



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

DATE: September 3, 2014

TIME: 6 p.m.

PLACE: 1777 Broadway, 1st floor, 1777 W. Conference Room

1. CALL TO ORDER

2. SWEARING IN OF NEW BOARD MEMBER

3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

- A. The **August 6, 2014** Environmental Advisory Board minutes are scheduled for approval.

4. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

5. PUBLIC HEARING ITEMS

- A. Integrated Pest Management/Neonicotinoids/Emerald Ash Borer (Rella Abernathy, Community Planning & Sustainability and Kathleen Alexander, Parks & Recreation)

6. DISCUSSION ITEMS

- A. Intro to Kendra and Commercial Industrial Strategic Plan process (Elizabeth Vasatka and Kendra Tupper, Local Environmental Action Division)
B. Energy Future (Heather Bailey, Energy Future)

7. OLD BUSINESS/UPDATES

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

9. DEBRIEF MEETING/CALENDAR CHECK

10. ADJOURNMENT

**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: August 6, 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, Larissa Read, Stephen Morgan, and Morgan Lommele.

Staff Members Present: Brett KenCairn, Jamie Harkins, Sarah Huntley, Colette Crouse, Lisa Smith and Juliet Bonnell

MEETING SUMMARY:

- The board was enthusiastic about and supportive of the Boulder Energy Challenge (BEC). They were excited about this year's finalists and interested to see the outcome of their projects. The board hoped to see the BEC continue in the future.
- The board felt that climate related outreach efforts need to be simplified, framed clearly, focused on tangible incentives and results, and sensitive to the results of the Sustainability Survey.
- The board expressed concern that the community's understanding of the connection between municipalization and the community's ability to achieve its climate goals has been confused and overshadowed by all of the negative press surrounding the city's legal battles with Xcel. The board encouraged staff to reorient communication efforts to elevate and emphasize the positive and integral role municipalization plays in achieving the community's larger climate commitment and energy resilience goals.

1. CALL TO ORDER

The Environmental Advisory Board 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. Abbott**, seconded by **T. Hillman**, the Environmental Advisory Board approved (4-0, **M. Lommele** abstained since she was absent from the June 25, 2014 meeting) the June 25, 2014 meeting minutes.

3. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

4. DISCUSSION ITEMS

A. Boulder Energy Challenge (Jamie Harkins, Local Environmental Action Division)

J. Harkins provided the board with an update on the Boulder Energy Challenge. Thirty applications were received, screened by the BEC working group, and narrowed down to six finalists. She reminded the board that the Boulder Energy Challenge Pitch Night event was scheduled for August 7 during which the finalists would provide community attendees with

information about their projects. She indicated that there may be enough funding for all of the finalists to receive awards. Once it is determined how much funding will be allocated to each of the chosen projects, grant agreements will be created including a Scope of Work and outcome plan for each of the projects. A process for checking in regularly with each team will be created and mentoring may be part of the process plan.

B. KenCairn mentioned that the proposed projects were incredibly diverse and address many of the challenging energy issues that are being faced. He informed the board that Boulder has joined the Clean Energy Cluster to help grow our clean energy sector and suggested that they may be able to help mentor Boulder emerging entities such as the BEC finalists.

S. Morgan noted that there was diversity on the working group, but that there was consensus on the finalists. He felt this was a great beginning and hoped to build on the success of this energy challenge.

J. Harkins asked for the board's feedback and thoughts on best ways to move forward with the BEC.

L. Read suggested being clear with project managers/finalists about anticipating and mitigating risks.

S. Morgan commented that simple metrics should be established and measured properly. He also noted that the Sustainability Survey results should be kept in mind in order to frame things in a manner that will resonate positively with the community.

M. Lommele noted that different metrics should be set for each project since the projects are so diverse. If a project looks like it's not going to be successful and achieve the goal it set out to achieve, she suggested that some of the money be used to create a final report outlining why it wasn't successful to ensure that we learn something and benefit in some way from it.

J. Harkins informed the board that the BEC will likely launch again in 2016 to allow time for this year's projects to be completed, the results evaluated, and the fund to build up again to approximately \$300,000.

B. Update on Sustainability Survey, BoulderUp, and Climate Commitment Outreach Strategy (Sarah Huntley and Colette Crouse, Communications)

C. Crouse informed the board about the Sustainability Survey that the city and county pooled funds to conduct last December in order to better understand the public's perceptions of climate change and the environmental actions members of the public are taking. Staff plans to use the results of this survey to inform climate change related outreach moving forward. Key findings of the survey were that city residents' opinions and actions varied greatly from those of county residents. City residents were most motivated by concern for future generations and a sense of moral obligation. They felt that if collective group action was taken, positive change would occur. City residents felt that climate related initiatives were a good use of city funds. And the survey results indicated that cost savings was less important to city residents than anticipated. City residents reported recycling, composting, and conserving indoor and outdoor water. And residents who didn't compost indicated that if it was easier to compost they would do it. The energy services that could be provided if Boulder was a municipal utility that residents were most interested in were the installation of real time meter-reading equipment to help people save

energy in their homes and the facilitation of neighborhood climate action through solar gardens and bulk purchases of solar equipment.

