GUNNISON COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION
PRELIMINARY AGENDA:
Friday, February 1, 2013

Draft- For Review

8:45 a.m. Call to order; determine quorum
Approval of Minutes
Unscheduled citizens: A brief period in which the public is invited to make general comments or ask questions of the Commission or Planning Staff about items which are <u>not scheduled on the day's agenda.</u>

9:00 a.m.
- Planning Commission will leave for Pesnell site visit

9:20 a.m. **O.A. Pesnell, Monson Creek Outfitters**, site visit/no action, request for the use of two cabins for year-round guest lodging and sleigh and hay rides. Seasonal use (May – October) as a staging area for guided horseback tours onto adjacent BLM lands, and as a waypoint for jeep tours on adjacent BLM lands; with jeep rentals originating in the City of Gunnison; 59005 Highway 50, north of Highway 50, Doyleville, legally described as being located in the NW/4NE/4, NW/4 Section 1, N/2SW/4, the SE/4SW/4, part of SW/4 Section 1 and NE/4, NE/4SE/4 lying north of Highway 50 Section 2, Township 48 North, Range 3 East, N.M.P.M., 465-acres

10:30 a.m.
- **Carbon Policy Task Force Report**, work session/no action, Planning Commission review and discussion of the Carbon Policy Task Force Report. Development of recommendations to the Board of County Commissioners.

Adjourn

GUNNISON COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION
REGULAR MEETING
February 1, 2013

****

The Gunnison County Planning Commission conducted a regular meeting, in the Commissioners' Meeting Room in the Blackstocks Government Center, Planning Commission meeting room. **Present were:**

Chairman- Ramon Reed
Commissioner-Kent Fulton
Vice-Chairman- Jim Seitz
Commissioner-Susan Eskew
Commissioner-Warren Wilcox
Alternate Commissioner- AJ Cattles
Alternate Commissioner-Jeremy Rubingh

Director of Community Development- Joanne Williams
Assistant Director of Community Development- Neal Starkebaum
Planner-Cathie Pagano
Community Development Department Services Manager-Beth Baker

Others present as listed in text

****

With a quorum present Chairman Ramon Reed opened the regular meeting of the Planning Commission.

MOVED by Seitz seconded by Fulton to approve the minutes of December 7, 2012 as amended. The motion passed unanimously.

MOVED by Fulton seconded by Eskew to approve the minutes of December 21, 2012, as amended. The motion passed unanimously.

****

O.A. Pesnell, Monson Creek Outfitters; The Gunnison County Planning Commission (Commission) conducted a site visit; to observe the site of the request for the use of two cabins for year-round guest lodging and sleigh and hay rides. Seasonal use (May – October) as a staging area for guided horseback tours onto adjacent BLM lands, and as a waypoint for jeep tours on adjacent BLM lands; with jeep rentals originating in the City of Gunnison; 59005 Highway 50, north of Highway 50, Doyleville, legally described as being located in the NW/4NE/4, NW/4 Section 1, N/2SW/4, the SE/4SW/4, part of SW/4 Section 1 and NE/4, NE/4SE/4 lying north of Highway 50 Section 2, Township 48 North, Range 3 East, N.M.P.M., 465-acres.

No minutes were taken.

****

Carbon Policy Task Force Report; The Gunnison County Planning Commission (Commission) conducted a work session. The Planning Commission reviewed the Carbon Policy Task Force Report, and discussion of the development of recommendations to the Board of County Commissioners.

With a quorum present Chairman Ramon Reed opened the work session.

Reed noted there is only a short period of time to gather the information for the Commission's recommendation to the BOCC, in time for the BOCC February, 2013 retreat. Planner Cathie Pagano said the recommendation will focus on the Carbon Policy now, and will be able to more specially focused following the BOCC retreat, with the BOCC input.

The Commission reviewed the memo prepared by Planner Pagano and the Matrix she distributed. The memo and matrix are attached here.

The BOCC of County Commissioners (BOCC) has directed the Planning Commission (PC) to provide recommendations on carbon policy relative to the BOCC's Strategic Plan. The Planning Commission makes the following recommendations to the Board of County Commissioners.

Recommended Strategic Result:
By 2014, fund the Office for Resource Efficiency (ORE) Energy Smart Program and an ORE education program addressing energy efficiency in rental housing.

Identify by 2014 possible options for the creation of an ongoing revenue stream to fund the Energy Smart Program and/or rebates for energy efficiency upgrades to existing buildings and recommend by 2015 a revenue stream source for the program(s).

By 2014 an employee of the Housing Authority shall be certified to instruct "First Time Homebuyer" classes which meet state and federal requirements.

