



Colorado Department
of Public Health
and Environment

Meeting Minutes

Pollution Prevention Advisory Board

Tuesday, May 24, 2011

Note: The next board meeting will be held on Tuesday, July 26th from 10:00 a.m. – 1:00 p.m. at the Aurora Municipal Building [address], Aurora, CO.

Recorder: Rachel Wilson-Roussel

Attending: Donna Pacetti, Karen Hancock, Beth Chacon, Kate Navin, Landon Gates, Dave Stewart, Patrick Hamel, Meg Collins (phone), Jim Schrack, Andy Pattison, Beth Chacon

Not Attending: Melissa Yoder, Bill Hayes, Kai Abelkis

Staff and Guests: Lynette Myers, Rachel Wilson-Roussel, Eric Heyboer, Marjorie Griek

April Minutes

A motion was made to approve the April minutes. Motion passed, the March minutes were approved.

Open Floor

The board went around the table and talked about new projects they were undertaking.

Karen sent Rachel information on the Colorado Climate Network. Rachel will contact Tom Easley to see if he would like to come and present to the board at the July meeting.

CAEE is holding their first focus group with classroom teachers to get input into the online network. They are also well on their way to moving the content and resources they already have transferred into new system

The Governor's Energy Office had a contractor, Green Seal, look into recycling paint in Colorado. The final report will be completed soon and Jim will provide a more thorough update at the July meeting.

Dave, Meg and Landon volunteered to come up with a whitepaper on the nutrient criteria issue. The last nutrient criteria workgroup meeting took place on May 9th and covered NPS as well as stormwater dischargers. For those two categories there would be a 10 year voluntary BMP approach and if they did not see improvement they would look to a mandatory approach by 2022. From an agricultural perspective they want to pursue BMPs tied with increased education to public as to what the BMPs are and likely to achieve. They would be subject to a tri-annual review. Every three years they can check to see if the BMPs are being utilized and at the end of the 10 year period – if the voluntary method is not sufficient, they will try a mandatory approach. *What is the regulating body?* The standards are coming down from EPA – but the WQCD is the regulatory body. *What are the nutrients the criteria are trying to address?* Phosphorus and nitrogen primarily. The next meeting is June 11th and the agenda can be found on the Water Quality Forum website.

RREO Recycling Grants

The board recently approved 3 RREO grant applications as part of the second round of grant awards and rejected a fourth application that had been recommended for funding by the committee. The board sent a letter to the

Assistance Committee justifying their decision on Monday (May 23rd). Department staff had also identified areas for improvement in the evaluation process after speaking with department's internal auditor. The RREO act passed in 2007 and the committee/board have only been approving grants since 2008 and are continually improving. It would be helpful for the committee to work with the board to establish more defined procedures. The group discussion that takes place during the evaluation process plays an important role as the committee learns more about some of the issues that one person in the group may be aware of. In order to tighten up how the evaluations are done, the committee could look into breaking the criteria down further or adding in more detailed scoring guidance. The committee hasn't had a chance to talk about the letter at this point, but they will discuss whether or not they would like to fund another grant or let the funds roll to next year. The committee will work with Eric to provide a response to the board as soon as possible.

The next RREO cycle won't likely be till next year (2012). This past year, the committee did elect to hold two cycles because of increased revenue. The department will monitor the tipping fees and if they continue to rise, will request an increase in our spending authority from the JBC so that the AC and board may fund additional grants.

During the board's conference call discussion, it was agreed that it wasn't appropriate to go back and ask questions of the applicants since that has not been done before and since all applicants would not have the same opportunity to correct mistakes or respond to questions. Each grant application must stand on its own. The committee holds a bidder's meeting where everyone is strongly encouraged to attend in-person or by phone and where applicants may ask very detailed questions. The committee also tells applicants that they may indicate several funding level options for consideration. But if they don't offer options for different funding levels in the application – it has been the committee's procedure to only consider funding at the level indicated on the application.

Erika Gibson is a grant administrator at the Governor's Energy Office (GEO) and Assistance Committee member. Erika provided her input on the RREO grant process and remarked that there were many similarities to the GEO's grant process. Erika remarked that as a grant administrator, no matter how hard you try, you can't completely eliminate scoring inconsistencies. The GEO also throws out high and low scores and found that helps remove some of the outliers. This process sometimes changes the order of the grants. *What does the GEO do in instances where there are remaining funds to be allocated?* When the top ranked projects have been funded – but there are still some funds remaining, GEO reminds reviewers that they do not have to fund very low scoring applications. When the GEO did not feel they could provide sufficient justification to fund those low-scoring applications the money was just returned to the fund.

