



**THE FOUNTAIN CREEK WATERSHED
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Meeting Memory
January 18, 2008
Colorado Springs City Council Chambers**

INTRODUCTIONS & WELCOME VISITORS

Meeting Participants

Bill Alspach
Carol Baker
Dan Bare
Patty Baxter
Jay Frost
Duane Greenwood
Steve Harris
Kim Headley
Kevin Houck
Greg Langer
Dennis Maroney
Rex Miller
Bob Miner
Rich Muzzy
Gary Rapp
Ken Sampley

Representing

City of Woodland Park
Colorado Springs Utilities
City Colorado Springs
El Paso County Emergency Service Dispatch
Central Colorado Soil Conservation District
City of Fountain
Colorado College
Pueblo County
Colorado Water Conservation Board
Natural Resource Conservation Service
City of Pueblo
Central Soil & Conservation District
Town of Palmer Lake
Pikes Peak Area Council of Governments
Recycling Coalition of Colorado Springs
City of Colorado Springs

REVIEW OF NOVEMBER 29, 2007 MEETING MEMORY

The Meeting Memory was accepted as written.

ARMY CORPS OF ENGINEERS WATERSHED STUDY

Charles Wilson, Army Corps of Engineers Albuquerque District, participated in the meeting via conference call. Rich Muzzy asked Charles to review the timeline. Charles replied that Gary Rutherford, Army Corps of Engineers Albuquerque District, is responsible for the timeline and Gary was not able to attend the TAC meeting. That week Gary and other Corps staff viewed about half of the prioritized sites. The intention was to come back in two weeks to review the remaining sites. A report will then be generated. The Corps is still working on the Feasibility Scoping Meeting Report which is a report on the existing conditions. That includes all the documentation that the Corps has worked on up until this point. It also will include identification of problems, opportunities, goals, objectives, constraints, general

recommendations, and prioritization of potential projects. This documentation is almost complete.

ARMY CORPS OF ENGINEERS WATERSHED STUDY PRELIMINARY GENERAL RECOMMENDATIONS

Charles Wilson stated that the current goal for the general recommendations was to review what they were, comments received, and how to address possible conflicts with the comments at today's TAC meeting. A handout was distributed that listed the general recommendations as they appeared on the power point presentation made by Charles at the August 17, 2007 TAC meeting.

Ken Sampley stated that he had a draft copy of the Feasibility Scoping Meeting Existing Conditions report. It included the general recommendations that are going to be discussed at the TAC meeting in the same wording that was initially presented. He felt that it would have been preferable to make an extra note saying that comments still needed to be reviewed. Charles Wilson replied that the draft report was written in early September however it wasn't released by Corps until the end of October.

Charles Wilson stated that there were seventeen general recommendations that were made that looked at a variety of different aspects of the problems in the watershed and ways to address the issues in nonstructural perspectives. Mostly policy type perspectives were used.

The general recommendations were as follows:

1. Modify development policy to include more consideration of open space needs in development (focus on more habitat development within traditional parks).
2. Rehabilitate riparian areas to a healthy, functioning condition.
3. Preserve existing wetlands and create additional wetlands where opportunities exist.
4. Limit sediment sources during construction by minimizing over lot grading in large scale developments.
5. Modify development policy to include the concepts put forth by the Center for Watershed Protection (cwp.org) and Low Impact Development (lowimpactdevelopment.org).
6. Modify development policy to require the post development hydrographs to match the predevelopment hydrographs for peak, volume, and timing.
7. Modify development policy to require the post development sediment transport to match the pre-development sediment transport.
8. Collect sediment load data for the Fountain Creek Watershed so that appropriate sediment transport modeling can be calibrated for all future development in the watershed.

9. Modify development policy to require assessment of downstream impacts, and particularly the impacts due to small frequently occurring storm events such as the two year event.
10. Modify development policy to include involvement by regulatory agencies and stakeholders as soon as possible in the development process.
11. Entities must follow through with review of development plans, adherence to approved plans through the construction process, and inspection/maintenance of completed projects.
12. Staff must be educated/ trained in the principles of geomorphology and sediment transport to support the review process for new development and to support the ongoing efforts of their entities in the watershed.
13. Entities should use the hydrologic and hydraulic models developed as a part of the Fountain Creek Watershed Study to update their FEMA floodplains.
14. Entities should use the models developed as a part of the Fountain Creek Watershed Study to certify their levees.
15. Remedial projects that affect Fountain Creek or its tributaries should utilize stable channel design.
16. Entities constructing remedial projects in the watershed should develop a consistent approach and methodology for project design and construction.
17. Create a Fountain Creek Watershed Authority that could serve as a funding source for large scale projects, and to assist entities with training, review, and/or maintenance.