The strategic measures that would support this strategic result are:

- Designate continued funding for the Business and Home Energy Smart program currently provided by ORE at a capacity of 200 energy assessments per year and 100 retrofits per year.
- Determine if the International Energy Conservation Code (IECC) can be adopted every three years while continuing to adopt the International Building Code (IBC) every six years.
- Research options for creation of a revenue stream for the Energy Smart Program and/or rebates for energy efficient upgrades to existing buildings.
- County subsidized housing shall have energy audits completed for all buildings and begin the process of upgrading existing buildings to be more energy efficient. It is critical that the County be the leader in this effort and set the example for the citizens of Gunnison County.
- Any County funded housing shall be energy efficient and meet the requirements of the currently adopted IECC
- Determine feasibility for reduced permitting fees or expedited processing for additions and remodels that seek to increase energy efficiency.
- Include an allowance for thick exterior walls in new construction.
- Utilize the County communications consultant to create a centralized effort to address potential grant funding sources for the above items.

Existing buildings are the one of the largest sources of inefficient energy use in Gunnison County. To continue addressing remodeling and retrofitting of existing buildings we recommend that the BOCC increase the funding support for building retrofits and remodels. The Office for Resource Efficiency (ORE) currently provides subsidized energy assessments and some upgrades to Gunnison County residents and businesses through federal funding. Providing support for ORE's Energy Smart Program to sustain these services after federal funding expires will enable additional residents and businesses to reduce their energy consumption. The Energy Smart Program also supports the strategy of "Promote Healthy Communities" by identifying, mitigating and educating the public on building health and life safety issues such as combustion air zone problems and radon.

The Energy Smart Residential Program has completed the following:

- 855 home energy assessments
- 270 home energy improvements
- $935,632 invested in our local economy
- 721,727+ lbs. of CO_2 emissions eliminated

The Energy Smart Business Program has completed the following:

- 70 commercial energy assessments in partnership with Gunnison County Electric Association
- 48 commercial energy improvement projects completed
- $50,000 in challenge grants to businesses for energy improvement projects
- $44,000 in estimated annual cost savings to businesses

We recommend that the BOCC investigate the creation of an ongoing revenue stream to fund Energy Smart and/or rebates for energy efficiency upgrades in existing buildings. Eagle County has created an "Eco Build" program that requires buildings to achieve a specific number of points, based on the square footage of the building, using energy efficiency measures. If the number of points cannot be achieved the County requires payment into an Eco Build rebate fund. The funds are then used for rebates on energy efficiency measures for existing buildings. Pitkin County has adopted the Renewable Energy Mitigation Program (REMP) which charges building owners a fee if a new residence exceeds 5,000 square feet and/or if they exceed the allowed energy budget as defined by the program. Fees collected are then used to fund energy efficiency measures. It appears that the intention of both programs is not to penalize smaller, average size homes but to require that larger homes or homes with heated outdoor areas (pools, driveways, sidewalks) pay an additional fee based on their additional energy consumption or total square footage.

We also recommend that the BOCC fund an education program to be managed and conducted by ORE. The education program should be directed at renters and especially college students to provide education on the benefits of renting an

energy efficient home and requesting information on utility bills when searching for a rental. This will likely accomplish the goal of getting the market to respond to the need for energy efficient units. Education of renters will eventually demand that property owners upgrade their buildings to be more energy efficient thereby creating a better stock of property rentals.

Education about energy efficiency should also be extended to first time homebuyers. Many first time homebuyers are required by state and federal lending agencies to attend a "First Time Homebuyer" class; the closest classes available are in Grand Junction and Pueblo. We recommend that an employee of the Housing Authority become a certified "First Time Homebuyer" instructor (to meet state and federal certification requirements). We also recommend that energy efficiency be included as a portion of the curriculum. This will enable new homebuyers to understand the implications of energy efficiency and how it can impact their monthly budget. It will also serve to impact the marketplace in a way that is not regulatory but instead creates better education and may result in increased demand for energy efficient homes.

The County should also act as the leader in remodeling existing housing. Existing County subsidized residential buildings should have an energy audit completed and begin the process of upgrading the existing buildings to be more energy efficient. We recommend that the County include any audit/remodel efforts as part of its Communications Plan and do a press release describing the initiative.

Recommended Strategic Result:
By 2014 amend the Gunnison County Land Use Resolution (LUR) to include comprehensive energy, waste and transportation standards for new, major impact subdivisions.

Identifying areas appropriate for future growth and developing regulatory policy to allow that is critical to this recommendation. Marlene Crosby, Director of Public Works and Assistant County Manager, noted that "encouraging development of existing lots or encouraging building close to existing population centers is one of the most important points of the plan. We have tried to increase our level of service to subdivisions within the City of Gunnison's three mile planning area and also those close to CB, Mt. CB and CB South. The cost of mobilizing a plow to a subdivision one mile north vs. 12 miles north is huge. Encouraging growth close to the City was a strong selling point for the North Gunnison Sewer project which extended the sewer line north nearly to the 3 mile boundary."