S. Huntley discussed how staff is using the findings of this survey to inform their community outreach. Residents were surveyed about their feelings (positive, negative or neutral) toward certain terminology, such as “climate change”, but the way the questions were worded led to inconclusive findings. It was discovered that survey respondents didn’t have a clear idea of what resilience means, so we’ll either need to better define this term or use different terminology..

No questions related specifically to the flood were included in the survey. This was due to the fact that the survey consultants didn’t feel informative feedback would be received because the survey was conducted soon after the flood, so it was assumed that people would have noted that there was a connection between the flood and climate change.

When asked how often community-wide surveys are conducted, **S. Huntley** responded that a broad community survey is done every 3 years, but does not provide the opportunity to ask climate-specific questions as this one did. This more specific type of survey is done on an as-needed basis. This survey, designed to delve deeper into our community’s energy efficiency efforts, cost \$17-18,000 to conduct and included calling residents’ cell phone numbers.

T. Hillman noted that the survey responses were self-reported numbers of climate actions taken and therefore, likely inflated.

M. Lommele attended a resiliency workshop and felt that its focus on how to build community in order to motivate people was important and could be used while messaging climate action outreach efforts.

S. Morgan felt that the survey should have gathered more feedback on how the community felt the city and county were doing with sustainability efforts including specifying the numerous sustainability efforts and gathering opinions on their effectiveness.

S. Huntley highlighted the fact that residents felt climate action is important, but that they were not asked to rank or prioritize these efforts against other issues like fixing potholes, public safety, etc. The biggest take-aways from the survey led to staff’s goal of shifting community conversation away from the fear-based thinking and toward the idea of creating opportunity (including a thriving economy and entrepreneurship) and creating opportunities for future generations. Staff hopes to shift peoples’ mindsets in order to better motivate our community. Climate commitment engagement and communications should show how our actions roll up into the city’s larger goals of municipalization and climate actions and the opportunity for more clean energy. She wants to focus more on positive, tangible outcomes. In addition to municipalization the city is working with Vermilion to create a call to action campaign to show the interconnectedness of actions that can be taken that will make a difference. This outreach campaign will likely be called BoulderUp and launch in 6-8 months.

S. Morgan felt some fear-based message of “we must take certain climate actions” is important.

M. Lommele asked if the city is leveraging other communication channels and suggested engaging neighborhood groups and interest groups in a targeted manner. She wondered if post-flood residents have greater or lesser confidence in the city’s ability to successfully run an electric utility. She noted that we shouldn’t rely on behavior change alone and should consider

changing or creating laws and regulations to minimize climate impacts. She suggested a campaign focused on “Imagine a world where...(there is no potable water- or something else negative)” to motivate people to behave differently.

S. Huntley responded to **M. Lommele’s** campaign idea and countered it with “Imagine a world where (insert positive statement for a hopeful future)” She thought it would be more powerful messaging to acknowledge the harsh realities, but provide ways that we can act positively. She noted that the news reported in the Daily Camera is important and widely read. She mentioned that short videos that can be pushed out via multiple channels including interest groups will be used. She agreed that more targeted, on the ground neighborhood and interest group outreach would be great, but that it would require many more staff resources. She responded that some residents expressed confidence in the city’s ability to run a utility while others didn’t think the city could handle it. She noted that if the city municipalizes, a utility advisory board would be formed to make decisions and report to City Council.

L. Read suggested simplifying our messages. She observed that the county results of the survey reflect state thoughts and behaviors. Therefore, she suggested that since many people commute in from the county to work in the city, the city should include messaging designed to reach county residents and demonstrate a model to strive toward.

T. Hillman liked the concept of BoulderUp and felt it was great to move toward more tangible ideas and results and returns on investment. He suggested ensuring that businesses that are up for sale are required to meet minimal energy efficiency/renewable energy requirements.

M. Abbott mentioned that the framing of our message needs to be very clear. She suggested “Imagine a world where...” there’s a positive or negative outcome and focus on the tangible economic incentives/benefits.

B. KenCairn noted that when we reach out to neighborhood groups we want to have a clear message and actionable items which we haven’t defined yet. He asked the board if they thought the community understands the connection between climate and municipalization.

