

APPENDIX E

**Fountain Creek Vision Task Force
Consensus Committee
Meeting Summaries**

**Fountain Creek Vision Task Force
Consensus Committee
Meeting Summaries**

**Fountain Creek Vision Task Force
Consensus Committee
February 16, 2007
Final Meeting Summary**

Attendance

Gary Barber, Mary Barber, Jeff Chostner, Sallie Clark, Ferris Frost, Dan Henrichs, Dennis Hisey, Sam Humpert, Loretta Kennedy, Carole Lange, Walt Lawson, Dennis Maroney, Bruce McCormickz, Bob McGregor, Rex Miller, Bob Miner, Rich Muzzy, Greg Nyhoff, Larry Patterson, Cynthia Peterson, Jane Rawlings, Tom Ready, Richard Skorman, Larry Small, Barbara Vidmar, Ross Vincent, Jay Winner, Pam Zubeck, and Heather Bergman

Meeting Objectives

- Discuss stakeholder interests
- Revisit vision statement and suggest changes/improvements
- Agree on a source of funding for ongoing facilitation

Stakeholder Interests

The facilitator gave a brief presentation on the differences between the positions that stakeholders hold about an issue and the interests that underlie them. These differences include:

<u>Positions</u>	<u>Interests</u>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>What</u> I want or need • Often binary (yes/no, more/less, etc.) • Distributive (resources can and will be divided) • Involves stakeholders <u>claiming</u> their piece of the pie • Involves win/lose dynamics • Stakeholders seek to maximize their own gains and minimize their own losses 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Why</u> I want or need it • Describes the motivation for a need or want • Integrative (stakeholders' interests can be integrated for shared gain) • Involves stakeholders <u>creating</u> new solutions and new "pie" • Involves win/win dynamics • Stakeholders seek to maximize joint gains

After this presentation, participants were asked to break into small groups to discuss their interests. The groups reported the following interests (numbers in parentheses indicate the number of groups who stated that interest):

- Recognition of stormwater and drainage as a resource
- Watershed as an asset and an amenity (2)

- Protect public/private infrastructure
- Preserve natural channel capacity
- Preserve natural drainage way
- Predictability in flows and channel stability
- Right solutions based on sound science
- Balance solutions and costs
- Sustainable regional economy (in the watershed) (2)
- Be proactive about funding
- Create a sense of community
- Efficiency in stormwater management (2)
- Maintain or improve quality of life
- Greenway connector (2)
- Protect public health (3)
- Improve human experience along the Fountain (sight, sound, smell, etc.)
- Stable base flows/stream system
- Protect water quality
- Increase appreciation and stewardship
- Ensure equality between communities
- Maintain good irrigation water
- Provide recreation opportunities (2)
- Provide commuting opportunities
- Get something done soon, but do it right
- Flood control
- Genuine cooperation
- Don't waste stakeholder and community time
- Protect, preserve, enhance agriculture as part of the cultural heritage and quality of life of this area
- Protect wildlife, for its own sake and as an indicator of ecosystem health
- Education (about riparian areas, ranching way of life, culture, heritage, etc.)
- Maintain watershed

There was a brief discussion about whether the goal of this group should be to restore Fountain Creek to its "natural" or "historic" state. Some participants believe that this cannot be accomplished, since Fountain Creek used to be an intermittent waterway and is now a perennial stream with substantial flows. Others felt that the natural state of the Creek should be pursued where possible.

After the groups shared their interests, participants reported the following observations about their interests:

- It is interesting to see that we share so many interests
- It is helpful to see people separate their interests from their positions
- Interests represent bigger, better, and different thinking
- Interests suggest that we can find ways to work together

- Although there are a few competing interests, for the most part we want the same things
- We can build on these interests and move forward

Mission and Vision

The group reviewed a draft mission statement and vision statement that the facilitator prepared based on previous discussions. Although a small number of changes were discussed, overall the group approved of these statements. The facilitator will make the changes the group discussed and redistribute the mission statement and vision statement to the Consensus Committee for its approval. After that time, these documents will be shared with the full Fountain Creek Vision Task Force for discussion and input.

Funding

At a prior Consensus Committee meeting, the group agreed to submit a proposal for funding for facilitation to the Arkansas River Basin Roundtable. Members of the Consensus Committee who also sit on the Roundtable recently reported that this is funding is not looking likely for a variety of reasons. It was agreed that while the group should continue to pursue funding from the Arkansas River Basin Roundtable, other funds should also be pursued.

After some discussion, it was agreed that the members of the Consensus Committee who are able to do so should contribute funds to a common pool to pay for ongoing facilitation. The group agreed to try to come up with about \$38,000 for facilitation through June 2007 by “passing the hat” and asking entities to contribute at a level that is comfortable for them. Confidential approximations of funding contributions were offered from several organizations. These contributions were tallied and totaled approximately \$35,000. Members of the Consensus Committee will confer with their respective organizations to determine actual funding amounts and report their official pledge to the facilitator via email by March 2, 2007.

It was agreed that the private citizens on the Consensus Committee (landowners, etc.) are welcome to contribute any amount to the funding pool if they choose to do so, but they will not be expected to contribute. The same is true of other members who are not affiliated with a larger organization or entity. Amount of contributions will not affect anyone’s standing as an equal member of the Consensus Committee.

Brief Presentations

Sam Humpert from Trout Unlimited spoke to the group briefly about a habitat survey that will be occurring on Fountain Creek in coming months. Sam also reported that Trout Unlimited is submitting a grant for a Fishing is Fun grant from the U.S. Department of Interior for work on Fountain Creek. He is hoping that members of the Consensus Committee will endorse the grant proposal. Sam will send additional materials on the funding proposal and a draft letter of support to the facilitator for distribution to the Consensus Committee. Members who are interested can use this draft letter to prepare

their own letter of support. The Consensus Committee as a whole did not take a position on this funding proposal.

Cynthia Peterson from AWARE Colorado spoke to the group briefly about the work that her organization does to share ideas about urban development, impervious surfaces, and stormwater runoff. Cynthia offered to come back and do a full presentation for the group, which would include a discussion of her organization's "tool box" for addressing stormwater runoff in urban areas. It was agreed that most of the participants in the Fountain Creek Vision Task Force would benefit from this presentation and that Cynthia should be invited back at a later time. More information about AWARE Colorado is available at www.awarecolorado.org.

Next Meeting

The next Consensus Committee will be held on Friday, March 16th, from 1 p.m. to 4 p.m. at the Fountain City Hall.

