



**THE FOUNTAIN CREEK WATERSHED
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE**

Meeting Memory

November 2, 2007

PPACG Lower Level Conference Room

INTRODUCTIONS & WELCOME VISITORS

Meeting Participants

Carol Baker
Dan Bare
Barbara Dallemand
Dennis Darrow
Jay Frost
Duane Greenwood
Greg Langer
Dennis Maroney
Rex Miller
Steve Miller
Rich Muzzy
Sandy Rayl
Ken Sampley
Chris Woodke

Representing

Colorado Springs Utilities
City Colorado Springs
El Paso County DOT
Pueblo Chieftain
Central Colorado Soil Conservation District
City of Fountain
Natural Resource Conservation Service
City of Pueblo
Central Colorado Soil Conservation District
Colorado Water Conservation Board
Pikes Peak Area Council of Governments
USACE
City of Colorado Springs/Stormwater
Pueblo Chieftain

REVIEW OF OCTOBER 19, 2007 MEETING MEMORY

The Meeting Memory was accepted as written.

**ARMY CORPS OF ENGINEERS WATERSHED STUDY PRELIMINARY
RECOMMENDATIONS**

Charles Wilson, Army Corps of Engineers Albuquerque District, participated in the meeting via telephone. A revised spreadsheet from the October TAC meeting was distributed for review. Charles Wilson announced that changes to the spreadsheet included the addition of a numeric score for the flood control, ecosystem restoration, and channel stability columns. A potential cost column was added however it currently only covers the flood control sites. A composite score column which is a summation of the flood control, ecosystem restoration, and channel stability columns was also added. A description of how the criteria were devised is found on the last page of the spreadsheet. Charles stated most of the channel stability sites would likely fall into the medium to high cost range. Charles was not able to complete the potential cost estimates for the ecosystem restoration sites. Several sites have scores in

more than one criterion and Charles believes that they need to be adjusted and combined on the next version of the spreadsheet to give a more accurate composite score. This will likely change the spreadsheet dramatically. Charles stated he feels as though the ecosystem criteria are very strong but the flood control and channel stability criteria have room for modification and suggestions.

Ken Sampley inquired about potential net benefits in the flood control criteria. Charles explained that the net benefits are the potential benefits that come from a flood control site project and that is why there were more points than structure and infrastructure protection. Ken suggested a revision in how the points are distributed.

Ken Sampley also asked about the difference in ranking for structural and infrastructure protection. Charles replied that originally he had tried to set up the ranking so that structural protection weighed more than infrastructure but he now believes that they should be weighted equally and that the structural versus non-structural concept could be dropped. The ranking would then be based on the size of area protected. The TAC concluded that infrastructure includes items such as bridges and channels and that it is possible that a site could have high infrastructure risk but low structural risk. The TAC agreed that a possible high score of 2 points should be assigned to structural as well as infrastructure protection and 2 points for potential net benefits. This would give flood control sites a possible total score of 6 points.

Barbara Dallemand asked if population risk was covered in flood control site benefits. Charles stated that population risk is covered partly in structural protection. Barbara stated that infrastructure risk and structural risk should both continue to be considered in the ranking.

Rich Muzzy stated the current terminology used in the flood control and channel stability criteria rankings are difficult to quantify. Rich suggested it would be useful to note what is considered "large" and what is considered "small" in regards to infrastructure and structural risk. Charles replied that currently the estimates are based upon professional judgment and by comparing the sites to one another. Complete structure counts have not been done for all the sites. Charles believes that it would be difficult to quantify what makes a sediment source a large sediment source other than taking into consideration cut banks. Charles stated that without seeing the sites in person he can only make quantification judgments from previous modeling and mapping efforts. Ken Sampley agreed with the need to quantify the terminology.

Dennis Maroney added when quantifying sediment sources the size of the drainage basin should be considered as well as what percent has been developed versus what will be developed in the future.

Ken Sampley stated that the current spreadsheet does allow for a good geographical split of sites, however funding source possibilities might not be weighed heavily enough during this prioritization process.

Charles Wilson stated that he would like any feed back about the spreadsheet by November 8th so he could have it finalized before the next TAC meeting on November 16th.

Dennis Maroney inquired if any progress had been made in completing the Program/Authority/ Funding source column by speaking to the necessary agencies. Charles replied that he needed to meet with the Natural Resource Conservation Service, Colorado Water Conservation Board, and FEMA to accurately complete the column. Charles stated that he had planned to meet with the agencies before he came to the November 16th TAC meeting but it might not be possible. Dennis asked if the meetings could take place over the telephone which Charles said is a possibility. Ken Sampley believes that a meeting of the agencies would be better than a teleconference and the revised spreadsheet should reflect the outcomes of meetings. Greg Langer, Natural Resource Conservation Service, asked Charles to call him in order to schedule a meeting. Charles will also contact the Colorado Water Conservation Board to schedule a meeting which he hopes will include all three agencies.

