

MINUTES
ENVIRONMENTAL POLICY ADVISORY COMMITTEE
APRIL 3, 2014

A meeting of the Environmental Policy Advisory Committee (EPAC) was convened on Thursday, April 3, 2014, at 5:15 p.m., in the Pueblo County Department of Planning and Development Conference Room, 229 West 12th Street. Chair Kester called the meeting to order at 5:15 p.m.

ROLL CALL

Those members present were:

Susan Finzel-Aldred
Betty Alt
Doris Kester

Ted Lopez
Gene Michael
Chad Wolgram

Member absent was: Lois Illick.

Guests present: None.

Staff present was: Sandra Smith, EPAC Recording Secretary.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES FROM THE FEBRUARY 6, 2014 MEETING

Mr. Lopez moved to approve the minutes from the February 6, 2014 meeting with the following changes. Ms. Finzel-Aldred seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

Page 2, under, Water Quality Subcommittee, change Sentence One, "Ms. Keller stated at the last meeting that Mr. Michael explained some of the reasons for the Clean Water Act, noting a lot of water pollution issues had increased due to population and identified ~~resolution~~ activity."

Page 3, Lines 6-7, change, "They also adopt regulations that are meant to ~~help with compliance with~~ implement the standards."

Page 3, Line 29, change, "...noting ~~they~~ members of the public..."

Page 3, Line 38, change, "If the Division..."

Page 3, Line 39, change, "...doesn't make changes, ~~and~~ the entity..."

Page 4, Lines 7-8, delete, "~~Anything outside will be considered out of scope if it's brought up at the wrong meeting.~~"

Page 10, Line 11, change, "...hearing-specific..."

Page 6, Line 1, change, "legislation" to "Legislature".

STATUS REPORT – DORIS KESTER

Chair Kester reported Ms. Sandy Daff was having a forum for the residents in Bessemer about the trash question and wondered if it would be appropriate for EPAC to sponsor some kind of forum about the trash question. Mr. Lopez suggested waiting for the Solid Waste Subcommittee report to answer the question.

ENVIRONMENTAL COORDINATOR (EC) REPORT – SUSAN FINZEL-ALDRED

Ms. Finzel-Aldred reported she helped the City of Pueblo write their *Recycling Resources Economic Opportunity* (RREO) grant application. The application requested funds to purchase 1,500 95-gallon wheeled carts for the residential waste haulers should City Council pass the pay-as-you-throw and recycling ordinance. She stated she also requested funds for the EC to provide public education and outreach from July 2014 through January 2015 to inform the public that they now have a choice and encourage them to call their hauler. The grant would provide for advertising on buses, kiosks, billboards, newspapers, televisions, and radios. The notice of grant approval should be given within the first two weeks in May. The total requested in the grant is \$162,586. She completed the Stormwater Education Report that goes to the State. It details all of her stormwater activities per the City's permit. She stated that she has reached 2,024 people through school classes, education booths, presentations on anti-littering, pollution prevention, and the watershed model. She did a lot of outreach and promoting the Statewide poster and calendar contest with all of the Pueblo schools. She held a reuse and recycled art class at the Children's Museum, attended several meetings including the County Sustainability Plan, and placed a dumpster for a Bessemer resident under the Solid Waste Assistance Program (SWAP). She noted that two other properties were identified for roll-offs to be placed in March. She stated the SWAP program provides complimentary dumpsters for those that have violations. She is trying to do one or two of them every month this year in an effort to keep within budget and meet needs. Mr. Lopez questioned if assistance was received from the City. Ms. Finzel-Aldred replied the funds came from the landfill user fee. She stated she gets additional money from the County for and SWAPs in the County. She stated in March she attended more meetings on the *Full Service Trash and Recycle Plan* for the City, noting the ordinance was presented in a slide show. She stated Mr. Lopez will present a report on the March 17, 2014 City Council meeting. She made a stormwater presentation to the McClelland School and met with some Pueblo West High School seniors to plan their school-wide food waste diversion. She stated four girls did a project of diverting, sorting, and weighing the waste from three lunch periods. She stated for 1,200 students, 16 gallons of food was poured out. The SWAP will place roll-offs on the Westside, Oakwood Estates, and Pueblo West. She was able to attend the Colorado Association for Recycling (CAFR) monthly board meeting in Denver, which was hosted by Goodwill. She stated she was able to tour Goodwill's electronics, books, and bike recycling warehouse. She has been receiving a lot of calls about paper recycling because of the loss of the Shriner's bins. Most of the people have been going to the north side or south side King Soopers to recycle their paper. She stated the north side King Soopers will remove their bin permanently this weekend due to illegal dumping, dumpster diving, and it being used as a homeless sleeping area. She stated the south side King Soopers recycling bin remains at this time. The Pueblo Chieftain has a dumpster the same size as the Shriner's at the back of their lot on 8th Street and Blake. She stated it accepts everything single-stream. Mr. Lopez questioned if it was intended for public use. Ms. Finzel-Aldred replied yes. She passed out a flyer highlighting the Recyclable Waste Day, May 10th, at the Colorado State Fair Grounds on one side and the Spring Clean-Up Day (free day at the dump), May 17th, at the Southside Landfill on the other side. She passed out another flyer highlighting the Bessemer Neighborhood Clean-Up, April 26th, at the lot located on Abriendo Avenue and Canal Street on one side and the Recyclable Waste Collection Day, May 10th, on the other side.