Fountain Creek Vision Task Force Consensus Committee Meeting March 16, 2007 Final Meeting Summary

Attendance

Bill Alspach, Tom Autobee, Carol Baker, Gary Barber, Kristin Bricker, Jeff Chostner, Sallie Clark, Pamela DiFatta, Jeff Drabing, Ferris Frost, Kim Headley, Dennis Hisey, Jeri C. Howells, Juniper Katz, Loretta Kennedy, Carole Lange, Dennis Maroney, Bruce McCormick, Bob Miner, Margaret Mora, Rich Muzzy, Larry Patterson, Jane Rawlings, Tom Ready, Richard Skorman, Larry Small, Graham Thompson, Tom Warren, Jay Winner, Chris Woodka, Heather Bergman, and Helen Littrell Smith

Action Items

Keystone	Follow up with Max Parker from Palmer Lake; get information to him about the Task Force
Consensus Committee Members	Review documents handed out by the Outreach Committee and send comments to Heather by Friday, March 23
Keystone	Email the funding pledge list to the Consensus Committee (<i>Facilitator Note: This was emailed on March 19.</i>)
Gary Barber and Heather Bergman	Work out the language around the work product coming out of the Task Force to meet the CWCB funding requirements.
Keystone/Consensus Committee Members	Keystone will add in time at the beginning of each Consensus Committee and working group meeting to address pressing issues. Consensus Committee members should email issues that they are aware of

	to Heather so she can gauge how much time is needed to discuss them.
Jeff Chostner and Loretta Kennedy	Find a location for the next full Task Force meeting on Thursday, April 19 at 6:00 p.m.
Presenters at April 19 Task Force meeting	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mission/Vision: Jay Winner • Goals/updates from working groups: Keystone will take this task back to the working groups to identify presenters for each of the three working groups
Keystone	Write the April 19 Task Force meeting notice/press release to ensure consistency in various media
Jane Rawlings: <i>The Pueblo Chieftain</i> Gary Barber: <i>The Gazette</i>	Get meeting notice published in respective local media.
Jeff Chostner and Tom Ready	Provide light hors d'oeuvres at the meeting

Meeting Objectives

- Tend to a few housekeeping items
- Hear a finance update from Keystone
- Begin to translate stakeholder interests into goals
- Plan full Task Force meeting

Housekeeping Items

- Land Use and/or Environment Working Group(s)
 - The Consensus Committee agreed that the Land Use and Environment working groups should be merged into one working group because the issues they address overlap.
- Outreach Committee needs
 - Is it still the aim of the Outreach Committee to contact local media (smaller newspapers, radio and TV) about what the Task Force is and what it is trying to accomplish?
 - The idea is to be able to spread the word on the issues that have been identified by the Task Force and the educational efforts it undertakes. The Outreach Committee is open to suggestions from the Consensus Committee.
 - The challenge they are working on is to develop documents that not only communicate about the Task Force externally but also serve as the glue that holds the Task Force together (because not everybody can attend every meeting)
 - Any specific ideas on what to share with local media?
 - More positive news about accomplishments, accomplishments of other watersheds, etc.

- It was suggested that the Outreach Committee develop talking points or articles about what the Task Force is working on, to be reviewed and approved by the Consensus Committee, so that individual agencies could distribute them to their own media lists. It would be helpful to develop them as templates so the individual agencies can tweak them to fit their needs. Additionally, they were asked to continue to develop their communication plan at their next meeting to share with the Task Force.
- The next Outreach Committee meeting is scheduled for Thursday, April 19 from 2-4 p.m. at Beidleman Center.

Last Revisions to Mission and Vision Statements

Keystone provided a brief overview of the changes that have been made to the mission and vision statements since the last draft, and noted that changes were primarily made to the mission paragraph.

- Consensus Committee members were asked to read through the revised document and let Heather know if it is acceptable to use by the end of this meeting.
- No major concerns were raised about the document.

Finance Update

- Pledges received
 - To date, Keystone has received pledges totaling \$42,300.
 - Please notify Helen Littrell Smith or Heather Bergman if you require an invoice or further documentation to process your pledge.
- Are there any objections to Keystone sharing the amount pledged by each entity?
 - There were no objections and the group agreed it should be public information.
 - Keystone will circulate the list of pledges to the Consensus Committee.
- Checks received; amount in account
 - Two checks totaling \$100 have been received as of Thursday, March 15
- Amount spent in January and February
 - Keystone's expenses for January and February totaled \$6,550
- Roundtable update
 - There is \$75,000 in funding from the Colorado Water Conservation Board (CWCB) that is a possibility for funding the facilitation of the Task Force. The biggest difference in this funding is that CWCB will reimburse whatever entity pays Keystone. It is a reimbursement program, not a program of paying invoices from Keystone. In this scenario, Pueblo and El Paso County (and possibly other entities) would likely have to front the money and then be reimbursed by CWCB. CWCB is reluctant to pay for facilitation for facilitation's sake; thus the Task Force must produce a consensus-driven work product that addresses the consumptive/non-consumptive water needs in the Fountain Creek watershed in order to qualify for the funding.
 - It was clarified that the work product of the group will be a consensus-based watershed plan on consumptive/non-consumptive water needs in the Fountain Creek watershed (as opposed to a study of those needs).

- If pledges come in as promised from this body, Keystone has enough funding for the time being. Obtaining funding from CWCB and GOCO is not as urgent of an issue.
- Does the CWCB have an interest in where this body ends up (i.e., as a watershed authority)?
 - CWCB is mainly concerned with their fiduciary responsibility to the people of Colorado, whose money it is that would be used to fund facilitation services.
 - The Fountain Creek Vision Task Force has agreed (in the past) that developing a watershed authority is on the table for discussion, but the group is several steps away from being there yet.
- Has anyone looked into getting a grant from Great Outdoors Colorado?
 - Not yet.

