMARY: Juliet Bonnell, 303-441-1931

NAMES OF MEMBERS, STAFF AND INVITED GUESTS PRESENT:
Environmental Advisory Board Members Present: Mara Abbott, Tim Hillman, Larissa Read, Stephen Morgan, and Morgan Lommele.

City Council Member Present: Tim Plass

Staff Members Present: Jonathan Koehn, Val Matheson, Juliet Bonnell

1. CALL TO ORDER
The Environmental Advisory Board temporary Chair **M. Abbott** declared a quorum and the meeting was called to order at 6:06 p.m.

2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES
On a motion by **M. Lommele** seconded by **M. Abbott**, the Environmental Advisory Board approved (5-0) the October 2, 2013 meeting minutes.

3. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION
Randy Moorman of Eco-Cycle presented Eco-Cycle's Cooling the Climate through Boulder Business Recycling Campaign and asked for the EAB's support in recommending to the City Council that they include in their January retreat consideration of a mandatory commercial recycling ordinance.

Brenda Lee spoke on behalf of Boulder Bear Coalition regarding the issue of securing trash from black bears. She felt that change to the city's current approach is necessary for the safety of both bears and residents. She suggested that the city take more action and enforcement measures in order to address this issue.

4. DISCUSSION ITEMS

A. Ongoing coordination of City Boards and Commissions: Council Member Tim Plass

T. Plass informed the board that a Boards and Commissions Committee has been created with the main objectives of enhancing B&C recruitment, the selection process and the support of B&Cs, enhancing the functioning of B&Cs, and ensuring that B&C members are fulfilled and have a positive experience. The B&C committee interviewed staff members and board chairs to gather baseline information to evaluate B&C recruitment, orientation, on-going training, staff support and the experience of board members. This information is included in the B&C report that was in the EAB's 12.4.2013 packet. Based on this report, the following recommendations were made:

DRAFT

1. Clarify the actions and roles of board and staff members.
2. Utilize Channel 8 and social media to assist with recruitment efforts.
3. Consider holding on-site community meetings with appropriate outreach instead of holding all meetings in Council Chambers.
4. Alter B&C applications so that they include questions that address emotional intelligence (e.g. questions about working in groups instead of just subject matter questions).
5. As part of orientation, provide a board member 101 training that provides information about how the city works and perhaps also offer a panel with long-time board members sharing lessons learned.
6. Provide on-going training for board members.
7. Establish best practices across B&Cs including annual retreats, agenda meetings, meeting debriefs, special training for board chairs, specialized training for quasi-judicial boards, etc.
8. Create a staff support group for B&Cs to improve coordination between different boards
9. Create parity between boards regarding resources, money for training, meals, etc.

He asked for feedback from EAB on how to improve board and commission functioning.

S. Morgan suggested increasing interaction between boards and boards and council. He would like to receive more feedback from both council and the community about the recommendations the EAB is making. He suggested that by ensuring serving on B&Cs is a good experience, it may be possible to recruit out-going board members from one board to other boards.

L. Read liked the idea of sharing best practices and felt that parity between boards is important. She suggested that emotional intelligence could be determined a bit during the B&C interview (perhaps by asking scenario-based questions). She suggested sharing the B&C video made by Channel 8 with a broader audience and tapping into social media more.

T. Hillman liked the idea of holding meetings in different locations within the community. He also expressed support for board chair training.

M. Lommele suggested doing board member profiles in the paper and/or having B&C members write letters to the editor about their positive experiences. She would like to see a more focused, better defined 2014 work plan. She felt subject matter expertise should be a priority over emotional intelligence as a criterion for board members. She felt there was value in having joint board meetings and suggested having more of them.

M. Abbott felt that the B&C video should be advertised in other ways besides through Channel 8. She suggested using social media.

B. Analysis and Options to secure trash and curbside compost from black bears: Urban Wildlife Coordinator Val Matheson

V. Matheson presented background information to the board on the Black Bear and Mountain Lion Component of the Urban Wildlife Management Plan which was adopted by council in 2011 and identifies an adaptive management approach to reducing the accessibility of trash to bears in Boulder. The approach included returning to council in 2014 with feedback on the approaches that have been implemented over the years and additional options on how to secure trash from bears.

She noted that this became a council priority due to four bears being killed over the past year. **V. Matheson** proposed three options to the EAB to secure trash and curbside compost and asked for the board's feedback on location options, storage requirements and enforcement options. Based on results from public meetings, a public survey, and EAB feedback, staff will formulate recommendations on these options to present to council in January 2014.

First, she discussed location options of where it is important to include in an ordinance to effect change in the way trash is being secured and managed. These options included the following locations: (a) a broad bear activity west of Broadway that includes 12,436 homes and 1,001 businesses (b) a high bear activity area where the majority of bear activity has occurred over the past 5 years that includes 6,906 homes and 433 businesses or (c) alleys, where the method of trash storage experiences the most disturbances by bears and includes 6,496 homes and 594 businesses.

Next, she discussed the two storage requirement options for securing trash which included: (a) a requirement for securing trash in enclosures or bear-resistant containers until 5 a.m. on collection day, or (b) requiring trash and compost stored in or near alleys to be secured in bear-resistant containers. The upfront cost of enclosures is high, but in the long run is very cost-effective. Bear-resistant containers cost residents more than regular trash containers as does pick-up service for bear-resistant containers.

Finally, the three enforcement options she proposed included: (a) adding an administrative service of summonses which allows a trash violation to be directed to a landlord even if direct contact cannot be made, (b) increasing fine amounts from $100 to $250 for first offense and (c) offering a summons fine alternative of obtaining a bear resistant container.