Steve Miller, Colorado Water Conservation Board, stated that the dam site should be a GI site and Charles agreed and stated that he will make the change on the spreadsheet.

Rex Miller inquired if the TAC needed another month to complete this prioritization process which would mean finalizing the top ten sites at the December TAC meeting. Charles Wilson replied that the TAC could take another month if they chose however the goal was to get back on the original schedule and move on to the evaluation phase before it got too far into winter. Ken asked Charles when the site visits would take place if the top ten sites were not finalized until the December TAC meeting. Charles replied that the process could be delayed several months due to heavy snow.

Carol Baker added that Colorado Springs Utilities has filmed a flight from the confluence of Monument Creek down to the confluence of the Arkansas River and inquired if the film would be useful to the Corps. Ken added that the City of Colorado Springs could possible arrange to have a similar film made within the city limits. Charles replied that these films would be useful due to access issues (snow and private property) but he still needs to see the sites on the ground. Carol replied that Colorado Springs Utilities will have the helicopters used to make the film until the end of the year. She suggested that Charles could fly in the helicopter to view areas with poor access as long as there are favorable flying conditions. Barbara Dallemand suggested that perhaps the TAC could view this video at a future TAC meeting. The TAC agreed that these types of videos would be useful for the public to view on the web.

Rich asked Charles how quickly site visits could begin after the top ten sites are chosen. Charles replied that he needs to arrange for several people to come view the sites aside from himself. They would most likely be viewing two sites a day taking a total of 5 days to view the top ten sites. It would probably not be possible to start viewing sites immediately after the November TAC meeting.

Barbara Dallemand asked for a review of steps that need to be taken to complete this process. The TAC agreed that the steps include:

- Contact and meet with resource agencies in order to complete the authority column
- Complete any necessary revisions to the criteria
- Update the rankings to include the combination sites
- Complete the cost column by obtaining basic site features in order to get cost estimates
- Presentation of final spreadsheet and final prioritization using the composite scores
- Agreement on top ten prioritized sites
- Site visits
- Evaluation process

Charles stated he may not be able to resolve all the issues with the spreadsheet before the November TAC meeting because he does not know the availability of the agencies he still needs to meet with. However, he could have revisions to criteria, combinations, and cost completed by November 14th. Rich Muzzy suggested in the interest of time the resource agency meetings should take place over the phone. Dennis asked Charles to attempt to contact and meet with the agencies as best he could before the 16th so that the November TAC meeting could take place as scheduled.

Barbara Dallemand suggested that it would be useful to create a rational of how the numeric ranking systems were created in order for the TAC to better understand their meanings. Charles Wilson agreed and stated that he would create backup on how the points were applied. Ken Sampley requested that this be completed before the November TAC meeting. Barbara also suggested that the combinations be presented to the TAC in the form of a summary sheet.

Rich Muzzy asked Charles to explain the locations of the ecosystem restoration sites that had acronym names such as LFC-1, CSC-1, and MC-1. Charles Wilson replied that they came directly from the last chapter of the ecosystem restoration report where they are laid out in more detail. Rich requested that the names of the reaches be included in parenthesis next to the acronym names. Dennis agreed with the need for reach descriptions along with the acronym titles.

Carol Baker requested that the map of site locations be available for the next TAC meeting.

Ken Sampley asked Charles about the status of 2008 funding. Charles replied that currently congress is considering an omnibus bill that the president will likely request several changes on. It's possible what happened to the Corps this year will happen again next year. This means the Corps will submit a work plan and will be told to work on the same funding level as the previous year.

Rich Muzzy asked Charles if the president's veto of WRDA would affect the study and Charles replied that it would not.

FOUNTAIN CREEK WATERSHED VISION TASK FORCE UPDATE

Dennis Maroney provided the TAC with a Fountain Creek Watershed Vision Task Force update. At the last Policy Workshop meeting it was decided that a report would be developed by city and county technical staff to consider areas where regulations could be changed. The report would be used as text for the next meeting which would include policy makers and developers. Following that meeting entities would meet to formulate regulation changes. A final meeting would act as a consensus on what was going to be done to ensure uniformity throughout the watershed.

Carol Baker added that the Outreach Committee met with the public in Pueblo and Colorado Springs to discuss what information is important to the public and ideas on how to effectively communicate that information. All the technical committees have been asked to put together summaries on where they are so far and what conclusions have been reached. The purpose is to develop a report for the grant and give guidance to the Corridor Master Plan.

OTHER TOPICS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

None

DATE OF NEXT MEETING - November 16, 2007 at the PPACG office at 10:00 a.m.

ADJOURNMENT - The meeting adjourned at 2:50 p.m.