Translation of Stakeholder Interests into Goals

The group reviewed the list of interests from their last meeting and was asked the following questions: Is this the complete list? Is there anything mischaracterized? Are there interests missing? The group agreed that the following interests should be added:

- Comply with federal law
- Water conservation
- Space between communities/greenway connector; suggest using the word “multi-use” to describe the connector.
- Control erosion and sedimentation

Brainstorm Related Goals

The group was presented with the list of the issues that the 3 working groups have identified as the most important in the watershed. These key issues are:

- Land Use / Environment
 - Land use planning/urban development
 - Wetlands
 - Ecosystem services & development
 - Water Quantity
- Impervious areas
 - Sediment transport
 - Return flows Southern Delivery System (SDS)
- Water Quality
 - E. coli
 - Urban runoff/stormwater
 - Selenium

Participants were asked to break into small groups and identify specific goals for the Task Force to pursue for each of the key issues. The following goals emerged from the small group discussions:

- Land Use / Environment
 - Implement green development solutions (ponds, vegetation, overlays)

- Develop enforceable and sustainable land use regulations consistent with this group's articulated interests
 - Establish common land use policies across municipalities
 - Create a recreational corridor
 - Promote inter-modal transportation opportunities
 - Preserve open space
 - Preserve, maintain, enhance, and increase wetlands
 - Preserve, maintain, and enhance ecosystem services
 - Educate citizens on these issues
- Water Quantity
 - Regulate/control flows in watershed
 - Anticipate new water flows in watershed (related to climate change)
 - Mitigate existing and wisely manage future impervious surface area
 - Reduce runoff
 - Stabilize sediment transport patterns
 - Effectively manage return flows
 - Reuse non-native water as high up in the watershed as possible
 - Use more non-potable water
 - Protect water rights
 - Educate citizens on these issues
- Water Quality
 - Meet or exceed state water quality standards
 - Implement policy, biological, and technical solutions to reduce E. coli
 - Refine/augment existing water monitoring systems—above and beyond state requirements
 - Educate citizens region-wide on non-point source pollution
 - Establish common planning policies regarding stormwater

These goals will be forwarded to the appropriate working groups and task group(s) for discussion/solutions. The Consensus Committee can add goals to these lists; working groups can not without approval from the Consensus Committee.

Next Full Task Force Meeting

- The group agreed that the next Task Force meeting will take place on Thursday, April 19, 2007 at 6:00 p.m. in Pueblo.
- Loretta Kennedy and Jeff Chostner agreed to find a location for the meeting.
- The group agreed that the topics for meeting should be:
 - Mission
 - Vision
 - Goals
 - Updates from working groups
- Categorizing the list of goals developed today as the ultimate set of goals for the group to the full Task Force meeting might seem limited. Instead, suggest separating

them into goals developed thus far, key issues that have been identified, and activities to-date in order to demonstrate the breadth of the group's work.

- Presenters
 - Mission/Vision: Jay Winner
 - Goals/updates from working groups: Keystone will take this task back to the working groups to identify presenters for each group.
- Meeting notification in local media
 - Keystone will write the notice/press release to ensure consistency in notices in papers
 - Jane Rawlings will put meeting notification in *The Pueblo Chieftain*
 - Gary Barber will work to get it in *The Gazette*
- Refreshments
 - Jeff Chostner and Tom Ready will work to provide light Hors d'oeuvres at the meeting

**Fountain Creek Vision Task Force
Consensus Committee
May 18, 2007
Final Meeting Summary**

Attending

Tom Autobee, Carol Baker, Gary Barber, Elise Bergsten, Sallie Clark, Paul Fanning, Ferris Frost, Jane Green, Dan Henrichs, Juniper Katz, Irene Kornelly, Carole Lange, Bruce McCormick, Rex Miller, Bob Miner, Rich Muzzy, Larry Patterson, Sandy Rahl, Tom Ready, Jane Rhodes, Richard Skorman, Barbara Vidmar, Ross Vincent, Jay Winner, Chris Woodka, Niki Koszalka, and Heather Bergman

Action Items

Heather Bergman	Will arrange with Pueblo members to have the June 15, 2007 Consensus Committee meeting in Pueblo
Jane Rhodes and Heather Bergman	Will look into arranging a field trip to view the Fountain Creek watershed
Juan Trujillo and Carole Lange	Will look into who the developers are on Fountain Creek and the watershed
Ross Vincent	Will work to get a small group to review the data list and determine what can be done with the present information
Carol Baker, Juniper Katz, Heather Bergman and Jane Rhodes	Will coordinate a tour and celebration for the Frost easement
All	Agreed to get Heather Bergman the contact information of anyone interested in attending a watershed authority presentation from a representative of the Cherry Creek Basin Water Quality Authority

Updates and Housekeeping Items

Embankment failure in Pueblo (Dennis Maroney)

- ❖ The embankment failure occurred north of Wal-mart. The water was coming directly at the embankment due to issues created by and relative to erosion. The embankment was constructed in 1937-1938. Fountain Creek has changed its flow patterns because of a proliferation of vegetation and debris. The breach occurred at about 6:00 am on Monday, May 7, 2007. A second breach was manually created downstream to allow water to go back into Fountain Creek. The second breach was north of the bridge at 42nd Street. The west side of Dillon Drive was flooded for an hour and a half. When the downstream breach was opened, the water flowed back into the creek. By 5:00 pm, the water was down to below house level. Large rock and concrete debris were used to make the closure. By Tuesday at 4:30 pm, the embankment was in place and the water was back into Fountain Creek. Large amounts of sediment debris were moved out of the easterly branch of Fountain Creek. A large rock about four to five feet in diameter was used to deflect the water back toward the channel. The lower breach is still open. All areas that were flooded were in the 100-year floodplain. These areas will remain in the 100-year floodplain.

Questions and Answers

Was there a storm that caused the surge?

There was a general storm. The storm did have some moisture but in terms of magnitude, it was not a big storm. The problem lies more with the meander patterns than the size of the storm. When the meander patterns are toward an embankment or levy problems with flooding may be the result.

How much did it cost the community for the mitigation efforts?

The cost to the community was approximately \$100-\$150, 000. There was monetary assistance from the state, Colorado Springs Utilities (CSU), and the local counties as well. Some private contractors and machinery were hired.

Streamside testing

- ❖ There was a Streamside Systems presentation at the full Fountain Creek Vision Task Force meeting on April 20, 2007. A representative from Streamside suggested a meeting in Pueblo on June 15, 2007. Streamside will be doing a presentation June 11-15, 2007 in Pueblo. The Fountain Creek Vision Task Force is invited to see the operation in progress. Heather Bergman will arrange with people in Pueblo to have the June 15, 2007 Consensus Committee meeting in Pueblo as well.