V. Matheson asked for feedback from the board on the three option components to reduce the accessibility of trash and food waste to bears and whether the EAB would like to see staff explore any other options.

S. Morgan noted that trash in his neighborhood is always knocked over, but that he's never seen a compost container knocked over. He felt that any storage requirement changes should cost less than $10/month more than current storage and service costs. He warned against only addressing this problem in one location and that this would simply shift the problem to other locations. He mentioned that enforcement by the city is somewhat lacking and suggested using Western for enforcement purposes by having them charge extra for strewn trash.

L. Read felt that the problem locations where trash has been strewn by bears (not areas where bears have just been sighted) are the ones that should be focused on. She mentioned the need to take into consideration the different needs of the various populations affected by changes in requirements made and potentially using different approaches/requirements for different populations and areas. She suggested looking into the possibility of building trash enclosures for interested residents and she liked the idea of offering a summons fine alternative of obtaining a bear resistant container.

T. Hillman agreed that building communal trash enclosures for interested residents should be pursued where allowed by code. He also liked the idea of allowing residents to purchase/subscribe for bear resistant containers instead of paying the fine associated with a trash ordinance summons.

DRAFT

M. Lommele supported all of the options and noted that action is necessary. She felt that this is a problem that needs to be addressed immediately.

S. Morgan suggested that in high density areas on the hill, redevelopment projects should be required to include communal trash enclosures.

M. Abbott agreed that actions taken should be considered and appropriate to the various populations that are being served. She'd like for the expectations between landlords and tenants to be clear. She suggested that the city receive more clarity from Western about costs as soon as possible and prior to taking options out to the public. She also liked the idea of bear resistant containers instead of a fine or fee.

5. PUBLIC HEARING ITEMS

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

A. EAB input to Council retreat

J. Koehn informed the board that the council is approaching their retreat differently this year. This year council is asking for input from the board about what the top priorities are for the EAB within council's work plan and how the board can help advance the council's goals. Council is also asking if the board would like to see any other items that aren't on the work plan addressed. The board's response to council is due to CMO by January 3, 2014. Staff will provide the board with a template for them to fill out and reach consensus on their priorities.

M. Abbott offered to compile board members' comments. She also suggested that board members go to council study sessions to stay tuned in to council's pulse to then inform the EAB's list for next year.

S. Morgan suggested trying to keep their goals more narrowly focused and actionable.

The board discussed that they would like to work more collaboratively with other boards to bring an environmental lens to other issues such as affordable housing. EAB would like to apply their filter to non-environmental issues to ensure that the environmental perspective is covered in all issues.

By December 15 the board will provide their comments to **M. Abbott** to compile. **M. Abbott** will compile their comments by December 20 and the board will provide feedback on the compiled document to reach a consensus on the document that will be sent to council.

The board scheduled their retreat for the first Wed in February.

L. Read suggested doing a brief re-introduction of each of the board members at the EAB retreat.

J. Koehn announced that the city received a Rockefeller Grant as one of thirty three resilient cities.

DRAFT

J. Koehn informed the board that two working groups have been formed. A Solar Working Group has been formed to look at the next generation of solar in Boulder. This group is deciding how to evaluate solar, where we want to get to, and determining what barriers exist. A Natural Gas working group has also been formed to discuss best practices, issues related to methane release, and alternatives to natural gas.

Discussions are also being had about what the utility business model of the future should be and how energy should be treated as a service.

7. DEBRIEF MEETING/CALENDAR CHECK

8. ADJOURNMENT
Environmental Advisory Board adjourned at 8:54 p.m.

Approved:

_____

Chair Date

DRAFT

CITY OF BOULDER, COLORADO
BOARDS AND COMMISSIONS MEETING SUMMARY

NAME OF BOARD/COMMISSION: Environmental Advisory Board

DATE OF MEETING: February 5, 2014

NAME/TELEPHONE OF PERSON PREPARING SUMMARY: Juliet Bonnell, 303-441-1931

NAMES OF MEMBERS, STAFF AND INVITED GUESTS PRESENT:
Environmental Advisory Board Members Present: Mara Abbott, Tim Hillman, Morgan Lommele, Stephen Morgan, and Larissa Read

Staff Members Present: Jonathan Koehn, Brett KenCairn, David Driskell, and Juliet Bonnell

Facilitator: Heather Bergman

1. Welcome and Introductions

2. Review Meeting Objectives/Desired Outcomes

- Debrief accomplishments of 2013
- Board goals and focus areas for 2014

3. Debrief of 2013

A. Key accomplishments for 2013

B. What worked? What was successful?

Elements in 2013 that were effective and successful (meeting format, public engagement, etc)

Staff noted that EAB was integral in the rebranding of Climate Action into Climate Commitment and that they created important new direction and goals for this commitment. It was also pointed out that the board's focused and specific interest in Climate Commitment helped staff narrow their focus and zero in on specific issues.

The board appreciated that they got to see the completion of the Climate Action Plan and felt that it was really helpful to set small, specific, measurable goals that they were able to accomplish and feel good about. The board was excited that the City Manager indicated that EAB would be asked for feedback on a 14th St. parking garage. It felt good that the feedback and opinions of the EAB were valued and solicited on important topics such as this.

Despite lots of changes and transition during 2013, EAB still managed to accomplish a lot.
It was noted that Market Innovations is an important project and although it has been delayed, it has not been forgotten and is now moving forward.