M. Lommele felt that the city has been messaging municipalization as an opportunity to reduce carbon emissions.

M. Abbott agreed that carbon reduction is the main motivating factor for municipalization and felt that we could better leverage economic factors to change social behaviors.

L. Read noted that the main motivating factor for municipalizing seems to be an opportunity to get away from the control of large corporations.

S. Morgan felt that climate was the main reason for municipalizing, but that more leverage can be gained by framing it as economic incentive.

T. Hillman responded that his community circle is skewed more toward seeing climate as the motivating factor for the municipalization effort, but felt that BoulderUp was a great opportunity to clarify our future goals and the actions that we’re taking. He suggested leveraging community goals to support the city’s sustainability efforts.

L. Read noted that multiple messages aren’t a bad thing. What people care about varies and

changes, so it's good to share multiple messages as one might strike a chord with someone while a different message will be more meaningful to a different person.

B. KenCairn mentioned that the city is trying to re-integrate our messaging of municipalization to support our climate goals. He is interested in understanding what the community thinks and assuring that the community understands that the municipalization effort is in support of our community's goals.

M. Lommele felt that although the city originally messaged the municipalization effort as an opportunity to meet our climate commitment goals, the messaging about why the city is trying to municipalize has gone astray. Most of the current media coverage has focused on the city's power struggle and legal battles with Xcel.

M. Abbott agreed that efforts have become messy and overshadow the positive motivations behind municipalizing. We need to remind the community of the outcome of why we're fighting this battle and continuously illustrate the positive in a more engaging way instead of focusing on the legal battle.

L. Read noted that the community doesn't respond positively to words like "fight and battle." Because most of the recent information being shared with the community about Boulder's Energy Future efforts has dealt with our interactions with Xcel, perspective has been lost as to why we are making the effort to municipalize our utility. She felt it was important for the city to regain control over our media messaging.

M. Lommele thought staff should focus on positive campaigning, encouraging community members to make pledges, reaching out to neighborhood groups, and making promises to get people excited about their future.

M. Abbott thought that the BEC is a great positive message and suggested advertising the idea that if we municipalize, we will be able to do more of these cool types of projects using wind, solar, and other renewable energy sources.

S. Morgan agreed that the original municipalization message has been lost. He suggested the need to simplify the important messages and repeat them regularly. He expressed the need to listen to the constituency to understand how to message important items.

B. KenCairn noted that municipalization is an enormous undertaking during which staff is developing a transition plan and new business model. He asked the board for their feedback on the best way to couple the municipalization message and climate commitment goals in a positive way.

T. Hillman commented that once BoulderUp has been launched we'll have a whole new foundation after a year or so in order to leverage more community support. He suggested leaving the climate commitment and municipalization messages somewhat separate until community perception has been rebuilt positively and the image of climate commitment has been rebranded more positively.

B. KenCairn noted that energy source change is the key to reaching our climate commitment goals. Municipalization is the effort being undertaken which will lead to energy source change. The dilemma is how to connect these two messages in a way that will be supported and

understood by the community.

B. Queen, the new EAB member who will officially start serving on the board next month, noted that climate change can be sliced into smaller issues and addressed (but that not many people will approach it that way). This issue needs to be made smaller and more understandable as an economic challenge. We need to improve our climate actions in order to be more internationally competitive and retain a competitive advantage. This is a pretty radical shift in our way of thinking, but it needs to be considered. He suggested leveraging the market and economy to outperform other communities in the front range. He felt our messaging should appeal to peoples' competitive spirits.

B. KenCairn mentioned that we are aiming to measure our climate success by the amount of clean energy such as solar power, wind, etc. that the city has.

S. Morgan liked the message of "we can't afford to not do this because..."

L. Read reiterated the need to simplify our messages. She also felt it would be helpful for the city to provide information about what exactly is happening and how. For example: is the city taking over Xcel's plants? If so, what will that look like on the ground?

M. Lommele didn't like the BoulderUp branding because it doesn't speak to an action. She'd like to hear more about branding strategies in the future.

5. PUBLIC HEARING ITEMS

6. OLD BUSINESS/UPDATES

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

M. Lommele volunteered to be the timekeeper at the September 3 EAB meeting. The board agreed to have a different member fill this role at each meeting moving forward.

8. DEBRIEF MEETING/CALENDAR CHECK

The next EAB will take place on Sept. 3

A Joint Board Meeting will take place on Sept 22 to discuss AMPS best practices work, the draft Transportation Demand Management Toolkit, and quick code fixes

9. ADJOURNMENT

Environmental Advisory Board adjourned at 8:10 p.m.

Approved:

Chair

Date