Fundraising

- ❖ The Fountain Creek Vision Task Force did not receive the grant from the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA). There were six proposals that were funded out of 100. At this time, it is unclear if they will have any money available in 2008. The EPA felt that the proposal was a good one but not what

- they were specifically interested in funding. The EPA was looking for a broader area and was more interested in a group that had just begun. The Fountain Creek Vision Task Force was too far along in its process. If there is a decision to reapply, the reapplication should be submitted for an implementation grant.
- ❖ There is grant money available through the Water Supply Reserve Account (WSRA). The grant approval is staff recommended. The application for a grant will be presented Wednesday, May 23, 2007 in Montrose. There must be production of a document quantifying consumptive and non-consumptive methods. There are several years to spend the money in the grant. Under the assumption that the grant is approved, the Fountain Creek Vision Task Force should go through the WSRA roundtable process again. This group has grant money available.
 - ❖ There is a need for an additional \$175,000 for the Army Corps of Engineers study. The documents are being summarized and the locations of the specific projects on the watershed have already been looked at. The Army Corps of Engineers would like to get the Fountain Creek Vision Task Force involved. They would like to have a date set aside when there can be direct input from the Fountain Creek Vision Task Force.
 - ❖ There is currently \$40,000 in the Keystone Account.

Data Needs Survey

- ❖ Keystone prepared and sent out a survey to determine what the data needs were for the working groups. In addition, the survey wanted to know how and where these needs should be met.
- ❖ In terms of the water quality group, it was decided they needed to find out where the data is needed and how to get the data. The common issues are selenium and sediment. The group is currently addressing selenium. Sediment is on the priority list for both water quality and water quantity groups.
- ❖ Southern Delivery System (SDS) and sediment also seem to be priorities. There is not currently very much information about sediment. Pikes Peak Area Council of Government (PPACG) is working with US Geological Survey (USGS) on a suspended sample model to make it easier to assess the concentrations of sedimentation. The Colorado Water Quality Commission is coming up with standards for sedimentation. It is important to understand that vegetation (living and dead) and sedimentation can determine where the creek is going. There is a prioritized need to look at the options and gather information regarding SDS. The Fountain Creek Vision Task Force could opt to fund a study regarding suspended sediment and the problems that it poses. To understand suspended sedimentation, there would be the need for a sampling study.
- ❖ The water quality group would like to move forward on the issue of E. coli. They need to establish where source areas are and why. It is in agreement that E. coli is the top priority but without more information, it cannot be solved. Colorado Water Conservation is currently doing a study in the upper Fountain.
- ❖ A field trip to view the Fountain Creek Watershed could be very beneficial. Jane Rhodes and Heather Bergman will work to arrange a field trip.

- ❖ There is the need to continue to focus on the available information. It is important to wait for the current studies to be completed before initiating new ones. This way there is no duplication and no funds are wasted. If it is determined that there are no studies being performed on a certain topic, the Fountain Creek Vision Task Force should make a plan, including financials, to have a study performed.
- ❖ It would be helpful to have a compendium for activities that are slated for Fountain Creek. There is significant development in the works for Fountain Creek and the watershed. Juan Trujillo represents the new owners of McCullough Ranch (North Pueblo LLC). Carole Lange and Juan Trujillo will work to find out who the developers are on Fountain Creek and the watershed.
- ❖ Gathering a small group of smart people to review the data list could help the working groups to determine what can be done with the present information. Ross Vincent will work to establish this group. Kathleen Riley with the State Health Department could be a focal point for collecting this information.

Outreach Committee Report-Carol Baker (CSU)

- ❖ The Outreach Committee Group has plans to get the community information through an internal communication goal and an external communication goal. The internal track will help to coordinate education of the outreach groups to each other, to the greater task force and the Consensus Committee. The external track hopes to provide educational opportunities and accurate information to the public on Fountain Creek Watershed issues, including water quality, water quantity, environmental, and land use.
- ❖ The external communication track needs to produce fact sheets for each watershed issue. It is not a concern if there is a “fix” underway or not. If there is a “fix” underway it is important that the “fix” be identified. It will be important to have the funding and coordination plans needed as well.
- ❖ The Outreach Committee Group would like to send out a zoomerang study to help them determine the best way to move forward with the creation and distribution of the fact sheets. The current fact sheet idea is that they would be handed out to the Consensus Committee and would be on the fountain-crk.org website.
- ❖ The Outreach Committee is creating a vision board. The vision board would serve as a visual reminder of the goals for the Fountain Creek watershed. The vision board would attempt to project what the Fountain Creek Vision Task Force is trying to accomplish. The photos need to be easily translatable and recognizable for the community. There should be an inclusion of Fountain Creek from an urban perspective as well.
- ❖ The Outreach Committee would like to work creating some communications tools including information packets, watershed tours, and a DVD with chapters (introduction, water quantity, water quality, environmental, and land use). The Outreach Committee wants long lasting education for the community. The creation of watershed educational programs (new and existing) would greatly benefit the community.
- ❖ The Outreach Committee sees that there is a need for funding. In terms of DVD production and copies there is a funding need of approximately \$30-50,000. Another \$10,000 is needed to start lead efforts in other areas of outreach.

Questions and Answers:

In terms of DVD production, could a local community college be contacted and have this completed as a student project?

At one time students from CSU Pueblo were working on a DVD or video of Fountain Creek. Research needs to be done to see if it has been completed and if it will meet the needs of the Outreach Committee.

Is the DVD something that the WSRA roundtable would pay for?

It is worth the time of the Outreach Committee to submit an application to the WSRA roundtable for additional money. There is an educational mission statute that was created by the WSRA roundtable.

Is the Outreach Committee on the right path?

- ❖ The communities are curious. It would be useful to have more articles about what was going on with the group. The Outreach Committee should draft a document that government officials can use it as a template. It is never too early to start the process of engaging the public and officials. It is a very good suggestion to have a template.
- ❖ In terms of public education, there should be articles in newspaper, television reports, and presentations from the task force to communities at town meetings. It appears that there is a lack of materials going to Colorado Springs for the community. The Outreach Committee discussed producing a power-point presentation with talking points to present to other groups and government officials/councils. It would be beneficial for the Outreach Committee to get components of the power-point presentation together soon. The information can then be given to government officials who have more pull with the local media. Many towns, cities and counties broadcast their meetings on community access television. This will also help get the word out to the communities.
- ❖ A solution to the high cost of DVD production could be to have a film festival. There could be prizes and categories. The result could be that the Outreach Committee ends up with the DVD produced by local people from the watershed.