Staff observed that there have been unanticipated interruptions and postponements of projects from the flood and other unexpected circumstances in 2013 and appreciated the board's persistence in helping move both Climate Commitment and Market Innovations forward.

DRAFT

C. ***What didn't work? What did we learn?*** Lessons from 2013 to be more successful in 2014.

The board expressed a desire to be better informed about how their feedback on issues is being used. The board discussed the need to proactively check in with staff to gather information about how their input is informing memos and presentations to council. It was suggested that board members who are passionate about certain projects become "point persons" and follow up on those projects and track their progress as those items are heard by other boards and council.

The board also discussed the fact that individual board members do not always agree on issues and questioned staff about the usefulness of feedback that includes divergent opinions versus when consensus is reached by the board.

The facilitator noted that the value of the group is an important thing to define and that there is great value in building upon an individual's thoughts and building group consensus.

Staff indicated that the style of board minutes can be altered to better show how EAB's comments will be reflected in council correspondence. Staff will provide the board with details on exactly what is being requested of the board and how the board's input will be used. Moving forward, direction on the type of feedback being requested for each agenda item will be provided to the board in each meeting agenda and packet.

The board agreed that they are aiming for cohesiveness in their comments, not necessarily requiring consensus. The board and staff acknowledged that a certain degree of board agreement and consensus of opinion provides more power to the board's recommendations to staff and council.

The facilitator noted that it's important for staff to clarify their expectations of the board and follow up with the board to close the loop and ensure that the board knows how their feedback is being used and how their feedback could be more useful.

It was acknowledged that it's important to set goals for the year, but it's also important to understand that as the year progresses, goals may vary and that the board needs to remain flexible.

Staff noted that since City Council created their vision and prioritized their areas of focus and then worked with city departments to prioritize staff's work plan items, the EAB is better informed this year about council's goals and staff's work plan prior to setting the board's goals so that these items can be better aligned and supported.

The facilitator noted that the challenge is balancing the overwhelming size of issues with the need to move progressively toward goals.

The board discussed what their role should be in engaging with community members and gathering feedback on key issues from members of the public. The board felt that they could play a more active role in collecting feedback from the community in less traditional ways such as seeking out random feedback from people at grocery stores or on the street instead of in the usual venues of public meetings. Board members were interested in gathering and bringing public comment to the board to inform their conversation and recommendations. It was suggested that staff could note on upcoming board agendas which topics it would be helpful to have additional

DRAFT

board-gathered public feedback on.

However, staff mentioned that most items have already gone through some level of public process prior to being heard by the EAB and that public engagement may not be the best use of board members' time and energy. EAB will be informed of staff level public engagement that has taken place through information provided in EAB memos and packets. Some agenda items may be heard by the board first and then taken out to the public for comment in which case staff will indicate this on the board's agenda.

The board provided the following operational suggestions/requests to contribute to their success in 2014:

- Appointment of a chair and vice-chair
- Vice-chair assistance in keeping track of key themes, agreements, key points of divergence in the group's perspective, and/or agenda items that need to be followed up on, depending on the meeting
- Adding "old business" as a topic to the agenda as an opportunity to check in on and receive brief updates on items that were heard by the board and have continued moving forward
- Selection of one or two board members as "point person(s)" to track key topics and bring updates back to the board on their progress
- Facilitation/meeting management training for board members to improve their meeting format and flow.

4. Operation Issues for Board Discussion

- Boards and Commissions coordination, review of board bylaws, meeting format, succession planning, etc

B&C coordination:
Staff clarified that the objective of enhanced board and commission coordination is to better inform EAB and help them provide more well-rounded and integrated feedback and recommendations.

The board discussed B&C coordination and noted that there are several different approaches that can assist with coordination and be used in conjunction with each other. Board members can:

- become "board buddies" with members of other boards,
- attend other boards' meetings when there are relevant discussions
- monitor other boards and council's calendar in order to stay abreast of the progress of topics that interest them.

It was noted that board members' time and energies need to be considered when choosing the best ways to remain engaged.

DRAFT

The board agreed that establishing formal "board buddies" is not necessary, but individuals should feel free to develop relationships with other members of other boards and commissions. Additionally, board members may track items of interest to the EAB that are under discussion by other boards and commissions and, when necessary, bring them to the attention of the rest of the EAB.

Bylaws:

The board agreed that it would be helpful to have a chair and vice-chair. **M. Abbott** agreed to serve as board chair and **S. Morgan** agreed to serve as board vice-chair of EAB until April 2015. The chair and vice-chair are held by the most senior members of EAB, respectively. The chair will be responsible for meeting with any new members appointed to the EAB by council and orienting them to the board, the issues, and the overall process. The vice-chair will be responsible for summarizing key points of each meeting and coordinating with the board secretary to ensure that these key points are incorporated at the beginning of each meeting's minutes.

Meeting format:

The board agreed to revise their meeting agendas and format to include:

- "old business/updates"
- clarification on what type of feedback staff is requesting of board
- details about how the board's feedback will be used

The board agreed to try discussing old business at the beginning of one meeting, then discussing it at the end of the next meeting to determine which point in the agenda it makes more sense to discuss this item moving forward. It was also suggested that some portions of old business could be discussed at the beginning of the meeting if they are pertinent to and will help inform items on that night's agenda, but that a strict time limit be set on the update.

Staff will provide direction on what type of feedback they are looking for from the board as well as whether feedback has already been gathered or board members should gather feedback for each item on their agenda. Staff will work with the chair during the agenda meeting to finalize the agenda.