Studies done by RPI Consulting of Durango and the Sonoran Institute have found that outlying, rural development increases county costs for infrastructure and services and is not offset by the tax revenue generated by these outlying developments. Their study, done in Wyoming, found that outlying lots covered 10% of county operational costs and 31% of capital costs for infrastructure and other services. These recommendations could be considered as a performance based system where an applicant could pick and choose from a variety of options. The recommendation could be used as one tool in managing growth and development in a manner that minimizes costs to the County and reduces energy consumption.

Recommended Strategic Result:
Identify by 2015 options for mitigating transportation impacts for each new major impact subdivision.

The County commissioned a report in 2009, "Gunnison County Road and Bridge Capital Expansion Impact Fee," that reviewed options for impact fees. At that time the BOCC decided not to adopt an impact fee due to existing economic conditions. It is recommended that the BOCC include the above recommendation as a strategic result in order to research other options available to the County for mitigating transportation impacts.

Recommended Strategic Result:
By 2014 amend the Special Development Project (SDP) application to include projection and analysis of the project's energy impact:

- ***i. Annual energy consumption projection during its construction and operation phases.***
- ***ii. Identification and analysis of energy source options for the project during its construction and operation phases, together with a rationale for the sources selected. Potential sources of energy within Gunnison County must be considered.***
- ***iii. A plan for annually assessing the project's energy consumption during construction and operation.***
- ***iv. A projection of new energy transmission infrastructure that will be required by the project.***

And, Require SDPs to minimize CO_{2E} emissions and energy use by requiring applicants to designate a set of best energy practices to be used during their construction and operation phases. These best energy practices must be based on accepted science and industry standards.

SDPs are large-scale projects and their energy consumption and efficiency may have a significant impact on Gunnison County. While the regulations include a substantial number of related plan submittal requirements, design and construction standards and requirements for ensured financing (including for impact mitigation), the Carbon Policy Task Force has suggested that additional measures be included. Amending the Special Development Project Regulations (SDPRs) to include additional energy information and best practices could strengthen the regulatory component for these projects. The above recommendations serve as information and data for Gunnison County. They don't demand that the projects be carbon neutral, but would increase requirements in data collection and project management.

Please note that the PC intends to continue work on this issue to address standards and incentives related to mitigating carbon emission impacts from SDP's. The issue is complex and requires additional time and research before a recommendation can be made.

Recommended Strategic Result:
Identify by 2014 County-owned assets (e.g. land, rooftops, etc.) for potential designation towards community energy projects.

This recommendation can be considered as data collection for future use. It would enable the County to understand exactly what resources it has and thus may enable some future use of those resources for energy production.

Cost Analysis
A cost analysis has not been completed for the Carbon Policy Task Force recommendations. In consideration of the Strategic Plan deadline there was not time to complete a thorough cost analysis of each of the recommendations. After further direction from the Board of County Commissioners, staff can begin researching cost/benefit information. Cost analysis may require outside consultation, depending on the recommendation.

Background Information
Please consider some background information and context on the importance of carbon emissions and energy efficiency. Carbon policies and energy efficiency measures have a range of costs and benefits. Without any action we can expect economic and environmental impacts to occur in Gunnison County. According to a report from Resource Engineering Group of Crested Butte, Gunnison County sends over $71 million dollars out of its local economy each year in energy expenditures. Energy efficiency measures keep more money in the County and in the pockets of residents and businesses.

The Aspen Global Change Institute (ABGI) and data from the United Nations Panel on Climate Change noted that Pitkin County will experience significant economic impacts from climate change. Those reports also noted that ski areas are likely to experience financial losses as winters become shorter and warmer. ABGI found that losses of 5% to 20% of skier days by 2030 could result in financial losses of $16 million to $56 million in the City of Aspen and Pitkin County area. Gunnison County also relies on the ski industry as part of a recreation based tourism economy and can expect that economic impacts will also occur in Gunnison County due to climate change. Crested Butte Mountain Resort will likely have fewer ski days causing revenue losses because winter will be shorter, according to ABGI. A study done for the City of Aspen projects that the local ski season could be a week and a half shorter by 2030 and four to ten weeks shorter by 2100. Auden Schendler, Vice-President of Sustainability for Aspen Skiing Company noted that, "Ski resorts operate in deficit until March, when we make most of our profit. If you shorten our season on either end—take away March, for example—and we go out of business. The problem: a shortened season is one of the most reliable predictions of climate modeling and science."

Hotter and drier: The West's changed climate, notes that ski areas, agriculture, and hunting and fishing are already being impacted by climate change along with noticeable impacts to local economies that depend on those industries for revenue. Hunting and fishing industries will be impacted as habitats are lost and fish and wildlife numbers drop, leading to fewer available hunting and fishing licenses issued by the State of Colorado. In Colorado in 2002, the drought reduced business for outfitters by an estimated 40 percent. About one million fishing recreation days were lost and 93,000 fewer fishing licenses were sold, with a corresponding $1.8 million loss for the Colorado Division of Wildlife. We can expect the same to be true of the 2012 drought. Agricultural operations will also suffer losses in the form of less irrigation water for hay meadows due to droughts.

