



Economy Sector Working Group
March 16, 2023
10:00 - 11:30 a.m.

MEETING SUMMARY

1. Welcome and roll call
 - a. Present
 - i. Jeff Trip (Co-Chair)
 - ii. John Bristol (Co-Chair)
 - iii. Gail Garey
 - iv. David Torgler
 - v. Sheila Symons
 - vi. David Torgler
 - vii. Michelle Stewart (YVSC technical assistant)
 - b. Not present
 - i. Christine Rambo
 - ii. Lisa Popavich
 - iii. Tegan Ebbert
 - iv. Rachel Tuyn
2. Update from the Board meeting
 - a. Proposed recommendations timeline
 - i. March - Identify gaps/recommendations
 - ii. April - Assess/rank recommendations
 - iii. All CAP Working Group session - April 27 (3-5pm)
 - iv. May - Format recommendations
 - v. Public Open House - end of May (WG members to meet with the public, answer questions, capture public input and feedback)
 - vi. June - Finalize formatted recommendations (implementable)
 - vii. July - Public release of recommendations - move to quarterly meetings
3. Critical review of current 'big wins'/recommendations and possible gaps
 - a. Economy sector strategies are not linked to carbon reduction the way the other sectors are. More weight in co-benefits (economic diversification, equity, workforce development)
 - b. **Recommendation 1** - Develop green purchasing programs/policies at government, commercial, and residential levels
 - i. Challenge - procurement distributed across different departments and can come at an extra cost
 - ii. Benefit - extra cost goes into the local economy

- iii. Gov't entity has to be of a certain size, hard for a small municipality to do this
 - iv. Need to work on the education component of this (keeping money in the economy), benefits of green procurement, clear discussion of co-benefits
 - v. Action - Pitch night for what we would like to have locally-sourced, what's available and what's out there
 - vi. Action - identify higher impact procurement changes
 - 1. Buildings and transit for the city (also significant for emissions)
 - vii. Action - Review procurement policies, identify relevant staff of appropriate municipalities size
 - viii. Would there be efficiencies of centralized procurement?
 - 1. Centralized, key entities - hospitals, gov't, schools, big industry (Ski Corp - has central procurement, lodging)
 - 2. Centralized purchasing for restaurants? PFAS now a big concern for compost (reusable may be the way to go)
 - 3. What about gas stations (to go cups, paper straws)?
 - ix. Concern - All green power costs more for Oak Creek
 - 1. Renewable Green Energy Program Fund
 - 2. Costs need to be put right up front, are we going to mitigate costs or just have people pay more
 - 3. Hydropower helps keep costs down
 - 4. What are the offset incentives out there?
 - x. Cost is an important question - WGs are looking to this group for creative funding mechanisms, climate aligned investments as they relate to energy are high, how do we create the bridges to make climate investments more possible?
 - xi. Economic opportunities and economic realities
 - xii. How do we support smaller entities that want to also do this, actions may be a blend of policy and other, are we looking for a menu of options or a policy shift?
- c. **Recommendation 2** - Expand a buy local campaign and educate the public/businesses about why/how to buy local
- i. Also came up in third strategy (regional self-reliance)
 - ii. Chamber has added a whole week for local food
 - iii. Expand and support growth of via vendor connections...
 - iv. Co-benefits are high here, but GHG impact low
 - v. How can local campaigns expand geographically, partner pretty closely with CAA. Local producers membership (\$75) - would like more regional businesses in there, can expand in social campaigns, adding on to email database
 - 1. Leverage CAA county wide, forge those connections, getting information to buyers and producers to get involved, centralizing marketing costs
 - 2. Expand messaging on to visitors as well
 - 3. Feature CAA under Economy enewsletter (create space within CAP website), social media sites
 - vi. Action - Educate on how to buy local, centralizing marketing costs which are out of reach to small producers
- d. **Recommendation 3** - Fund and develop a feasibility study that examines a regional circular economy
- i. Follow up with Christine Rambo (NWCDC) potential to leverage partners there - leverage end waste products (e.g., tires ground up for road base),

extends outside the County - scaling behooves the outcomes (would engage both Routt and Moffat)

- e. **Recommendation 4** - Develop end markets for current compost operations -- use for ag and landscaping
 - i. Actions - identify opportunities, how big landscaping operations, how much compost being applied to landscape?
 - ii. Would you need a large scale composting facility? Establish a compost facility at Milner Landfill but only open seasonally during the spring/summer
 - iii. Composting is a valuable climate solution
- f. **Recommendation 5** - Support transition/expansion of Materials Recycling Facility
 - i. What's the potential revenue, benefit to the economy would be our take on this versus Waste recommendation
 - ii. Arguments that small source separated centers are the best for small rural communities. Hayden just has one hauler. Source separated distributed sites across the county.
 - 1. Yampa has SRC (all goes together and one person separates it all)
 - 2. Oak Creek recycles through Twin Enviro, Hayden through Waste Management
 - iii. Action - Collaborate with Waste Working group to identify best scenarios for recycling infrastructure and how that would support workforce development
- g. **Recommendation 6** - Support local hay production for ranchers, increase agricultural stewardship training opportunities to promote benefits of land stewardship for the community (grazing, leasing, water rights)
 - i. Is this a big win recommendation?
 - ii. Action - Increase education - Extension 'Guide to rural living'
- h. Working group still needs to work through 11 more recommendations

4. Next meeting - Thursday, April 20 - 10:00 - 11:30 a.m.