WATER QUALITY SUBCOMMITTEE – GENE MICHAEL

Mr. Michael stated there was an editorial in the Pueblo Chieftain this week regarding new rules being proposed by the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) and Army Corps of Engineers redefining “waters of the United States.” The editorial suggested we have our Congressional members oppose this rule. He stated, acting on the City’s behalf, he agreed with that position. He stated the rule would change the way business is done particularly in agriculture. He stated traditionally any small pond or water collection place on a farm or a ranch that would be filled with rain water part of the year and then dry most of the year would come under the control of the Clean Water Act. He questioned if the Committee would be interested in taking a formal position on the matter. He stated the rule was 370 pages, downloadable in two files with a little over 150 pages each. Mr. Lopez questioned if there was a deadline for comment. Mr. Michael replied it was opened for public comment for 90 days from the date of its release in February. Ms. Finzel-Aldred questioned if there would be comments after the draft rule revisions. Mr. Michael replied that the comments are published in the Federal Register and revisions are made, noting there normally is not a second review period. Chair Kester asked Mr. Michael if he had any advice for the Committee. Mr. Michael replied he did not have any detailed advice, and, generally, he opposed the rule; he felt it was much too broad. Ms. Finzel-Adred questioned if there was any exemptions for arid states. Mr. Michael replied no. Ms. Alt stated that would include small springs, noting she has one that makes a small pond. She stated somebody might need that type of pond for cattle. Mr. Michael replied yes. He stated the rule would have a greater effect on the East Coast and in the South because they have what is considered nuisance water all over the place. He stated the rule would bring under Federal purview the activities to control water on private property and actions to control floods may require a Federal permit. Chair Kester questioned if he was going to prepare a letter for comment. Mr. Michael replied he recommended the Committee’s recommendation go to the City Manager and suggested that City Council contact the congressional delegation and express opposition to the rule. Mr. Lopez stated that EPAC could be added as a signer in support of the opposition to the rule. Ms. Finzel-Aldred stated that EPAC gives advice to the Pueblo Area Council of Governments (PACOG), noting EPAC would give its comments to PACOG to forward to City Council. Mr. Michael replied that the City was part of PACOG, noting PACOG could compose a letter incorporating the City’s views. It would be better if each group composed a letter. Mr. Lopez questioned when the next PACOG meeting was. Recording Secretary, Ms. Smith, replied April 24th, noting the packet to PACOG was mailed April 17th; therefore, any submittals or requests to be included in the agenda would have to be done prior to April 17th. Chair Kester asked Mr. Michael how EPAC would be able to support him. Mr. Michael replied that EPAC could express its opposition to the rule to PACOG. Mr. Lopez questioned if PACOG was meeting every month. Ms. Smith replied it has been so far. Mr. Lopez stated the letter should be drafted and sent via E-mail to the Committee members for review. He stated that Chair Kester and Mr. Michael could give a presentation to PACOG. Ms. Finzel-Aldred stated that if PACOG members read the Pueblo Chieftain, they should be aware of the matter. Ms. Finzel-Adred stated she wanted it to be clear that the matter was associated with all waters and not just wastewater and treatment plants. Mr. Lopez stated he felt it would be a great opportunity for EPAC to bring the matter to the attention of PACOG and request support in opposition to the rule.

Mr. Lopez requested the floor to present his solid waste subcommittee report, noting two members were having to leave early, i.e., Ms. Alt and Ms. Finzel-Adred. Chair Kester approved.