In consideration of the direction from the BOCC, staff has reviewed the Carbon Policy Task Force recommendations and the BOCC Strategic Plan to identify areas for the BOCC to include carbon policy in the Strategic Plan. Staff has identified several different strategic results and which are included below from large-scale to small scale.

References

Sonoran Institute and RPI Consulting. 2012. Leaping the Budget Gap: Land Use and Fiscal Planning in Natrona County, Wyoming. http://www.sonoraninstitute.org/library/recoreading/doc_download/1202-natronacountrysummary.html

Aspen Global Change Institute. 2006. *Climate change and Aspen: An assessment of impacts and potential responses.* Aspen: Aspen Global Change Institute. http://www.agci.org/docs/CCA_Report_2007.pdf.

Field, C.B., L.D. Mortsch, M. Brklacich, D.L. Forbes, P. Kovacs, J.A. Patz, S.W. Running, and M.J. Scott. 2007. *Climate change 2007: Impacts, adaptation and vulnerability. Contribution of working group II to the fourth assessment report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change*, ed. M.L. Parry, O.F. Canziani, J.P. Palutikof, P.J. van der Linden, and C.E. Hanson. Cambridge, United Kingdom: Cambridge University Press. http://www.ipcc.ch/pdf/assessment-report/ar4/wg2/ar4-wg2-chapter14.pdf.

Saunders, Stephen, Charles Montgomery, Tom Easley, and Theo Spencer. 2008. *Hotter and drier: The West's changed climate.* New York: Natural Resources Defense Council. http://www.rockymountainclimate.org/website%20pictures/Hotter%20and%20Drier.pdf.

Carbon Policy Matrix of Proposed Policies with Updates on Current Policy

Task Force Policy proposed	Updates since 2011 Report	Comments
Section I. Buildings-New Construction		
1a. Continually adopt the latest versions of the appropriate energy conservation code.	The County, The City of Gunnison, and Towns of Crested Butte and Mt. Crested Butte have adopted the 2009 International Building Code (IBC) and International Energy Conservation Code (IECC).	The County policy has been to adopt the International Residential (IRC) codes every six years which has also been agreed upon by municipalities. The delay in adoption allows time for local staff to be adequately trained, lets us learn from the International Code Council what "glitches" in the code are and better informs the County and its customers about what amendments will best serve local building practices, and what costs would be incurred for local construction. This time cycle also allows local contractors to understand and adapt to the new codes for a longer period of time. Additionally, it is costly to adopt a new code in terms of staff hours and purchase of new materials. The Building office estimates that new materials cost several thousand dollars and it can take staff several hundred hours to review the new codes, propose amendments and review proposed codes and amendments with the Planning Commission and Board of County Commissioners. Advocates of the IECC have asked if the IECC could be adopted every three years; staff can research that possibility and work with municipalities to determine if possible for them to do same. While the IECC changes dramatically every three years; the IRC does not change as dramatically and is more fine-tuning.
1b. Improve the performance outcomes of the code by amending the baseline code and supplementing it with a performance-based energy conservation worksheet.	Currently require Energy Conservation Worksheet as required by the Land Use Resolution. The 2009 IECC provides various methods to achieve and demonstrate compliance with the IECC.	Currently the 2009 IECC allows building owners to use a HERS rating, which is a method of measuring the energy efficiency of a home and providing a baseline rating, as one option to achieving the code requirements for energy efficiency. Other options include prescriptive measures which model the proposed energy efficiency of a building (such as ResCheck and ComCheck); most applicants have chosen this option. The 2009 IECC has been drafted in a way to give an owner multiple options to achieve code

Task Force Policy proposed	Updates since 2011 Report	Comments
		compliance. Community Development may also meet with Assessor to determine if energy efficiency information could be included in their database. The current Energy Conservation Worksheet may be reviewed to determine applicability and currency, especially considering the adoption of the 2009 IECC. Many of the requirements in the IECC may supersede the items in the Energy Conservation Worksheet. It may be appropriate to revise the current Energy Conservation Worksheet to be consistent but not duplicative with the IECC.
1c. Require a preliminary model of home energy use at the time of plan review to assure that the building's performance will achieve the standards established in 1b.	Adoption of the 2009 IECC allows for modeling as an option to demonstrate compliance with the IECC.	The 2009 IECC allows for modeling (ResCheck, ComCheck) of energy use to meet the code requirements. This is the most common method that owners use to meet the energy standards in the IECC. Per the code requirements, modeling can be used in place of a HERS rating, it is one of the options (as discussed above) available to homeowners.
1d. Include an allowance for thick exterior walls in new construction.	The Board of County Commissioners reviewed this during the most recent building code adoption (April 2011) and decided not to revise the current method for square footage calculation (exterior wall).	The Community Development Department currently calculates square footage, according to the IBC, which requires measuring from exterior wall to exterior wall. The BOCC reviewed the method and discussed the exception for thicker walls but determined that it was best to maintain a consistent method of measurement but discussed the possibility of reviewing the issue again. The BOCC minutes from April 5, 2011 noted: "Concerning the use of gross floor area for purposes of valuation, he (Channell) stated that he would like to see modified language related to using perimeter measurements and deducting for thickness of walls in excess of 6", which would then be used to calculate the gross square footage, valuation, and building permit fee. Commissioner Chamberland wondered, since alternative building options are not common, how time consuming it might be to educate the staff and then perform the inspections. County Manager Birnie suggested being consistent with the language in order to avoid complications. Commissioner Chamberland was agreeable to leaving the language as proposed. Commissioner Swenson also agreed with the staff recommendation, but stated a desire to schedule a work session to look at the ramifications of changing it. Commissioner Chamberland agreed that the County might be able to evaluate ways of being proactive about encouraging energy efficiency."
1e. Require an energy audit and a County-specified energy performance rating (HERS) at a building's final inspection.	The County adopted the IECC which requires either a blower door test, insulation inspection or home energy evaluation (i.e. HERS) testing. An owner may choose from the	An insulation inspection is required as part of 2009 IBC and is currently conducted by the Community Development Department; alternatively, applicants may opt for a blower door test or home energy evaluations rating (i.e. HERS) to demonstrate compliance with the IECC. In the 2012 IECC both an insulation inspection and blower door test are required.