Watershed Authority-Preliminary Discussion

- ❖ At the April Task Force meeting, there was a lot of excitement about creating a Watershed Authority. Jeff Chosner volunteered to begin this process. He called elected officials in the watershed. Some officials have expressed interest in discussing a watershed authority but no commitments have been made. It would be a “closed door” session with only government officials. Heather Bergman and Jeff Chosner would then report to the Task Force with the information from the meeting. The Consensus Committee needs to be comfortable with a “closed door” meeting. The Fountain Creek Vision Task Force protocols state that all meetings are open to the public.
- ❖ There are homeowners’ associations, elected officials in conservation areas, ditch companies, and landowners that also would need to be invited and heard from.

- ❖ Perhaps it would be best to have general discussions about authorities and then come up with a game plan. It could be very helpful to understand what worked for the Cherry Creek Basin Water Quality Authority (CCBWQA). Maybe bringing in elected officials is too premature at this time. It is important to remember that this is only an option, a conversation that we want to have at some point.
- ❖ The Consensus Committee decided that it would not have a “closed door” meeting. There was also consensus that the group was not prepared to have a meeting with elected officials yet. It was suggested that a representative of CCBWQA give a presentation at the next Consensus Committee meeting and that elected officials are invited to attend. Participants agreed to get Heather Bergman the contact information of anyone that they felt should attend this meeting and hear the presentation.

One Vision for the Watershed (Jonathan Moore and Dan Pike)

- ❖ Colorado Open Lands (COL) and its partners have a vision for the watershed beyond the Great Outdoors Colorado (GOCO) grant proposal that was presented to the Land Use Working Group. COL wants to move forward with its vision but does not want to work at cross-purposes with the Fountain Creek Vision Task Force.
- ❖ The GOCO proposal allows for protection of eight miles along Fountain Creek. COL would like to maximize the amount of GOCO protection and go beyond. COL believes it is important to get levels of protection before the land is gone. There are a number of proposals in the permitting and approval processes. It would be unfortunate if opportunities to mitigate and save pieces of Fountain Creek were missed. There needs to be discussions as to how these decisions affect Fountain Creek and if there is a need or way to soften their impacts. There is an opportunity for the Fountain Creek Vision Task Force to be part of these decisions.
- ❖ The Peaks to Prairies project is only dealing with the initial ideas for the corridor. There is a larger vision for this corridor. There are proposals that will have an impact on this corridor in the next 10 years. COL wants to work with the Fountain Creek Vision Task Force to make sure all considerations are heard.
- ❖ COL feels that there should be a set of “tools” at the disposal of the Fountain Creek Vision Task Force. One tool is to find out how to amend governing master plans so there is inclusion of the recommendations of the Task Force. Another tool could be the Task Force providing informational packets. These packets are presented to elected officials providing a better understanding of what the group is doing. It would be important to make sure there is an understanding between county, city and town government officials regarding what the Task Force is doing.
- ❖ Included in the outcomes that COL would like to see are park, land and open space dedication, cash in lieu of dedication, dedication of trail easement, and cash in general.
- ❖ The GOCO grant is a huge opportunity to anchor properties. There would be 6 to 10,000 acres along Fountain Creek that would be saved. Time, currently, is a big

factor. The corridor is lucky to be latent at this time but it is on the cusp of more activity. There is a huge opportunity to do tremendous work here. There is a need to get more proactive to make sure others are aware of what we are doing.

Questions and Answers:

Does COL plan to do work only along Fountain Creek or will they include the watershed as a whole?

The corridor is considered Pueblo to Colorado Springs. This is not within the scope that COL normally looks at but they would be open to the idea.

What is the best way to get started so that opportunities are not missed?

The best way would be to get started right away on the easy stuff. There could be the creation of nice, clean informational packets. There may not be an authority but the Fountain Creek Vision Task Force did agree on its mission and vision. These could be presented to jurisdictions. This group could have immense influence with the larger jurisdictions. In the near term, work with the Outreach Committee to prepare the documents. It is important that the jurisdictions realize that this is a collaborative consensus agreement process.

How long has COL been waiting on the GOCO process?

It has not been a quick process. COL has been waiting for the GOCO Legacy for years. COL asked for seven million dollars and will ask for matching funds from the jurisdictions.

What are the next steps that can be taken by COL and the Fountain Creek Vision Task Force to be available for all other opportunities in the watershed?

Until the Fountain Creek Vision Task Force is prepared for action, it is important COL does everything it can to secure the corridor. The first step should be to identify the short-term pressing issues. The second step is to involve the officials with the short-term pressing issues identified in step one. The next step would be to identify any anticipated future development, other than residential.

Can the Task Force and COL to participate in the development of the Envenergy Plant?

Envenergy is not providing power to this region. They are using the land to benefit those in Denver and Xcel customers. They are proposing a huge development with many financial implications. The Fountain Creek Vision Task Force has had a conversation with Envenergy but it would be helpful if COL could bridge the gap as well.

Is there a way have the Land Use/Environment Working Group become connected with future development ideas along the Fountain Creek Watershed?

The Land Use/Environment Working Group could become the sounding board for upcoming projects. Perhaps if the jurisdictions appreciated the larger vision this could be established. There are many people in the Fountain Creek Vision Task Force. The numbers of this group will eventually carry weight in the short- and long-term.

Is there value in trying to have the vision of the Fountain Creek Task Force and COL brought up in the permitting process?

There are 930 miles in the watershed. COL does focus on the corridor and realizes that the Fountain Creek Vision Task Force has a larger vision. The Consensus Committee agreed that they do want to have the vision on the Fountain Creek Vision Task Force and COL brought up in the permitting process.

**Fountain Creek Vision Task Force
Consensus Committee
April 20, 2007
Final Meeting Summary**

Attending

Tom Autobee, Carol Baker, Gary Barber, Kristin Bricker, Sharon Brown, Sallie Clark, Todd Dahlberg, Jeff Daniel, Dennis Darrow, Dennis Hisey, Ferris Frost, Jane Green, Gwen Happ, Dan Heinrichs, Carmine Iadarola, Bryan Johnson, Juniper Katz, Loretta Kennedy, Irene Kornelly, Carol Lange, Greg Langer, Dennis Maroney, Bruce McCormick, Bob Miner, Margaret Mora, Rich Muzzy, John Newbie, Larry Patterson, Dan Peters, Jane Rawlings, Tom Ready, Nettie Rosenthal, Richard Skorman, Drew Sloat, Larry Small, Perry Thomas, Wayne Vanderschuere, Ryan Weston, Ralph Williams, Jay Winner, Chris Woodka, Heather Bergman and Niki Koszalka

Meeting Objectives

- ❖ To learn about three upcoming land uses in the watershed.
- ❖ To determine if it is possible to influence the form these projects take.
- ❖ To decide if/how the Task Force should address these projects.