Charles Wilson stated that he has received several comments on the general recommendations since they were presented in August. He received a letter from Dennis Maroney requesting verbiage changes on the post development hydrographs and post development sediment transport. Colorado Springs Utilities and City of Colorado Springs also requested verbiage changes to several of the recommendations. Charles stated to Ken Sampley that the comments he received from the City of Colorado Springs were lengthy but that in most cases changes were not specified clearly enough and this could be problematic. Ken replied that he felt that the Corps, as a consultant, should be able to fill in the details. Charles replied that he needs more specific feedback in order to know exactly what would satisfy the City of Colorado Springs.

Charles Wilson stated that it would have been best to have copies of all the comments available to distribute to the TAC members for this meeting in order to review the general recommendations. Unfortunately there were no copies available at this time. Carol Baker agreed that the best approach would be for the TAC to review all the comments made and then come to conclusions for revisions at the next TAC meeting. Rich Muzzy replied that an alternative approach for today's meeting could be to review which of the 17 general recommendations were not controversial and could be agreed upon by the TAC. Charles agreed to this alternative approach.

Charles stated that Colorado Springs Utilities requested small changes to the verbiage on almost all of the recommendations. None of the changes seemed major to Charles but they may be considered major to others.

Bob Miner inquired as to why the City of Colorado Springs and Colorado Springs Utilities are addressed as separate entities when they are under one government. The TAC reiterated that they are separate entities. Ken Sampley stated that while both entities have separate comments on the general recommendations that they would not be in disagreement.

Charles Wilson stated there seemed to be a consensus of agreement regarding general recommendations number 4, 8 and 11. No changes were requested on these recommendations. The TAC agreed that general recommendations 4, 8 and 11 were acceptable as they were originally presented.

Kim Headley stated he believed that meaningful discussion could not take place without first seeing the suggested changes and Ken Sampley agreed. Dennis Maroney asked Charles Wilson if he only received comments from City of Pueblo, City of Colorado Springs, and Colorado Springs Utilities. Charles replied that those were the only written comments he received that requested changes to the general recommendations. Charles also received feedback from El Paso County but they did not request changes.

Bob Miner asked Charles Wilson if in any point in time once the study is published that the watershed authority could go back and make changes that they feel would better serve the watershed community. Rich Muzzy stated that there is nothing binding about the general recommendations. It is up to all the watershed entities to implement the recommendations. Charles Wilson stated that Rich was correct. Bob asked Ken Sampley and Carol Baker if the changes they suggested would have any major impacts within the watershed. Dennis Maroney stated that the City of Pueblo's recommendations were favorable. The only comments were on expanding the maximum practicable limits on two items and that this was most likely also commented on by City of Colorado Springs and Colorado Springs Utilities. Ken Sampley stated that the City of Colorado Springs looked for verbiage changes in statements that were not technically feasible to accomplish right now and using the verbiage maximum extent practicable.

Ken Sampley stated, for example the first general recommendation reads "modify development policy". Ken believes that this statement assumes that all policy is wrong or needs to be updated. He feels that it is not appropriate to make such a flat and blanket statement. Charles Wilson replied that these statements are geared toward the watershed as a whole and if individual entities are already addressing the issues then there are no problems. Ken stated that he would be more comfortable with the verbiage "review development policy" which was suggested by Colorado Springs Utilities.

Kim Headley asked Charles Wilson what the timeline for completion would be for this portion of the project. Charles replied that the goal will be to have a draft report with these recommendations and some of the technical recommendations for the site specific projects ready by the end of May. Charles stated he could compile a Word document that includes all the requested changes on the general recommendations that have been submitted to him. This document could then be reviewed by the TAC in order to come to mutual agreement. Kim Headley stated that all the entities that have not already given Charles their recommended changes should get those to him as soon as possible so he can compile everything before the next TAC meeting.

Ken Sampley inquired about the specific role of the Corps as a consultant when all the entities are reviewing and making changes to the general recommendations. He was concerned that perhaps the Corps was not offering enough technical expertise during the process of collecting all the comments regarding the general recommendations.

In response to Ken Sampley's question about the Corp's role Charles responded that this is a process where many entities want different things and Charles is trying to make sure that everyone's voice is being heard. He is trying to find a middle ground but he stands behind the recommendations that he and his team made. He is okay with verbiage changes, but would like to make certain all the TAC members are comfortable with all the suggested changes. He is looking for something that will work for the entire TAC.