Mr. Michael proceeded with his presentation after Mr. Lopez's report. He handed out a hardcopy of the PowerPoint presentation. The title of the presentation was, "Water Quality 301, a Summary of Water Quality Criteria". He stated the presentation had to do with how you calculate numeric standards that are assigned to streams for various pollutants. The way the Clean Water Act is supposed to work is the states identify water bodies and designate uses for the water bodies and adopt criteria to protect those uses. The criteria are supposed to be limits on specific substances or other characteristics that are needed in order to protect the designated use, specified by use. Criteria are supposed to be based on sound science by law and can be either narrative or numeric. He stated there are some things that don't lend themselves to a single number. There will be narrative standards such as "no toxics and toxic amounts". With respect to nutrients, you might say that "nutrient concentration shall not be such as to result in nuisance growths of algae." He stated the EPA has a very strong preference for numeric criteria and most of them are numerical. He stated the aquatic life uses protect fish and insects, recreation and drinking water uses protect human health, and the agriculture use protects livestock and crops. In almost all cases, the aquatic life uses turn out to be the ones that are most sensitive. When dealing with aquatic life, the criteria are based on toxicity of chemicals to different organisms, i.e., acute and chronic. Acute toxicity means chemical concentrations that kill aquatic organisms. The statistical measure for tests is the LC_{50} , the median lethal concentration, the lowest concentration expected to kill 50% of exposed organisms over 48 or 96 hours. He stated when dealing with Acute Toxicity you are trying to calculate the Final Acute Value (FAV), which gets modified by a couple of factors into a Criterion Maximum Concentration (CMC). When you look in the table of standards, CMC is one of the numbers you will see there. Chronic Toxicity refers to sub-lethal long-term exposures. You are not looking so much at individual organisms as you are looking at population health as a whole. Commonly, you find that a given population of fish is going to be smaller than the average fish. There are going to be fewer fish than you would expect to find in this habitat. They have a reduced rate of reproduction, increased susceptibility to parasites, and other things of that nature. The fish don't actually die as a result of the exposure. He stated the statistical measure is an EC_{50} , the median effective concentration, the lowest concentration at which sub-lethal effects are observed in 50% of exposed organisms. He stated when dealing with Chronic Toxicity you are trying to calculate a Final Chronic Value (FCV), which, with modification, becomes a Criterion Continuous Concentration (CCC), which is the chronic number you see in the regulations. Each chemical regulated under aquatic life will have two standards, i.e., an acute standard and a chronic standard. Not all types of fish are equally as sensitive as other organisms. The general rule of thumb is the bigger you are the less susceptible you are. He stated that a doctor needs your body weight in order to properly prescribe a medication dose. Types of aquatic life are amphibians, mollusks, insects, copepods, and plants. On Page 5 of the PowerPoint presentation, he stated the insects in the photo were microscopic. The top left was *Daphnia magna*, on the top right was *Daphnia pulex*, and on the bottom left was *Hyalella azteca*. He stated these three species were driving almost all of the water quality standards, noting they are ubiquitous; they are in all waters, very small, and very sensitive. He stated when trying to protect 95% of genera, these three species always show up. He stated plants were part of what was being protected but they were not as sensitive as animals. He stated in the order of taxonomy, Domain was added to take into account things that were not easily identified as animals or plants. Modern taxonomy looks like the top slide on Page 6 of the PowerPoint presentation. The Archea are the most ancient organisms on the planet. Bacteria are the more modern types of bacteria. The Eukaryota are all of the animals and plants you've ever heard of. The old animals and plants kingdoms are still in there but are a very small portion of the entire spectrum. Slide 2 on Page 6 of the PowerPoint presentation is how you