Getting Started and Committee Business

- ❖ New and Pressing Issues
 - A participant mentioned that Congress appropriated \$300,000 in the Fiscal Year 2007 Energy and Water Appropriations Bill for the Army Corps of Engineers Watershed Study. There is still \$149,000 of additional federal funding needed to complete the study.
- ❖ Funding Review and Staff Positions in Fountain Creek
 - Bruce McCormick from Colorado Springs Utilities (CSU) discussed the \$300,000 that CSU and the Lower Arkansas Conservation District are making available for a 2-year period to fund someone to implement elements of CSU's master plan for Fountain Creek. This money is not allocated exclusively for salary. The individual or firm that is hired with these funds will interact with the Fountain Creek Vision Task Force but will not be directly associated with it. The tasks to be performed by the individual or firm are listed in a written agreement, which includes the following statement: "The necessary engineering shall be

- incorporated and integrated to stormwater and sediment, water quality studies, waste water spills, applicable mitigation and tamarisk removal in addition to issues revolving around flooding.”
- Keystone provided a summary of the funding situation for facilitation of the Fountain Creek Vision Task Force. At this time, over \$35,000 has been raised and only about \$7,500 has been spent, which means there should be sufficient funds to continue the process through the summer. There are some checks still en route to Keystone. Regular funding updates will be provided at future Consensus Committee meetings.

Presentations on Major Upcoming Land Uses

❖ Power Plant: Squirrel Creek Energy Center Invenergy; Fountain Creek Consortium (Carminé Iadarola)

- Squirrel Creek Energy Center Invenergy (SCECI) is a 550 megawatt gas-fired power plant that will be able to respond to any mid-day power changes. The location in El Paso County was chosen because it is near the last pipeline of the Comptroller and Auditor General (CAG), and Squirrel Creek will be able to hook up mid-way to the Daniels Park Grid.
- SCECI has made efforts in public outreach by holding a number of meetings. Each meeting has provided a better understanding of the community’s concerns. SCECI would like to connect Fountain Creek with Open Space at El Chico Basin (approximately 16,000 acres).
- SCECI is expected to bring \$187 million during the construction phase to the local economy and \$27 million, annually, into the community.
- SCECI expects to have minimal impacts because the plant is gas-fired plant. SCECI does not expect the plant to approach the EPA non-attainment standards for air quality.
- SCECI expects traffic loads to be approximately 20 trips per day, with the majority occurring during the morning and evening rush hours.
- SCECI is open to listening to public concerns and issues. SCECI will continue to work with neighbors and desires to work with the Peak-to-Prairie project.

Questions and Answers

Where does the 3,000 acre feet of water per year come from?

SCECI is not sure yet but is committed finding answers to this question in the near future.

Is this a permitted facility?

The facility is not permitted at this time; there will be a meeting May 10th with the El Paso County commissioners to further discuss this issue.

Is there a water resource yet?

No, there is not yet a water resource. A tentative agreement with Fountain has been made to get rid of the brine from their water treatment process.

How will the \$27 million annual revenue remain in the local economy?

The revenue will stay locally through contractors, taxes, maintaining building, and working with utilities.

How does SCECI affect the vision of the Task Force, which is to clean up Fountain Creek, decrease stormwater runoff, and turn the Creek into an amenity?

There will be impacts on the Fountain Creek both positive and negative. For instance, there will be the use of the air and water, which is the price that is paid for electricity. SCECI will work to provide electricity that is both cheap and environmentally friendly. In addition SCECI will, in the future, be open to helping to fund other water projects along Fountain Creek.

Will the 180-foot tall mission tower be visible from the Fountain Creek watershed? Will there be more towers added to the existing ones?

The mission tower will not be very visible from Fountain Creek. There is an existing power corridor with six towers that are Xcel's, and the SCECI will add two. The towers will be visible, but minimally.

Will SCECI have an impact on air quality?

SCECI anticipates having minimal impact on air quality, although there will be increases in sulfur dioxide.

What effect will SCECI have on agriculture?

No adverse impacts to agriculture are expected. SCECI has agreed to build a greenhouse/growing chamber at the facility site.

The 3,000 acre feet of water translates to how many gallons?

3,000 acre feet of water translates to approximately 9 million gallons per year.

Will SCECI supply power to this region?

Yes. Our primary customer is Xcel, which will serve customers from Pueblo to Denver (most of the demand is in Denver). There will be the option of more providing more power to Pueblo if the city grows. SCECI will have the ability to be on the grid immediately and will be able to fill gaps when power goes off-grid. It can benefit the local area immediately in emergency situations.

What kind of noise pollution will occur?

The noise level will be 40 decibels on the property and 35 decibels at the homes of people on nearby ranches. 35 decibels is about the same as the current noise level.

During the presentation, power plants (plural) were mentioned. Are there plans to build more than one?

SCECI was approached by Aquila in regards to negotiating a second plant, but nothing has been formalized at this time.

Will there be blinking lights on the tower?

SCECI was told that no blinking lights were needed even with the plan of having helicopter access.

Where is money coming from?

Invenergy

Will light be an issue?

The estimated amount of light will be less than a candle at the property line.

What percentage of power will be used locally?

We are not sure about that at this time.

Was dry cooling considered for the SCECI facility?

Yes, SCECI did consider it. However, we decided against it because Xcel did not want to dry cool.

What is the location of the windmills, and how many will there be?

There will be about 500 one-megawatt turbines. However, technology is “around the corner” for 5-megawatt turbines, which would mean fewer turbines on the land.

How will water get to SCECI?

The water will get to SCECI by wells and piping. The location will be where the wells produce the best and where we can get agreement from landowners.

Isn't this actually exporting water to the Front Range?

Water is a critical part of the environment, the local culture, and the economy. Water will stay here and, if done correctly, the process will not damage the environment.

❖ **Gravel Pit: LaFarge (Mark Vigil, M.L. Richardson, Kevin Moore and Rusty Cochran)**

- The goal of LaFarge is to mine a natural resource and reclaim it. LaFarge employs 190 permanent people in El Paso County. LaFarge is currently running a gravel pit in Fountain west of I-25 at exit 128. There are 2 or 3 years left at that location.
- The new proposed site is a gravel property leased through Investment for approximately 745 acres. The physical location is 5 miles south of Fountain along the west the side of Fountain Creek. We expect to develop 437 acres in approximately 15 years. The new site will supply El Paso County customers with pavestone and other materials. LaFarge plans to reclaim the land after mining and has an “end-use plan” for two large water storage areas.
- There are local and federal regulations that need to be in place at the new location, such as: a special use permit, a variance of use permit to allow concrete and asphalt plants, a county access permit and road maintenance agreement for Old Pueblo Road, the Colorado Division of Reclamation Mining and Safety Mining permit, the Colorado Department of Public Health and Environment permits,

Colorado Department of Transportation access permit to I-25, US Army Corps of Engineers Section 404 permit for any wetlands onsite, State Engineers Office “Substitute Water Supply Plan,” and the federal mine regulations.