Task Force Policy proposed	Updates since 2011 Report	Comments
	options to verify compliance with the required energy standards.	
1f. Create residential, commercial, and industrial versions of a Building Performance Mitigation Program (BPMP) that: • Establishes progressive performance benchmarks based on square footage. • Sets incremental fees and rebates for over- or under-performing the benchmarks.	None.	It would be appropriate to complete a cost analysis to determine feasibility of implementation and enforcement of this recommendation. Please see Appendix IV of the Task Force recommendation for an example of a BPMP.
1g. Contractor Education & Certification	The State of Colorado's Governor's Energy Office (GEO), ORE and Community Development have presented training session to building industry & homeowners provided by since January 2010.	Community Development Department has participated in and sponsored education programs for contractors. Attendance has been limited; as part of its communication plan, the department is working on how to get "the message" out to more people through expanded media use. The information is provided regularly on a one-to-one basis to homeowners, contractors and citizens during permitting and pre-permitting meetings. Maya Silver, Executive Director for ORE, noted that the hands-on training sessions that they have held (CAD, ASHRAE, etc.) have been very well attended. They have also certified 30 contractors to participate as auditors/installers for the Energy Smart Program and provided scholarships for contractors to be certified by the Building Performance Institute.
Section II. Buildings-Existing Construction		
2a. Adopt energy standards for remodeling existing buildings	Energy Conservation Worksheet points required for additions.	The Energy Conservation Worksheet was created and adopted by Gunnison County as part of the LUR. The current Energy Conservation Worksheet may be reviewed to determine applicability and currency, especially considering the adoption of the 2009 IECC. Many of the requirements in the IECC may supersede the items in the Energy Conservation Worksheet. It may be appropriate to revise the current Energy Conservation Worksheet to be consistent but not duplicative with the IECC. The IECC currently requires that only affected areas of construction (an addition or parts of a structure disturbed during remodel) must comply with the IECC. For example, if dry wall is removed from an interior wall but the framing is not disturbed, the code requires only that new insulation be placed in the cavity; the insulation does not necessarily need to meet the minimum code requirements nor does it require changing the existing framing.

Task Force Policy proposed	Updates since 2011 Report	Comments
2b. Develop and support regulation of residential and commercial remodeling, including technical support and financial options.	None.	See 2a. comments above. Review options for creating a revenue stream for energy efficient upgrades to existing buildings. Eagle County has created an "Eco Build" program that requires buildings to achieve a specific number of points, based on the square footage of the building, using energy efficiency measures. If the number of points cannot be achieved the County requires payment into an Eco Build rebate fund. The funds are then used for rebates on energy efficiency measures for existing buildings. Pitkin County has adopted the Renewable Energy Mitigation Program (REMP) which charges building owners a fee if a new residence exceeds 5,000 square feet and/or if they exceed the allowed energy budget as defined by the program. Fees collected are then used to fund energy efficiency measures.
2c. Use the marketplace to make energy efficiency a competitive advantage in attracting tenants.	None.	
2d. Establish incentives to encourage landlords to meet efficiency standards.	None.	
Section III. Buildings-Subdivision		
3a. Amend the Land Use Resolution (LUR) to include a comprehensive energy, waste and transportation policy for new, large subdivisions.	None.	Amendments to the LUR including policies and standards addressing energy conservation, transportation and waste management demands and related performance standards could be considered for adoption.
3b. Require transit impact mitigation plan for each new major impact subdivision.	County commissioned study on "capital expansion impact fee" in 2009 and BOCC decided not to implement impact fee.	The Task Force recommendation stated that there are various options to consider for a mitigation plan. Research other mitigation plans as alternatives to impact fees.
Section IV. Transportation		
4a. Develop and adopt a comprehensive transportation master plan to coordinate community development and transportation planning.	None.	Comments from Marlene Crosby, Director of Public Works and Assistant County Manager, noted in an email dated January 29, 2013 that, "A Transportation Master Plan is a significant undertaking that would include a lot of agencies, require funding and a large time commitment. Gunnison County roads do not provide a transportation network without our partners. Most of our roads, with the exception of roads within subdivisions, serve as collectors to other roads. To create such a plan would require all of the municipalities, CDOT, the County, the Forest Service and the BLM to participate." Include as part of a BOCC strategic plan and would be most