Bill Alspach inquired if Charles could compile a list of all comments for the TAC to review. He feels this may help the process go a little quicker. He believes that a lot of the comments that the other entities made would be accepted by the TAC members. The TAC could then compare this list to the original recommendations. Ken Sampley agreed.

Dennis Maroney added that he felt the TAC needed to see the Corp's recommendations regardless of the comments made. If Charles does not feel the comments should be included then they should not be included. The TAC will then let Charles know if they are uncomfortable with the revised recommendations at the next TAC meeting.

Charles stated that he will prepare a document that will show the original recommendation, the suggested verbiage and comments he received, and then how Charles believes the recommendation should read. This should be ready by next Friday or the middle of the following week and then e-mailed to Rich Muzzy for distribution.

Dennis Maroney stated that the general recommendations were well within the goals and direction of the Vision Task Force. Jay Frost thanked Charles Wilson for all his hard work.

Bob Miner asked Charles Wilson if he could come with his crew when they returned in two weeks. Charles replied he wasn't planning on coming. Bob stated he would like Charles to come

and take a tour with him for 3-4 hours. Ken Sampley inquired if the crew was coming to look at the recommended project specific locations and Charles stated that was correct. Ken Sampley stated that he felt that they should keep their focus on the project specific recommended locations.

FOUNTAIN CREEK WATERSHED VISION TASK FORCE UPDATE

Ken Sampley stated that the Funding Options Group talked about how the enterprise was constructed and enterprise zones. Ken Sampley encouraged the TAC to participate in the Funding Options Group. Ken also stated that the City of Colorado Springs also had a helicopter fly the upper parts of fountain creek and the footage will be available at a later date. Also the City of Colorado Springs has a couple of public private partnership opportunities they are working on. There are two petition ballot initiatives being distributed for signatures in regards to stormwater enterprise and phasing out payments from utilities to the city over the next 10 years. If they get enough signatures it could be on the ballot in November.

Rich Muzzy added that on Thursday, January 24 at PPACG there will be a public meeting to present the preliminary results of the Upper Fountain Creek E. coli Study. Information from the meeting will be posted on the Fountain Creek website the following day.

Dennis Maroney stated the Water Quality Group had met to discuss strategies on how to achieve the goals set forth by the Vision Group. Those are being worked on again and will be presented on February 13th. Dennis encouraged the TAC to attend this meeting. Dennis also stated parts of the Pueblo Springs Ranch are being annexed into the city of Pueblo. It's important that the Vision Task Force take notice so they can get what they want during the time of annexation agreement. Kim Headley added that the annexation would be 24,000 acres.

OTHER TOPICS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

Rich Muzzy informed the TAC that El Paso County would like to attend the TAC meeting; however the county has switched to working 4 day/10 hour work week and are closed on Friday. Even as private citizens El Paso County staff can not attend the Friday TAC meetings. Rich inquired if the TAC felt comfortable switching the regular scheduled meeting time. In general it was decided that Thursday was an inconvenient day but Wednesday was a possibility. Rich will send an e-mail to verify the availability of the TAC.

Carol Baker gave an update on the Corridor Master Plan. A draft Corridor Master Plan would be produced this quarter. Either later this quarter or early next quarter they will be inviting the TAC, Vision Task Force and the public to review and comment. This study covers the southern Colorado Springs limits down to the Arkansas River along Fountain Creek.

Dennis Maroney stated that city of Pueblo has submitted a grant application for 319 funds (water quality) for 3 pilot projects that were proposed for Fountain Creek. One deals with streamside system (sediment removal) and the other two deal with an off-line detention center (wetlands development north of highway 47) and a spring with high selenium content (creation of a wetland to assist with removal). These projects would be tested over 1-3 years. The Consensus Committee did not give their approval so the city made the submittal and they will use their forces to monitor this.

Rich Muzzy stated that El Paso County submitted a grant application for a policy evaluation and workshop through the DOLA heritage program. They should find out by mid-February if they were awarded funding. Also the Fountain Creek Watershed Newsletter will be distributed in a couple of weeks.

Bill Alspach added that there would be a workshop in Woodland Park for local developers, builders and consultants interested in stormwater management plans.

DATE OF NEXT MEETING - Rich Muzzy stated that an e-mail would be sent to confirm the date of the next meeting.

ADJOURNMENT - The meeting adjourned at 11:15 a.m.