The vice-chair will provide a summary of key points from each meeting to the board secretary. These key points will be added to the beginning of the minutes for their respective meeting and board members will have the opportunity to edit and/or approve the minutes including the key points at subsequent meetings.

The board discussed and agreed that each board member should become a point person for certain topics they're especially passionate about. Board members agreed to track their chosen topic and report back to the board on it as they see fit.

If board members have specific questions on items on their agenda, they may request additional information from staff to increase their understanding.

5. Debrief of 2014 City Council priorities and staff work plan

DRAFT

D. Driskell provided the board with an update on 2014 City Council priorities and the staff work plan. The topics that will benefit most from EAB comment are Climate Commitment, Municipalization, energy efficiency including SmartRegs and commercial energy efficiency strategy, solar strategy, implemented new energy code, Market Innovation, Zero Waste Master Plan update including discussion of construction and demolition waste, commercial composting/recycling, multi-family unit composting/recycling, every-other-week trash pick-up, Bears and Trash, Integrated Pest Management including the Emerald Ash Borer, the Civic Area as a model of sustainability practices and an ecodistrict, Resiliency, and Transportation issues.

6. Discuss 2014 Board Priorities in relation to Council Priorities and the 2014 Work Plan

- How does the board want to integrate with and support city work efforts in 2014?
- Which project or issue areas should be the board's highest priorities?

The board discussed the city's work efforts and which should become their priorities based on environmental relevance, whether the item would be heard by any other city board(s), and if it was a topic of particular interest to individual board members who would become the "point person" for that topic.

The board determined that their major focus areas for 2014 are:

- Municipalization/Energy Future – public engagement, understanding, de-politicizing, local energy generation
- Climate Commitment
- Housing/climate impacts
- Multi-modal transportation
- Integrated pest management (IPM) - Emerald Ash Borer
- Environmental Flood Impacts
- Creating more integration between boards re: environmental impacts
- Commercial/business recycling/waste reduction
- Local food

The following board members volunteered to be the "point person" for the following topics:

<u>IPM and Emerald Ash Borer:</u> **L. Read** and **M. Lommele**
<u>Local Food:</u> **L. Read** and **M. Abbott**
<u>Waste reduction:</u> **M. Abbott**
<u>Climate Commitment and housing:</u> **T. Hillman** and **S. Morgan**
<u>Local Generation:</u> **T. Hillman**
<u>Public engagement around Energy Future issues:</u> **M. Lommele**

M. Lommele has a board buddy on TAB. They agreed they would keep each other informed about their respective board's business. **M. Lommele** will also work with her TAB buddy to ensure that transportation issues are looked at through an environmental lens.

7. Review draft 2014 board calendar
Identify key priority areas for the Board.

DRAFT

8. Next Steps/Action Items

- Staff will follow up with other board liaisons to determine what B&C coordination approaches other boards are considering in order for EAB to best correspond.
- Staff will schedule a mid-year goal check-in.
- Staff will schedule a time for the Communications Team to meet with EAB to provide them with details about staff's outreach and communications plans for agenda items of interest to the EAB.
- Staff will add "lessons learned from the bag ordinance" under old business on the April 2 EAB agenda to inform approaches for the ZWMP.
- Staff will follow up with the board to gather specific topics the board would like to learn about and then coordinate with **D. Gehr** to create and schedule a facilitation/meeting management training for the board.
- Staff will send Feb 11 City Council Study Session results to EAB
- EAB "point person(s)" will write up what they hope to accomplish each quarter for their topic(s) of interest (this will be informed by the Feb 11 CC SS results)
- Staff will work with the chair to provide the board with better direction on what type of feedback they need and whether public outreach from the board is requested on each EAB agenda item.
- The board will add old business to the beginning of the next meeting agenda and at the end of the subsequent meeting agenda.
- The vice-chair will provide a summary of key points from each meeting to the board secretary which the board secretary will incorporate into the beginning of subsequent meeting minutes.

Approved:

_____

Chair Date

DRAFT

CITY OF BOULDER
CITY COUNCIL AGENDA ITEM

MEETING DATE: March 18, 2014

AGENDA TITLE: Consideration of a motion to accept the summary of the February 11, 2014, study session regarding the 2014-2015 work plan and next steps.

PRESENTER/S
Jane S. Brautigam, City Manager
Paul J. Fetherston, Deputy City Manager
Heather Bergman – Facilitator

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY
This agenda item provides a summary of the February 11, 2014 study session on the 2014-2015 Council Retreat and resulting work plan. The purpose of the study session was for City Council to review the work plan, ask questions and provide feedback for the next iteration of the work plan.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Suggested Motion Language:
Motion to accept the study session summary from February 11, 2014 on the 2014-2015 work plan (Attachment A) and the next steps (below).

BACKGROUND: The background for this topic can be found in the Study Session Memorandum dated February 11, 2014. Draft Work Plan for 2013-2015 City Council Term

Next Steps:

- The Vision and Outcomes wall graphics would be moved from Council Chamber to the City Manager's office hallway.

- Council approved the addition of Briefings as a way to get additional information about a topic. The Briefing is similar to the Roundtable used in the Energy project. Information would be shared with Council but no materials are provided in advance. The Briefing would be held from 5-6 pm with the second Study Session each month.