- LaFarge plans to mine 20-30 acres per year, and each phase of mining represents 5-10 years, totaling 270 acres.
- There will be monitoring wells on site, to monitor impacts to the water table, which gives LaFarge the ability to mitigate any impacts and to deal properly with jurisdictional wetlands. The best management practices in terms of water at the proposed new LaFarge site would include settling ponds, berms, and containments of silt fencing. There are also natural drainages flowing through the site. The plan includes recycling water, controlled discharge, and a groundwater monitoring and mitigation plan.
- LaFarge also has best management practices for other issues. For air, the plan includes adhering to Colorado Department of Public Health and Environment (CDPHE) guidelines. The offsite impacts of noise and light will be minimized by the use of berms to shield both. The maximum traffic will be 750 truck trips. The traffic will utilize Old Pueblo Road to I-25 and most flow will go to and from the north. LaFarge will need to procure an access permit from the county and the Colorado Department of Transportation (CDOT). The visual components will be dealt with by screening berms along I-25.

Question and Answer

Will the new LaFarge site be a concrete batch site?

LaFarge will actually be manufacturing ready-made concrete and asphaltic cement.

What will be the regulations in regards to air pollution and emissions?

LaFarge will have to have an air quality permit determined by what the state allows.

What about odor and visual pollution?

Visually, there will be a white plume of steam which is regulated to ensure that it is only a white plume and does not include any regulated air pollutants. There will be daily inspections by people who have been trained to monitor air quality. LaFarge also tried to mitigate the visual aspects by locating the processing plant far way from neighbors, keeping the berm away from natural corridor, and leaving a buffer. There will be a slight odor. However, it usually goes up into the air and leaves area quickly. LaFarge feels that the odor should not be noticeable in that area.

What kind of trucks will be coming and going from the Lafarge plant?

The trucks will be customer trucks, ready-mix trucks, dump trucks, and/or semis. There will not be any huge land movers during the input stage. Rather than trucks, LaFarge will use conveyers to move materials from one side of the property to another. On occasion there will be scrapers and excavators to build berms.

It was stated that the dig-out would be 15 years. However, last time was it 30 years. Is this a 15- or 30-year plan?

The dig-out is a 15- to potentially 30-year plan, depending on market needs. It could be a 30-year dig-out.

With 750 trucks, crossing two sets of train tracks, are there possible plans to build an overpass?

As planned right now, there will not be an overpass built. LaFarge currently operates in many places with similar railroad crossings.

What type of mineral extraction are you doing, and how does it contribute to air quality?
The minerals extracted will be sand and gravel. Due to the natural moisture in the minerals, the air quality will be minimally affected.

Have you talked to Squirrel Creek?

There has not been much dialogue. However, LaFarge has talked to neighbors and had conversations with area landowners.

At the screening plant, what will be used for size reduction?

Size reduction will be done by one or two crushers that will be located within the internal production facility.

The plant mentioned being “open” for 24 hours of operation? Would you explain that?

LaFarge wants the opportunity to be operating 24 hours a day during some periods to allow for delivery to local area customers and for construction projects (which are being asked to do more and more work at night). The typical hours of operation will be Monday through Friday, 6:00 AM to 5:00 PM.

What will help to mitigate the dust produced at the LaFarge plant?

The dust will be controlled through natural material, chemical dust reduction, and plans to reclaim disturbed areas as mining progresses (with subsequent re-vegetation).

Considering the intersection at Old Pueblo Road is a full movement intersection, would LaFarge rather use I-25?

Yes, LaFarge wants to push traffic out onto I-25 as soon as possible. We estimate that only 2% of traffic would go down Old Pueblo Road.

Maximum production of 750 trucks calculates to one truck every 2 minutes. Can the road handle it?

The 750 trucks per day would not occur very often, only during the maximum production demands. The typical number of trucks per day would be 300 truck loads.

What is the estimate of reserve?

The estimate of reserve is 20 million tons, plus or minus 5 million tons. The reserve is believed to be made up of 40% rock and 60% sand and silt.

What is the timeline of the Army Corps of Engineers Section 404 permit?

The 404 permit has been submitted to the Army Corps of Engineers, which is in the process of reviewing it. LaFarge hired consultants to map the wetland areas; there are potential wetlands outside of the mapped area. *[Facilitator's Note: A participant suggested that LaFarge take a look at the Historical Area Photograph.]*

How many miles long is the gravel pit, and how far away is it from Squirrel Creek?

The gravel pit is approximately 1.5 miles long, and Squirrel Creek is an estimated 5 miles east.

Where is the current LaFarge plant?

The current operations are across 1-25 on the west side and up on the plateau. This plant serves Pueblo and El Paso County with concrete and asphalt.

What is the average depth of excavation?

The average depth of excavation is 25 feet.

❖ **Regional Wastewater Treatment Facility: Lower Fountain Metropolitan Sewage Disposal District (LFMSDD) (Roger Sams)**

- It was identified that there was significant need to service Jimmy Camp Creek with wastewater treatment, and this is the reason LFMSDD was created. From 1986-1989 LFMSDD worked on design and discussion. It was then determined that there was not significant immediate need that couldn't be met by Fountain Utilities. As demand grew, LFMSDD debated whether they could satisfy part of their needs at an existing site or whether they should build a new facility that to take care of their long-term needs.
- LFMSDD decided to go forward with a new facility, which would be located northeast of the Pikes Peak Speedway. LFMSDD has owned property in the area since 1989.
- At this time, the proposal is to bring the new wastewater treatment facility online by 2008-2010.
- LFMSDD plans to use a gravity interceptor system at the site. Topographically, the location is over the ridge from the Fountain Creek drainage way and downstream of Callahan Reservoir; the site would be built on the south part of the property. The water on the property is below Callahan south, crosses Hanover Road and into the Fountain Creek floodplain and channel, which would be southwest of Hanna Road. There would be an easement for the pipeline if necessary.
- The entire Jimmy Camp Creek uses a volume of 45 million gallons per day. At this point, LFMSDD will not need to accommodate that volume. It is approximated that during dry weather, it would accommodate a volume of 6 million gallons per day.
- LFMSDD is administered by a Board of Directors who meet monthly on the second Thursday of each month. Jim Heckman is the operating manager and would be the contact for questions.