Task Force Policy proposed	Updates since 2011 Report	Comments
		effective as part of a County-wide comprehensive plan. Public Works has a 5-year maintenance plan and a strategic business plan. "The Gunnison Valley Transportation Plans" is a regional document that was prepared for CDOT in 2008. This document addresses roads administered by CDOT in the greater region.
4b. Establish energy conservation standards and increase intermodal capacity in road upgrades and new road construction.	None.	
4c. Amend the LUR and Special Development Project Regulations (SPDR) requirements for a Transportation Impact Study for new developments to include a Transportation Demand Management Plan.	None.	Could work in concert with recommendation 3a. *Require energy, transit, waste policy in LUR.*
4d. Implement a public education and advertising campaign to increase use of public transportation.	None.	The County's public relations consultant could be directed to draft informational tools to regularly provide educational advertising in local publications, flyers, etc. Mountain Express and the Rural Transportation Authority (RTA) publish routine announcements in the local newspapers and on local radio regarding their services.
4e. Include in public education the impact on air quality and public health of prolonged and unnecessary idling of vehicles and equipment, as well as the waste of expensive fuel.	None.	Town of CB adopted anti-idling ordinance since the release of the report. Work with municipalities to make the recommendation effective.
4f. Increase County budget for improvement to and maintenance of public transportation infrastructure.	None.	
4g. Submit to voters a ballot measure instituting an energy consumption fee on motor fuels, the proceeds of which would be for infrastructure and initiatives as in 4f.	None	Comments from Marlene Crosby, Director of Public Works and Assistant County Manager, noted in an email dated January 29, 2013 that, "Item 4g represents a double edged sword to our department. The majority of our budget for road maintenance and construction comes from Federal and State gas taxes. The Federal tax is passed to the State who then passes a share to us. There is also a separate State tax. Neither gas tax has increased since the 1990's, and more efficient vehicles and alternate means of transportation are reducing the amount paid. It is a flat fee per gallon, so it does not change with the price of fuel. Needless to say the price of road construction and maintenance materials have increased significantly. There is some movement at the national level to pass a bill increasing the gas tax. Unless our department's funding structure is changed and funding diverted from other

Task Force Policy proposed	Updates since 2011 Report	Comments
		important needs of the County we cannot build the infrastructure, such as bike lanes, that would include less use of motor vehicles. We can barely keep up with basic road maintenance needs. " Research regarding the implications of this related to state statute and a cost analysis is appropriate.
4e. Incentivize the purchase of fuel efficient vehicles via rebates or waived/reduced fees.	None	Cost analysis of this recommendation should be completed to determine feasibility.
Section V. Special Development Projects		
5a. The application for a SDP permit from Gunnison County shall include projection and analysis of the project's energy impact	None	The *Special Development Project Regulations* submittal requirements include energy conservation measures, local energy resources to be used, opportunities for recycling and salvage are required to be described for a proposed project. Also currently required are: • "Description of the Proposed Project's inclusion or exclusion of energy conservation measures, "green building" measures, conventional and alternative energy generation, and related impacts to local energy providers and local energy costs" • "Description of the impacts and net effect of the Proposed Project on sources of energy and construction materials in the area." • Description of a project's sustainable design which "may encourage and enable the use of alternative energy sources that are not detrimental to public health, safety or welfare." Standards in the SDPRs include: • The planning, design and operation of the Proposed Project shall reflect state of the art principles of resource conservation, energy efficiency and recycling or reuse. Additional amendment to the SDPs regarding energy efficiency could be considered.
5b. Require SDPs to minimize CO_{2E} emissions and energy use by requiring applicants to designate a set of best energy practices to be used during their construction and operation phases. These best energy practices must be based on accepted science and industry standards.	None	Additional amendment to the SDPs regarding energy efficiency could be considered.
5c. Require periodic audits of the project, at the project's expense, based upon the consumption projections	None	