- In the next version of the work plans:
    - Staff will clarify decision points for Council
    - Milestones will be added for the Open Space items discussed

ATTACHMENT:

A. Draft Summary of the February 11, 2014 Study Session regarding the 2014-2015 Council Work Plan

City Council Study Session Summary
February 11, 2014
2014-2015 Work Plan

PRESENT:
City Council: Mayor Appelbaum, Mayor Pro Tem Karakehian and Council Members Cowles, Jones, Morzel, Plass, Shoemaker, Weaver and Young.

Staff members: City Manager Jane Brautigam, City Attorney Tom Carr, Deputy City Manager Paul Fetherston, Executive Director of Public Works Maureen Rait, Executive Director of Community Planning and Sustainability David Driskell, CFO Bob Eichem, Police Chief Mark Beckner, Fire Chief Larry Donner, Human Services Director Karen Rahn and Acting Director of Parks and Recreation Jeff Dillon, Acting Housing Director Jeff Yegian, Executive Director of Downtown and University Hill Management Division and Parking Services Molly Winter, Director of Public Works for Transportation Tracy Winfree, Director of Public Works for Utilities Jeff Arthur, Communications Director Patrick von Keyserling, Director of Open Space and Mountain Parks Mike Patton, Director of IT Don Ingle, Courts Administrator Lynne Reynolds and City Clerk Alisa Lewis.

Facilitated by Heather Bergman of Peak Facilitation Group.

Purpose:

The purpose of the February 11, 2014 study session was as follows:

1. Discuss work plan developed by staff following the January Council Retreat
2. Agree on any items on the proposed work plan which should be deferred to allow work on other priority items
3. Agree on whether to proceed with Council Briefings or not

Overview of the Study Session:
The session was facilitated by Heather Bergman with Peak Facilitation Group. Ms. Bergman explained the purpose and objectives of the meeting and City Manager Brautigam gave a short overview of the context and content of the work plans. The session was facilitated with the following questions:

1. Does council have any questions or feedback about the draft plan?
2. Are any priority items missing from the draft work plan?
3. Are there any items on the proposed work plan which should be deferred to allow work on other priority items?
4. Is there any other information regarding the draft work plan that council wants to provide for staff consideration as it develops the next iteration of the work plan?

Mayor Appelbaum clarified that this portion of the study session would deal with the review of the 2014-2015 Work Plan and the Council Retreat wrap up. City Manager Brautigam presented two wall graphics, the Vision and Desired Two Year Outcomes that were created by the Council Retreat graphic artist. She then asked council to consider whether they should remain in the Council Chambers or be located elsewhere, perhaps within the Manager's Office. Ms. Brautigam

explained that the outcomes from the retreat had been organized into the work plan by the four categories that were discussed at the Council Retreat:

1. Livability-Homelessness, Social Behaviors and Issues, The Arts, University Hill and Code Enforcement
2. Local Food/Climate and Energy/Open Space
3. Housing/Land Use Planning/Transportation
4. Other

City Manager Brautigam reviewed the work plan and handouts and noted that staff believed that all Retreat items had been covered except two items that were discussed at the Retreat:

- DDAB (Downtown Design Advisory Board)- design guidelines– some parts are there and some parts are not there
- Review of Shelter Operations - not in the work plan but would be included in the strategic plan

Ms. Brautigam noted that some things in the work plan may not be as obvious as Council would like. Therefore, staff was present to answer any questions. She then turned the meeting back over to Mayor Appelbaum and Heather Bergman.

Prior to discussion of the work plan, a question was raised about Briefings. Ms. Brautigam explained that staff needed to provide information to Council in a way that didn't take up as much time. A briefing would be an additional tool, as often information included in "Heads up" or "IPs" gets lost. The Briefing would be similar to the Roundtable process utilized in the Energy project. Before a Study Session, information would be shared with Council without a formal packet. Briefings would be held from 4-6 pm prior to the second Study Session each month.

Questions on Livability:

Q1. Can we get more information about timeframe for leases, including Dairy Center? There has been interest from a community member on this topic.
A. In second quarter, a study session on Library and Arts would occur with an update on the Community Cultural Master Plan to get Council feedback; the scope, purpose and guidelines would be identified and could include the Dairy Center lease and interim temporary extensions. Master Plan updates could be a year long process.

Q2. Will the Hill reinvestment strategy be fleshed out?
A. A lot of work is being done specifically around the residential service district concept as well as service capital improvement projects and quality of life issues including code enforcement and safety. Beautification projects include parklet pilots, public art, staffing and resources to get all the work done, and perhaps a Hill Coordinator. Work is also being done with CU to fund a residential service district. Staff is looking more broadly at the long term organizational structure for the Hill including redevelopment options. More detail on these items will be provided in a Q2 study session.

Q3. How will staff activities and briefings roll up to the decision points for Council, particularly in the Hill and Human Services area?
A. Staff will add decision points.

Q4. How will check-ins be held with the Hill Re-development Site Plan?
A. There will be an IP update in Q1 and another update in Q2 as well as outreach to Boards and progress on negotiations.

Q5. With respect to homeless issues, how do we educate the community and other cities within the County about homelessness? What's the status of the analysis and outreach component to be taken to Boulder Consortium of Cities?
A. This would be part of the Homeless Action Plan Study Session scheduled in May.