calculate the criteria. With the acute, you're going to look at all of the published reports you can find on acute toxicity of a chemical to an organism, collate them, calculate a FAV, then make modifications to arrive at the criterion maximum concentration (CMC). The CMC is the number you'll see in the rules. With chronic toxicity, you'll also be looking at all of the published data you can find. He stated what was depicted was growth and reproduction instead of lethality. You calculate a FCV and CCC, which was the chronic number that would show up in the rules. The problem found was there is much less chronic data than there is acute data because it's much easier to tell if you've killed something. He stated it costs more to do chronic tests. One of the methods that have been developed was to use an acute to chronic ratio. Generally, you'll find one or two species from which you have both acute and chronic data. You take a ratio of the acute to the chronic value and you use that ratio and apply it to all of the species for which you have acute data, which is how you get to a chronic value in those cases. He stated that a couple of modifications need to be made between the final acute value and the idle criteria. One thing to take into account is water quality characteristics. Turns out that a whole lot of the criteria are calculated in the laboratory are overprotective by a factor of 50-100 over what you see in the natural environment. It has been learned over time that you have to take those water quality characteristics, especially ligands, into account, which is true for both acute and chronic calculations. He stated the first thing you have to do is have adequate data. This is specified by the EPA. You have to have at least one species of fresh water animal in at least eight different families including the family Salmonidae (trout, salmon) in class Ostiechthyes (fish with bony skeletons). You need a second family in the class Ostiechthyes, preferably commercially or recreationally valuable. The third family need comes from the phylum Chordata (animals with spinal cords), which are the frogs and newts. You need to throw in some planktonic crustaceans, which mean free swimming instead of being attached to the bottom. The crustaceans, which are the Daphnia, are shown on Page 5 of the PowerPoint presentation. He stated the cladocerans were Daphnia and the copepods were the Hyalella. You then need to have benthic crustacean, which is anchored to the bottom. It brings in things called ostracod, isopod, amphipod, and crayfish. You need to have insects represented and another family in the phylum other than Arthropoda or Chordata, i.e., Rotifera, Mollusca, and Annelida (segmented worms). You then need to include a family in any order of insect or any phylum not already represented. When done compiling data, you have data for 15 different species. For each species with at least one acute value available, calculate the Species Mean Acute Value (SMAV). By taking all of the data on rainbow trout, you can calculate the geometric mean of all of the values. Then for each genus within which you have species with acute values available, you average all of those together as a geometric mean, which becomes your Genus Mean Acute Value (GMAV). Now you have the raw material to work with. You take the GMAVs that you have and calculate the cumulative probabilities for each one and pick the ones with the probabilities closest to 0.05. He stated 0.05 is the statistical representation of 95%, and the rule says we are supposed to protect 95% of the genera. As a practical matter, if you have fewer than 59 GMAVs available to you, then it's always going to be the lowest four. He stated he was not aware of a single chemical that has 59 GMAVs available. You always pick the lowest four and three of them are always going to be the Daphnia pulex, Daphnia magna, and Hyalella azteca. Slide 1 on Page 9 of the PowerPoint presentation shows the actual formulas. He stated the EPA is recognizing that in nature things are not normally distributed. In nature, you find a lot more low values than high values. You get more representative information if you take a geometric mean over arithmetic mean. The first slide on Page 10 of the PowerPoint presentation shows an example of the differences between arithmetic and geometric means. He mentioned you adjust for ligands. A ligand is a chemical in the water that binds to a central metal ion to form a coordination complex, noting the coordination complex is non-toxic because

it's bioavailable. He stated the poster child for this was copper. The EPA did lab experiments and determined that the copper criterion needed to be around 20 ug/L, noting there were virtually no waters in the whole United States that were that low. He stated there were gold medal trout fisheries all over the place, and the rainbow trout was the species they were trying to protect. He stated more research was needed. He stated that calcium and magnesium ions and organic carbon will bind copper. If a chemical test or acid digestion test is done to find out how many copper atoms are there, you would get a fairly high number. He stated none of that had real toxic effects on the fish. You have to take the ligand forming abilities into account before you write a final standard. He stated the final standards for metals use formulas like the one noted on Slide One on Page 11 for copper. He stated a Final Acute Value is supposed to protect 95% of the general, but there is still concern. There are 5% of genera that "fall off the turnip truck". In order to form an extra layer of protection, and violate the exercise of sound science, they arbitrarily divide all of the FAVs by two after the ligand adjustment. The result becomes the Criterion Maximum Concentration.