Task Force Policy proposed	Updates since 2011 Report	Comments
and monitoring plan approved in the project application		
5d. Require SDPs to mitigate their energy consumption in an amount consistent with the County's most current CO_{2E} emissions reduction goals.	None	Current submittal requirements in the SDPR's include • "Details of plans to fund mitigation, cessation of operations, correction of environmental and permit violations and proposed sources of funds." • "For any adverse impacts of the Proposed Project that would fail to satisfy any approval standard inArticle 5: *Standards for Approving or Denying a Permit*, a description of proposed mitigation techniques and strategies necessary to satisfy that standard. The mitigation plan shall address all impacts of the Proposed Project, whether or not the impacts would occur after cessation of the project activities. The mitigation plan shall include a description of how, when and for how long mitigation will be implemented and financed, and a description of any impacts that are unavoidable and cannot be mitigated." Standards in the SDPRs currently require that a project be "financially feasible," which information MAY include: "Plan to fund mitigation, cessation of operations, environmental and permit violations and proposed sources of funds."
5e. Require projects that create significant new demand on energy infrastructure to create an escrow account proportional to the impact of increased demand, assessed on actual operations.	None	The SDPR's currently require that there be financial security provided via a Development Improvement Agreement, including the coverage of all required mitigation in compliance with conditions place on a permit. Release of the security by the County could not occur unless "Applicable mitigation requirements and conditions, including the development of public facilities and the provision of public services, have been satisfied, and the financial obligations associated with implementing such requirements and conditions have been paid or adequately provided for." The Board cannot release the guarantee unless, "Applicable mitigation requirements and conditions, including the development of public facilities and the provision of public services, have been satisfied, and the financial obligations associated with implementing such requirements and conditions have been paid or adequately provided for."
Section VI. Local Energy Production	• A methane capture system was installed at Elk Creek Mine operated by Oxbow in Somerset in 2012. • County Community Development is participating (2012) in Southwest Solar Transformation Initiative (SSTI)	According to a press release from the North Fork Valley Project, "Oxbow Mining LLC, owner and operator of Elk Creek Coal Mine, has joined forces with Vessels Coal Gas, Gunnison Energy, Aspen Skiing Company and Holy Cross Energy to build a $6 million power plant that will produce enough electricity to meet the needs of 200 homes, or the entire operations of Aspen Skiing Company, including four ski mountains, three hotels and 17 restaurants." Staff can review SSTI recommendations, assess for current and long-term local applicability, and provide specific recommendations for local involvement.

Task Force Policy proposed	Updates since 2011 Report	Comments
	which has provided customized recommendations regarding permitting, planning, financing and marketing solar development.	There is existing potential for development of geothermal energy production in Gunnison County that may provide for local energy production.
Section VII. Energy Generation and Distribution	None	Comments from Marlene Crosby, Director of Public Works and Assistant County Manager, noted in an email dated January 29, 2013 that, "Gunnison County Water Department does have a tiered rate system, which increases the cost for use above the minimum. Our goal was to make sure that our plant runs the time necessary to provide an adequate water supply to our residents for their use and for fire protection, but we did not want the cost of treatment and wear and tear on the plant for excessive use."
Section VIII. Waste: Facilitate and participate in actions that divert and reduce waste streams and seek opportunity for reuse, recycling and waste-to-energy generations.	County recycling drop-off site established in CB South in 2011.	Scales have been installed at the Gunnison County landfill. According to Marlene Crosby, the landfill still charges by the yard while they compare and develop an appropriate rate structure. A consultant for the County landfill felt that the landfill did not have the volume to justify the cost of scales however the Colorado Department of Public Health and Environment now requires specific density calculations for air quality that necessitated the purchase of the scales. Crosby also noted that, "We have opened a satellite facility at CB South. It does not allow co-mingling, but it does allow the residents to recycle all of the products we take before they leave the subdivision. It has been very successful. We pick up cardboard every other day with an old trash truck we bought from the City, which allows us to make the trip to Gunnison every 2-3 weeks instead of daily, and we pickup up their trailer on demand. We tried to open a Recycling Center in the Town of Crested Butte and it was not successful. Council members at that time wanted curbside, so they were not willing to staff the facility even one day per week. I did not have the budget to provide the service for them, nor could I offer co-mingled products. The price that we get for our product which helps keep the Center alive is based on a very high quality product. We get that quality by asking the public to sort so that we do not have cross contamination. We feel the Recycling Center in town is so successful because it is easily accessible. I am frankly worried that we will not have as much participation if we move the Center to our new facility, much less moving it 7 miles east of town to the landfill. It would take a significant amount of money to operate full centers in two locations. At the landfill we offer a discount price for clean wood, and virtually no contractor has been willing to separate their

Task Force Policy proposed	Updates since 2011 Report	Comments
		construction debris into two separate trailers. Because the wood pile is not on the working face of the landfill we have offered it to the public for useful wood, firewood, etc. We have had very few takers over the years even though we tried advertising when we had a large amount of pine trees. Most of the wood is cottonwood and not deemed as good material. Our State and BLM permits do not allow salvaging "treasure hunting" on the face of the landfill."
Section IX. Education and Collaboration: Including support of WSCU, GCEA, ORE.	The County contracted with ORE to implement the Energy Smart Program which is an educational program that provided tools and funding for implementation of energy efficiency measures. The program's funding will end 8/31/13.	Community Development has a variety of materials available to customers related to energy efficiency. Efficiency materials could be distributed to other departments as recommended. The BOCC can consider additional funding for ORE and the continuation of the Energy Smart Program for homes and businesses. The program was primarily supported by state and federal grants which are ending so increased County support may be necessary to continue the program. Maya Silver, Executive Director of ORE is working on a range of budget options to propose to the County and municipalities in asking for their financial support.
Section X. Agriculture: Carbon capture and sequestration programs and research	None.	