Questions on Local Food/Climate and Energy/Open Space:

Q1. It was noted that there are several contentious issues regarding Open Space. How will they be addressed?
A. White papers have been produced on topics such as night time use, temporal separation, and on-trail use, etc. and staff is prepared to deliver information at a Study Session whenever Council is ready. Clarity was requested of Council regarding its interest in sustainability and carrying capacity of regional trails. One council member noted that the city needed to deal with all the issues, but cautioned that Council should not "bite off" too much initially, but rather intersperse some of the issues gradually with less contentious items. Staff clarified the City is not in control of regional trails. Mayor Appelbaum noted the Open Space Board of Trustees had asked to look at the issues. Council agreed that while it did not have to take action on all of the Open Space Issues it could not realistically address Sustainability without at least having the discussion about those issues. OSMP staff suggested a first step of bringing the information to council and explaining the impacts. Then council can decide how to deal with matters. Staff clarified that Heil Ranch is an area the city controls.

Q2.Is Heil Ranch a stand-alone process or would it go hand in hand with the north TSA process?
A. A stand-alone approach would likely be the way to look at it from a resource context. OSMP staff did not think it would get to the north TSA this year. The difference in this case was the existence of farm roads and the expectation that Heil Ranch will be closed for a year. That noted, it was not clear whether the County would reopen it this year.

Q3. What about cattle grates?
A. OSMP met with FEMA and four of eight cattle grates have been installed with four more planned later this year. The Open Space Mountain Parks Department will use this year to analyze if grates work. There are exterior gates where pedestrians enter and the cattle grates are in addition to the gates, not replacements. Grates will continue to be used if they successfully contain the livestock.

Q4. Does the Q3 timing of resolving issues around ownership of a portion of Flagstaff Road allow enough time prior to the finalization of the 2015 Bike Race?
A. City Attorney Carr responded that those issues had been resolved. The Council interpreted the charter two years ago, but it could be reconsidered. A related issue that surfaced was with regards to e-bikes and 'What is the appropriate mechanism to say something is no longer open space?' This is a complex issue and the charter has conflicting information. The issue needs to go to the Open Space Board of Trustees and then to Council. It is anticipated Council will be asked to scope this large project in Q3.

Questions about Housing/Land Use Planning/Transportation:

Q1. Where are the negotiations on Longs Garden?
A. City Attorney Tom Carr indicated that negotiations are ongoing, but there was nothing to nothing to report to Council at that time.

Q2. Are there going to be code changes suggested for ADUs/ODUs and cooperatives since the current rules don't seem to work?
A. Staff noted there was a Study Session scheduled to address prioritization and clarity on goals and objectives for ADU's and ODU's.

Q3. There was an article about how Aspen was handling VRBOs (Vacation Rentals by Owners); how does that impact housing supply?
A. An article is being circulated that describes how Aspen is addressing vacation rentals by owner. Finance is working with the information from Aspen to develop options for a potential ballot issue that would address the issue.

Q4. Can issues like ADUs, co-op housing /unrelated people, be pulled out of the comprehensive housing strategy and looked at separately?
A. There will be a two part process. At the briefing there will be an update on work under way and the study session in Q2 would be for a prioritization of work effort, short and long term.

Q5. Is the briefing an opportunity for Council to say it wants to pull OAUs and ADUs out and work on them separately?
A. Staff responded that by the time of the briefing, staff would like to have a sense of what council hopes to achieve by using these as it relates to the Comprehensive Housing Strategy.

Q6. Where are we with capturing the ideas for opportunity sites and having the correct zoning?
A. A discussion on opportunity sites revealed that each site has different challenges associated with it. It would come down to what role the city should play in instigating change. The Comprehensive Plan is the best opportunity to work out those issues and clarify the vision. Staff also pointed out that we have more control over the sites we own for example, 30th and Pearl. Privately owned sites present more challenges as the city has to negotiate with property owners.

Q7. Can pattern books be added to the list?
A.A pattern book is a tool to guide development outcomes, similar to design guidelines but typically less prescriptive. It is one of the tools that has previously been contemplated as a potential outcome of the "Sustainable Streets and Centers" project. In 2014, next steps in that project are being integrated with a corridor planning effort focused on East Arapahoe. At a recent joint board meeting (with Planning Board, Design Advisory Board, and Transportation Advisory Board), meeting participants urged staff to focus first on developing a vision for the corridor before jumping to conclusions related to potential tools and strategies. Based on this input, an interdepartmental staff team is preparing for a corridor visioning process—drawing on some of the engagement strategies used in the Civic Area and piloting some new approaches as well. Based on the outcome of that visioning effort, a "pattern book" remains one of the potential implementation tools that could be developed.

Q8. Is that the most expedient way to address what is getting redeveloped?
A. The East Arapahoe Corridor visioning process is being used as a pilot for a "lighter touch" approach to area visioning and planning. Pattern books are one potential tool to help guide implementation, helping developers anticipate what kinds of plans or designs might be acceptable in a certain area. Other potential tools include more prescriptive design guidelines, code changes (zoning, design and construction standards, etc.), rezoning and/or area plans.

It was also noted by one councilmember that pattern books could be used in post-WWII era neighborhoods to help homeowners modernize and maintain their homes in creative ways. Planning responded that a focus on post World War II neighborhoods is not currently in the work plan. Pattern books for post World War II neighborhoods cannot be added to the work plan due to staff capacity unless something else can come off.

Q9. Could DDAB members discuss taking on the pattern book work?
A. Boards were part of the earlier workshop and the thinking was that pattern books were premature until there is understanding of the vision first. This approach would still require staff work.

Q10. Will we get an updated work plan? It would be helpful to have visibility on what is coming up and how will we handle what did not come up at the retreat? Will there be a comprehensive work plan?
A. No, but staff will provide agendas for Council that attempt to have visibility out more than one meeting in advance.