Mr. Michael reviewed Chronic Criteria stating it was a little bit different. He stated that two numbers were calculated for each species, i.e., the lower chronic limit, which was the highest concentration causing no unacceptable adverse effect; and the upper chronic limit, which was the lowest concentration causing unacceptable adverse effect. He stated you take the geometric average of those two numbers. He stated with respect to sound science, the term unacceptable was not defined. The regulation states they left it undefined because there was such a wide diversity of opinion. He stated those numbers are then run through the same calculation process as the acute values. He stated people generally think that when the Clean Water Act was passed in 1972 the EPA went out and conducted thousands and thousands of toxicity tests. This was not true. What they actually did was they relied on data that had already been published. He stated that was good and bad. It gave them a good start; otherwise, it would have been decades before they could get started on regulations. He stated the data would have also been peer reviewed lending some kind of quality control. He stated one of the problems was inconsistent experimental methodology. Some people would run experiments for 48 hours, others for 96 hours, and others for two weeks depending on the availability of resources. There was inconsistent data reporting, inconsistent statistical methodology, and inconsistency of the age of the test organism, and it makes a big difference whether you are testing a day-old fish versus a three-year old fish. There were inconsistent measurements of the forms of chemicals, noting genetic lines of the test organisms will all affect the toxicity results. Because there was no legal implication, there were no standards that had ever been set; there was an "apples to oranges" comparison across the board. Most of those measurements were made in the laboratory and not in the field, noting it was a big problem because the laboratory experiments were simpler than the conditions found in the field. The result was a vastly overprotected standard calculated in the lab. He stated the researchers had a large range of experience, i.e., Ph.D. with 20 years experience to a grad student with no experience. He stated the EPA used all of the data they had regardless of consistency. There could be fifty reports that tell you proper criterion for copper to protect trout would be between 45 to 50 parts per billion, and then have another person say there was trout dying at three parts per billion. He stated the EPA took the averages of all the reports.

Mr. Michael reviewed the human health hazards. He stated the human health hazards came into play when dealing with recreational and drinking water standards. The calculation methodology that was used for aquatic life is like a kindergarten exercise compared to a post-graduate course when dealing with human health hazards. He stated there are laws that

prevent direct experimentation on humans. He stated you can't feed a human a chemical until he/she dies, noting it really complicates the science. He stated there were many other confounding factors like nutrition and general health. The same factors exist with fish, but the fish can't tell you. He stated you deal with sub-lethal effects many of which will take a human lifetime or even generations to manifest. It also depends on how good historical records are. He stated exposure was very hard to define. You can be exposed by drinking water; consumption of fish or shellfish, which live in the water; you could swallow lake water while swimming; you could also be exposed through diet, or you could be exposed by dirt if you are a farmer working with the soil; and you could be exposed by atmospheric disposition. It's really hard to tell how much exposure the person is getting from water versus from other sources. The EPA uses the "Most Exposed Individual" mathematical model, which takes all the routes of exposure that they can think of and sets up the worst case scenario for each. Then it adds the effects of all the worst case scenarios together. He stated not all of it was going to be realistic. The bias was to create a standard that was going to be very protective. He stated if these standards could be met, nobody would ever be hurt anywhere. He stated cancer causing chemicals are a whole different class. The target cancer risk is 10^{-6} , which means they want to avoid an excess risk of more than one person out of a million developing cancer as a result of exposure to a particular chemical. He stated it was an arbitrary decision that was reached, noting there were plenty of people that thought it should be even tougher. He stated toxicity effects and cancer effects were separate and gets very complicated. Normally they end up with weight-of-evidence narrative, which is where they convene a panel of physicians that sit around the table for a week and they talk about how dangerous they think this particular chemical is, what their experience has been, and so forth. This was how they came up with a narrative that describes the type of threat we are dealing with. They try to identify the mode of action of the chemical because carcinogens, in particular, have different ways in which they act. They tried to come up with some sort of dose estimation that will allow you to say how much a person can stand without being adversely affected. He presented three slides of formulas showing how the math was done. If you are looking at a toxic material that is non-cancerous use this formula (Slide Two on Page 16). If you are looking for a cancer-causing chemical that has a nonlinear low-dose extrapolation effect you use the formula on Slide One on Page 17. What the nonlinear low-dose extrapolation means is there are some chemicals that are real hot buttons for cancer. If you get any time exposure at all you are almost certain to get cancer. As opposed to other carcinogens, which act more like normal things, if a little bit is bad, then more is going to worse and more yet might kill you. For the regular linear low-dose effects, they use the calculation on Slide Two of Page 17. He went over the references and contacts on Page 18. Mr. Michael also distributed a list of water quality standards acronyms.

Mr. Lopez stated that people need to be mindful of what they put in the water within their daily lives. He stated what came to his mind was toilet bowl cleaner, disposing of drugs, and chemicals from things we use every day. He stated it may be necessary to change to organic products. Chair Kester stated she read an article about hand sanitizer getting into the water and it was causing a change in the bacteria. Mr. Michael stated a lot of the bacteria are getting resistant to the antibiotic that is in the sanitizer.