Pagano said one of the largest issues is existing buildings and transportation. She said they could recommend continuing the funding of the Office of Resource Efficiency (ORE,) or a like program. Commissioner Eskew asked how ORE was funded: Pagano said a federal grant and partially funding from the County. ORE is working on a range of options to propose to the municipalities and the County. Reed suggested a strong recommendation to continue to support or even increase the support of ORE. Commissioner Rubingh reiterated Reed's suggestions and agreed even increasing the County support would be helpful; ORE is a resource center of information.

The Commission discussed the Energy Code and the Home Energy Rating System (HERS). It was noted most contractors are opting to do insulation inspections, rather than blower door testing. The Energy Code is drafted and planned for in the future. In 25 years there could be a net 0 Energy Code in place, as each code adoption will get more stringent. Commissioner Cattles said it is hard to reach the R Value requirements currently without using spray foam insulation; this creates such a tight house, it may be overkill to mandate a HERS rating.

The Commission requested additional information on adopting each new code rather than a code every six years. Cattles pointed out not only the building codes change, but the electrical and plumbing codes change frequently. Commissioner Rubingh suggested a requirement stating if ORE gets Co`unty funding, ORE will be required to provide education to contractors and homeowners.

Reed asked if there is coordination/ communication between the county and towns, concerning building codes; Pagano said they do confer with one another.

Commissioner Wilcox suggested using a carrot rather than a stick method; find a way to make it desirable to retro fit the older buildings. He pointed out perhaps an apartment building could command higher rent if it was energy efficient. The free market could possibly drive better energy efficiency. He added if there was a visible financial benefit to the owners, there would be better cooperation. Commissioner Seitz pointed out there is a large percentage of homes in Gunnison which are not owner occupied. Commissioner Fulton suggested the County lead by example and retro fit their apartments, making them more energy efficient. Rubingh agreed this would be a good start; it could be beneficial to fund

education for tenants and landlords. Cattles suggested using a green, yellow and red coding in the electric bills; it would easily indicate energy efficiency. Pagano noted it could be difficult to mandate.

The commissioners added Section 8 Housing could be an opportunity because the County helps by financially incentivizing those properties. They suggested requesting the owners provide an energy rating on Section 8 properties: this would provide influence in that direction. They also suggested ORE could give information to incoming students at Western; as additional information in their housing search. Wilcox suggested working with the University to provide a class for the incoming students.

Reed added another aspect is funding and funding mechanisms.

Community Development Director Joanne Williams noted the County contributes to Habitat for Humanity, so the County could mandate any construction would have to meet County energy requirements, in order to receive County funding.

Reed suggested housing could be responsible to apply for grants and funding sources. He added funding and the County role in figuring out funding should be emphasized and effort should be put into it.

The Commission emphasized this is a work in progress, and that should be conveyed to the BOCC. The suggestions were summarized:

- Have the County do an audit on existing County housing and retro fits
- Funding for ORE and the Energy Smart Program
- Any County funded housing must meet energy requirements
- Press releases on energy: need a PR component
- Planning Commission members to get energy audits on their own homes
- Houses built by Habitat for Humanity to meet energy standards
- A member of County staff should be certified to teach first time homebuyer energy efficiency classes
- Funding to be increased to include grant writing which includes energy efficiency programs
- Put effort into finding money for energy efficiency programs
- Research options for funding streams
- Incentivize builders to use ORE; possible rebates of the ORE fees
- Recommend the mandated wall thickness be consistent with the municipalities regulations
- Participate in the legislative process to create more incentives

Reed added two key areas- transportation & waste management should be pursued with Public Works and be mentioned in the letter to the BOCC. The Special Development Project Regulations should be explored. He also recommended pursuing air emissions and air quality in regards to natural gas development; it is important.

Commissioner Eskew requested a presentation to explain what jurisdiction the County has in dealing with the coal mines; incentivize the coal mines to capture their emissions. Fulton suggested that be a separate letter to the BOCC in a stand-alone document. Assistant Director of Community Development Neal Starkebaum suggested conferring with the County Attorney before drafting a letter to the BOCC.

The Carbon Policy recommendation will continue to be discussed at the next Planning Commission meeting, February 15, 2013.

*****

Fulton thanked Chairman Reed for his time and service to the Gunnison County Planning Commission.

****

Reed adjourned the meeting at 12:30 P.M .

_____
/S/ Beth Baker
Community Development Department Services Manager
Gunnison County Community Development Department