Questions about the "Other" category:

Q1.What is the status of the innovation blueprint with the Chamber?
A. It would be considered as part of the Economic Vitality Plan and Paul Leef has been assigned to meet with John Tayer to ensure that we are involved as part of the Civic Center Plan.

Comments from Council:

- The Briefing was a great tool and also allowed the public to listen.

- Concern was expressed about the stress and workload on staff. There was interest in what could come off the work plan to minimize the sacrifice of personal life. Amazement was expressed that everything Council asked for was on the work plan.

- In the context of Local Food, there was mention of edible agriculture land guidelines being formulated and whether the space between sidewalks and curbs should be included.

- The plans around the Emerald Ash Borer will get people focused on the urban forest. This might be a good time to wrap in a tree ordinance or regulations that deal with the rest of our urban forest.

- Council expressed appreciation for the work of staff. Even taking into account the flood, a lot has been accomplished and is a testament to the work of the staff.

- Thanks to Retreat Committee.

MEMORANDUM

To: Environmental Advisory Board

From: Department of Community Planning and Sustainability
David Driskell, Executive Director
Susan Richstone, Deputy Director
Jamie Harkins, Business Sustainability Specialist
Brett KenCairn, Senior Environmental Planner

Date: March 19, 2014

Subject: Boulder Energy Challenge Program Development Update

The purpose of this agenda item is to provide an update on the Boulder Energy Challenge (formerly referred to as "Market Innovations") program development and obtain feedback from the Environmental Advisory Board (EAB) on the proposed program structure, including:

1. The merit evaluation criteria
2. The format and role of public input at the Community Showcase event

BACKGROUND

One of the recommendations that came forward as part of the 2012 review of the city's previous five years of Climate Action Plan (CAP) programs was the development of an Open Request for Proposal (RFP) Program. The general purpose of the program is to solicit innovative strategies to reduce GHG emissions from the Boulder community, in recognition that city CAP-funded programs need to be paired with private sector efforts to achieve our community goals.

The mechanism currently being developed is the establishment of a RFP process that invites innovative GHG reduction strategies from individuals, businesses or other organizations. During the initial funding cycle (mid-2014 to mid-2015) the program is estimated to receive approximately $300,000 to fund selected proposals. In the past this program was referred to as "Market Innovations," and has been branded as the Boulder Energy Challenge.

Staff recommends focusing submissions on energy efficiency and clean energy related efforts in 2014. As the program matures and is shown to be successful, submittals could then be focused on other areas of community emissions such as transportation. It is also intended that the initial year of projects will serve as a springboard to grow the program in future years by leveraging city funding to attract additional private sector interest and funds.

ANALYSIS

Program Development Process

Program development began in 2013 and continues into 2014. A Community Working Group was formed in early 2014 to assist staff with program development, proposal evaluation and program oversight. The group consists of the following members:

- Bob Lachenmayer, Colorado Clean Energy Cluster
- Eric Gricus, Innovation Center of the Rockies
- Jeff York, CU Leeds School of Business
- Bret Fund, CU Leeds School of Business
- Stacey Simms, McKinstry
- Ann Livingston, Colorado Green Building Guild
- Steve Morgan, City of Boulder Environmental Advisory Board
- Neal Lurie, Boulder Chamber

The working group has made recommendations to staff about programmatic details, including the scope of the program, the funding strategy, application requirements, evaluation criteria, etc. They will also assist with the evaluation of proposals and oversight of selected projects.

In addition, as research professors at CU's Leeds School of Business, Bret Fund and Jeff York are interested not only in the program development but also in assisting staff with evaluating the program in the years to come. They will be assisting with the development of metrics to track and evaluation of the impacts of the program, both environmentally and economically.

The following sections of this memo will provide an overview of the currently proposed program structure for EAB's feedback.

Framing of Program

1. Program is funded by the Climate Action Plan tax and has a strategic goal of finding innovative solutions to reducing greenhouse gas emissions in Boulder.
2. The program is meant to invite and stimulate local innovation and create market driven solutions to addressing climate change.
3. In 2014 the program will focus primarily on energy efficiency and clean energy development.

Program Scope

Staff recommends focusing submissions on energy efficiency and clean energy related efforts in 2014. As the program matures and is shown to be successful, submittals could then be focused on other areas of community emissions such as transportation. This approach offers flexibility to shift funding to higher performing programs or strategies annually if responses do not achieve required conditions of performance.

Objectives

- Reduce greenhouse gas emissions in the City of Boulder.
- Support the development and commercialization of cutting-edge emission reduction technologies and strategies that lead to private sector adoption.
- Stimulate the growth of a low carbon innovation sector in the City of Boulder.
- Leverage City of Boulder funds to form public-private partnerships that target private investment in future years.
- For 2014: Promote energy efficient and renewable energy systems dissemination

Number/Amount of Grants

- In order to prevent discouraging any potential projects, no pre-determined distribution of grants.
- Grants will range from $10,000 to $100,000

- Aiming for portfolio of 5-10 projects

Eligibility Requirements

Types of Projects

1. Pilot projects – A limited test or trial of a technology, strategy, application, etc.
2. Concept feasibility/demonstration – An analysis or testing of the viability of a new idea.
3. New product/service development – The funding of continued development of a new product or service that has already demonstrated viability.
4. Education and behavior change – Community education and mobilization efforts aimed at significantly altering behavior that result in emissions reductions
5. Other innovative projects to significantly reduce emissions

Types of Applicants

- Any kind of entity – business, nonprofit, individual
- Does not need to be Boulder-based, but implementation must occur in Boulder
- No cost-share requirement, but if present will earn points in merit evaluation

Application Content

Interested parties will be asked to submit a simple Letter of Intent through the website so that staff and the Working Group can ensure that there is interest in the grants and that information about the program has reached the appropriate audiences.