SOLID WASTE SUBCOMMITTEE – T. LOPEZ

Mr. Lopez reported he received an E-mail from Ms. Ami Nawrocki to attend the City Council Work Session on March 17th, noting the City Public Works Department submitted to City Council a modified version of the trash and recyclables ordinance. He stated Ms. Nawrocki felt the

original Comprehensive Plan should be used. She felt if Council was not willing to do it, it should be put on a ballot before the voters. She has asked several people to contact different Council members to give the Comprehensive Plan some consideration. He stated he prepared an E-mail and submitted a copy to the EPAC Committee. He stated he submitted it to the Pueblo Chieftain for inclusion in Sunday's newspaper. It was basically a plea to the public to attend the City Council Work Sessions on April 7th, at NeighborWorks and April 21st, at City Council Chambers in City Hall, both held at 5:00 p.m. He stated he would send a copy via E-mail to Chair Kester so she could forward it to interested parties, the Democratic Party, and Ms. Nawrocki and other interested parties. He felt EPAC members should attend the work sessions. He stated the tools were initially developed by EPAC in the Solid Waste Management Plan as a guide. Ms. Finzel-Aldred stated this matter was very important and would like to see it addressed. She noted that they are trying to address what they can through City Ordinance by licensing and requiring the haulers to offer recycling or they don't get a license. Then there are the steps to implement yard waste and getting a Material Recovery Facility (MRF). The initial step is to get residential recyclables, "the low hanging fruit". She stated that businesses, commercial, and institutions fall under a different category. She implored the EPAC members to attend the work sessions to voice how important the issue was for the community. She stated she was disappointed with the media coverage of illegal dumping, and felt that instead of talking about it and "opening the wound" they should take steps to do something about it. Mr. Lopez felt that more people in attendance would make an impression on City Council. Ms. Finzel-Aldred stated the question of what to do about illegal dumping always comes up, noting that focus needs to be on implementing an ordinance. Mr. Lopez stated the Health and Sanitation section of the Code of Ordinances lists all of the tools necessary to deal with illegal dumping. The only thing missing was proper funding. He stated there also needed to be a commitment by City Council through the City Manager to actually deal with it. He stated he has learned that certain code enforcement that was in Land Use Administration was now with the Police Department. Ms. Alt stated that she was required to recycle in some of the other places she has lived. She questioned if the ordinance was going to be mandatory. Ms. Finzel-Aldred replied it would be a pay-as-you-throw system. If the ordinance passes, as of January 1, 2015, each hauler would have to offer their customers a large, medium, and small size trash can for various prices. She stated the haulers would be required to offer the service to their customers; it was not mandating that citizens have it, noting that was the next step. Ms. Alt stated that in other places where she has lived she used to pay a fee on the water bill that paid for the service. Ms. Finzel-Aldred stated haulers were concerned about districting; that the City would divide off the City into quadrants requiring the haulers to bid on it. She stated that some of the smaller communities have implemented districting. Mr. Wolgram stated that when they try to implement a mandatory system, they run into roadblocks. Ms. Alt stated it was mandatory in Virginia Beach or you didn't have water. Ms. Finzel-Aldred stated that Pueblo was a privatized market, which makes it very different than other places and has made it hard to do comparisons. Mr. Lopez stated the City has lost the opportunity to be in control, referring to the dump and by allowing the current approach. Ms. Alt stated she pays \$68 a month to Waste Management. Ms. Finzel-Aldred stated if the ordinance passes, Ms. Alt could possibly decrease her trash fee if she decided to recycle. Mr. Lopez stated the ordinance requires the owner or the occupant of a property to pick up litter, rubbish, trash, from the curb to the middle of the alley. There was some discussion between Mr. Lopez and Mr. Wolgram regarding the culture in Pueblo and it being used as an excuse to make a decision on the matter. It was noted that it was the culture to be able to smoke anywhere you wanted, which was changed. Mr. Lopez pointed out that in order to accomplish something, there has to be leadership. If there is no leadership, then the matter needs to be put on a public ballot for vote.

OTHER DISCUSSION

None.

AGENDA FOR JUNE 5, 2014 MEETING

The next regularly scheduled EPAC meeting is Thursday, June 5, 2014, at 229 West 12th Street, from 5:15 p.m. to 6:30 p.m.

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business before EPAC, the meeting was adjourned at 7:00 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,



Sandra M. Smith
EPAC Recording Secretary

SMS