Landon pointed out that the GEO's funding comes from federal dollars, over which the JBC has no authority. The JBC cannot raid those funds – while the RREO fund depends on a state appropriation and there may be more pressure to use all available funds in a given year. With the ARRA funds, however, some of the funds were taken back if they were not assigned to a project by a certain deadline.

The AC had hired a contractor in the last year to do a series of meetings around the state to get feedback and create a vision of recycling in the state. The AC is discussing this information and how we can best direct these funds perhaps providing a more focused application and push towards a more strategic plan. Some of the recommendations that came back from the contractors report were to just fund one or two communities a year to make the shift to a Pay-as-you-throw (PAYT) model or fund a hub and spoke model for recycling in Colorado. Once outside of the front range it's difficult to accumulate enough material to ship efficiently. If there were little spokes in smaller communities, who might have a small baler where they could then ship those materials to larger hub where they would get aggregated and shipped. New Mexico has received ARRA funds to fund a hub and spoke model for recycling. The Assistance Committee has invited English Bird, the Executive Director of the New Mexico Recycling Coalition, to speak at the next AC meeting on July 12th. Marjie invited the board to attend and Rachel will send out the meeting details. The committee would like the board to be involved in this discussion and collectively decide whether or not to go in that direction. Going this route will significantly change the RFA and the evaluations process. The discussion would be about using all of the grant funds to develop this model over the next few years. New Mexico was awarded \$1.2 million in ARRA funds.

How do we want to move forward working with the assistance committee and reviewing the grant evaluation process? The following board members volunteered to help capture the basic evaluations process in writing:

Landon, Jim, Erika, Meg, and Patrick. Documentation is key.

There may also need to be some clarification regarding the level of involvement committee members have with a particular grant application. When a committee member or a member's organization was directly involved with an application – they needed to step out of the room or off the call. The line of disclosure for situations with less direct involvement in an application may need to be tightened up. More disclosure may be needed. Perhaps members should sign a nondisclosure statement that states that they do not have a conflict of interest.

Department staff have typically been asked to participate in the evaluations process by scoring applications and providing comments during the group meeting. Marjie indicated that input is very valuable and staff opinions do hold weight with the committee, however, it is the AC who has the responsibility to make the final recommendations to the board.

At a time when cash funds will likely be looked at pretty closely over the coming years, it might be a good idea to ask for an internal review from our auditors. A formal written procedure needs to be established and clearly identify roles and who may vote on final recommendations. We can ask the auditors what they would suggest we keep track of.

A motion was made and seconded to allow the committee one week to take another look at the grant applications and make a decision to either make additional recommendations or let the funding roll over to the next grant cycle. No discussion. Motion passes.

Depending on the AC's decision the board will be prepared to follow up with a conference call discussion e-mail vote.

PPAB Strategic Plan

The board discussed their 2011 objectives and action items associated with each objective.

| PPAB Objective | Action Items/ Outcomes |
|---|---|
| Assist and support the Colorado Alliance for Environmental Education with the Colorado Environmental Literacy Plan. | 1) Approved \$12,000 in funding back in April to support CAEE's environmental literacy efforts. 2) Future possibilities include a letter of support from the board. 3) Board may play a role in networking. 4) Public review and comment on environmental literacy plan (opportunity for board comment) |
| Create financial incentives for government to lead by example. (Mini grants to assist some Greening Government projects get off the ground.) | 1) Patrick, Jim, Dave, Donna, Jill and Lynette will form a subcommittee to come up with a template for mini-grant applications. Establish criteria, focus area, formal review process, framework. |
| Assess the PPAB's grants process and determine appropriate mechanism for evaluating cross media impacts. (How do we give more credit to proposals that not only have high recycling rates, but also reduce GHGs through transportation reductions, create in state end markets, etc.) | 1) Landon, Jim, Patrick and Meg will meet and discuss. 2) Attend AC July 12th meeting and begin discussion. |
| Form a PPAB subcommittee to discuss nutrient criteria for water quality and possible cross media impacts. | 1) Dave, Landon, and Meg will work to put together a brief summary of the issue and share with the board (and ELP members). |

The board also discussed creating a short survey for following up on past grant recipients to request information on job creation (and/or jobs retained) and waste diversion that occurred after the grant ended. Rachel, Eric and Donna will meet and discuss possible survey questions.

July Agenda Items

- Revisit action items for the 4 PPAB objectives.
- Review RREO Rebate Application
- Recycled Paint Study Summary
- Colorado Climate Network. 15 min presentation 10 min questions.

Post Meeting Addendum

The Assistance Committee decided not to recommend additional applications to the board for funding in the 2012 grant cycle. Therefore, any remaining funds will roll over for use in the next grant cycle.