The application will require the following:

1. Concept Video (2-3 min) – self-narrating presentation (could be ppt, prezi, a person giving the pitch or something else creative) and must include required elements such as:
    a. Energy Challenge to be addressed
    b. Description of the project
    c. Potential of the proposed project, including:
        i. a description of alternative solutions and an explanation of what distinguishes this solution from them and why it is innovative
        ii. identification of the barriers to success and project risks and how those will be addressed, and
        iii. a description of how the project can be commercialized if appropriate
    d. Why the proposing project team is the team to address this energy challenge
2. Narrative Document (limited to 5 pages) – must include elements such as:
    a. A more in-depth description of project if needed
    b. Technology Readiness Level (if appropriate)
    c. Installation plan (if appropriate)
    d. Applicant team qualifications
    e. An explanation of any regulatory barriers to implementing the project
    f. A description of other funding (past or present) supporting the project (if applicable)
    g. Project benefits, including:

i. a detailed description and quantification of the energy and greenhouse gas reduction benefits expected from the project,

ii. an explanation of what co-benefits to the community (if any) the project has that are not directly quantified in the proposal, and

iii. an explanation of how many people will be impacted or able to participate in the project and if there are any limitations on who can participate

3. Project Budget
4. Project Work Plan

Evaluation Process

Projects will be evaluated through a four step process. Staff will conduct an initial eligibility screening on a pass/fail basis to ensure that the proposal meets the requirements. Accepted proposals will then receive a merit evaluation score from staff and the Working Group based on the proposed evaluation criteria below. Once the criteria are finalized they will be weighted and put into a scoring rubric Proposals that meet a minimum threshold in the merit evaluation will be interviewed by the group and finalists will be chosen. The final part of the evaluation process will be a Community Showcase event for the finalists with an element of public participation.

Initial Eligibility Screening Criteria

1. The proposal addresses the objectives of the program.	PASS/FAIL
2. The proposal fits within the 2014 scope of the program.	PASS/FAIL
3. The proposal quantifies the estimated greenhouse gas and energy reduction potential of the project.	PASS/FAIL
4. The proposed project is not already present in the competitive market.	PASS/FAIL

Merit Evaluation Criteria

Projected GHG Reductions: The GHG reduction benefits that are expected from the proposal
Readiness and Time to Benefit: Level of confidence that the proposal will perform as expected and deliver results in the time frame of the grant
Addresses a Barrier: Clear identification of barriers project is addressing and why project is superior to alternative solutions, strategies or technologies
Innovation: Clear identification of why the project is innovative and extent to which project contributes to building a low carbon innovation sector in Boulder
Externalities: Extent to which proposal supports co-benefits that are not directly quantified in the proposal
Scalability: Ability of project to be scaled larger than Boulder and, if appropriate, the demonstration of commercialization potential
Longevity of Impact: Extent to which project's impacts will be retained in the community
Community Visibility: Visibility of the project to the general community

Team Qualifications: Proposal team has relevant skills, qualifications and experience to support the project
Proposal Work Plan: Strength of work plan showing appropriate timeline and milestones
Budget/Cost-Effectiveness: Reasonableness of budget, economic sustainability of the project, cost-effectiveness of proposal in reducing GHG emissions
Impact: Number of people reached by the project
Feasibility: Ability of project to be completed in grant period without a heavy burden on staff resources
Equity: Extent to which benefits or ability to participate in the project are distributed equitably across social and economic groups
***Bonus - Location*:** The entity/individuals proposing the project are based in Boulder
***Bonus - Collaboration*:** The entity/individuals proposing the project are a result of a collaboration
***Bonus – Cost-share*:** The proposed project will not be entirely funded through a Boulder Energy Challenge grant

<u>Community Showcase Event</u>
The Community Showcase will give finalists an opportunity to pitch their project to attendees and give the community an opportunity to provide input to the evaluation process. The exact format and weight of the public input is still being developed, however one idea is to have the community vote for the "most impactful" project and have the winning proposal receive a bonus monetary prize.

Oversight and Program Evaluation
Funded projects will be required to submit quarterly reporting, including budget status and progress on project milestones. Direct coordination with city staff will greatly depend on the nature of the project. An evaluation plan for annual program performance (as well as multi-year performance) is being developed with the assistance of CU Leeds School of Business.

Program Risks and Assumptions

There is a large amount of risk for this program, both in the overall program performance and selected proposals. An inherent aspect of the program is that it is unlikely that all funding projects will be successful or achieve the level of GHG reductions that were anticipated. It will be important to communicate these risks from the very beginning so that the community is aware of all potential outcomes.

Communications Strategy
A communications strategy is being developed to ensure that any potentially interested parties hear about the funding opportunity and that the community is aware of the program and the selected proposals. A cornerstone of this strategy will be reaching out to existing networks/groups/organizations as well as leveraging the contacts of individual Working Group members. The Community Showcase will also provide an opportunity to communicate the objectives and potential of the program to the public and build excitement for the projects.

Program Milestones:

January - March 2014: Program Development
Late March – CAO review of application materials

April 2014: Program Launch and Promotion

Late May 2014: Proposals Due

June 2014: Proposal Evaluation and Interviews
Includes community showcase event

July 2014: Grants Awarded

3rd Quarter 2014: Promotion of Selected Projects