Questions and Answers

If the wastewater is going back into the Fountain via pipe, would it be better to take it back and reuse it?

The owners of the water would have to initiate any reuse or reclamation of the water. The majority is tributary water and needs to be replaced.

Was there consideration of creating wetlands to further treat water before releasing it to Fountain Creek?

Yes, there was consideration. The main issue is how to keep Fountain Creek whole. There could be an advantage with creating wetlands--to help repair vegetation and improve growth. The amounts would not be significant but would be able to support wetlands vegetation.

Would that be a good model for the rest of the area?

It could be a good model, but these applications are on a smaller scale. LFMSDD intends to accomplish all standards of discharge.

Would the release of 6 million gallons per day (mgd) create an erosion/sedimentation issue?

Yes, there will be erosion, but steps will be taken to mitigate this problem including dams built by Hanna Road. This issue will be given very close attention and careful mitigation.

What will be done about the smell?

LFMSDD is planning on specific odor-control facilities, which will be enclosed.

How are you protecting against spills?

LFMSDD will implement certain protective security measures and electronic monitoring. A total containment system is being planned for below the operating space.

Why are LFMSDD and CSU both building wastewater treatment plants?

In 2002, it was discovered that both LFMSDD and CSU were planning to build plants. In 2003, ideas were examined to consolidate these plants. From 2003 to 2006, both entities worked on a concept design and were unable to reach an agreement. There was a mismatch in timing, and it was determined that LFMSDD needed to move forward.

What is the elevation change in order to accommodate the pipeline (velocity/elevation)?

The discharge will be dispersed without any impacts to erosion on Fountain Creek.

In the case of catastrophic events, what is the proximity of the land drain and are they off the stream?

Yes, it is off-stream, and there have been many topographic studies done.

❖ **Regional Wastewater Treatment Facility; Clear Spring - Colorado Springs Utilities(CSU) (Jeff Daniels)**

- The Regional Wastewater Treatment Facility will work with 8 million gallons per day, 30 mgd at maximum capacity. The treatment process will be use a membrane bioreactor process that provides better effluent quality than conventional treatment. The solids are suspended, including E. coli and other pathogens. This makes them easier to remove. The membrane bioreactor process also protects the Creek from treatment upset. The project will be funded through the Banning Lewis Ranch Company.
- The screening plan timeline from 2000-2007 was as follows:
 - 2000 - Wastewater infrastructure Strategic Plan (WISP)
 - 2002 - WISP update for Jimmy Camp Creek Basin
 - 2003 - Pikes Peak Area Council of Governments (PPACG) 208 Plan
 - 2004 - Clear Spring Regional Water Reclamation Facility (CSRWRF) concept Design Report
 - 2007 - “East” site selected
 - The construction phase is planned for mid 2008-2009
- Toward the completion of the WISP, CSU continued with site selection. CSU planned to allow the public to participate in the process in many ways. In late December, the public was engaged. CSU has had numerous one-on-one discussions with residents; they continue to have discussions with the stakeholders. Public participation has influenced many factors:
 - The membrane bioreactor process has a smaller footprint, which will make the facility more aesthetically pleasing.
 - The public has also helped in the aesthetic planning of the facility by suggesting changes such as having a berm around the facility, planting trees, and maintaining a rural theme.
- CSU has on-going public meetings, and design workshops are expected in the near term. During the construction phase, CSU plans to engage the public. CSU values public participation.
- For more information, please contact Gwen Happ at 719-668-7395.

Questions and Answers

Does the membrane bioreactor actually filter water better than tertiary filtering?

Yes.

Why is the facility so far north?

If the treatment plant was not located up north, CSU would need to pump sludge through a pipeline. CSU determined it would rather pump clear water or reclaimed water farther up rather than down.

With 2 treatment plants so near to each other, is there a way to reuse 100% of the water?

The WISP mentions 100% reuse in the future.

There is a new 100-year study that will be released about the time of construction – will it be reviewed?

When the new 100-year study is released, CSU would decide whether or not to review the study.

With the expansion of the Nixon Plant, would the discharge be available for their use?
Possibly. We are looking at this.

If and when can the solution be found for the needs of the two sanitation districts?
The agreements have fallen apart, and litigation is in process. The plants will stay separate.

What are CSU's annexation plans?
CSU will not do any further annexation in the area around the plant. We currently own 40 acres of undeveloped land. CSU does not even have an annexation plan.

Will this facility produce single-family, landscape reusable water (non-potable)?
In terms of single-family landscaping needs, treatment facility reuse water cannot be used.

Group Discussion

Following these presentations, the facilitator asked each of the presenters to indicate whether there is a role for the Fountain Creek Vision Task Force to suggest ideas for mitigation of impacts or approaches to restoration and, if so, what the deadline for such feedback would be. The presenters offered the following replies:

- LaFarge is open to ideas and suggestions and would love to hear the group's concerns and address them. Regarding timing, the sooner the better, because LaFarge is hoping to move forward with permitting. The absolute deadline would be May 20, 2007.
- LFMSDD is open to ideas and suggestions from the group. Input would need to be received by August 1, 2007. LFMSDD would also like to be able to come to the Fountain Creek Vision Task Force with questions and concerns, allowing the dialogue to remain open.
- CSU is absolutely open to ideas and suggestions; it is part of the public process. There is no absolute deadline, but the 30% design will be done in the next few months, so questions/concerns should be brought up sooner rather than later.
- Squirrel Creek is open to ideas and suggestions. Squirrel Creek will be in front of the El Paso County Board of County Commissioners on May 10, 2007. Any questions/ideas/suggestions that need to be made should be submitted to the commissioners. Please identify if you are a member of the Consensus Committee or the Task Force in general.

Next Steps

- After some discussion about the appropriate next steps, the group decided not to prepare a group response to any of these projects. Rather, individual members of the Consensus Committee are invited to submit their own comments to the project proponents and/or the appropriate government agency.

- It was agreed that there may be an interesting synergy in two of these upcoming projects. One wants to put water in the Creek, and one needs to take water out. Dennis Maroney offered to put together a conference call to see if there is traction on bringing these two projects together to discuss this issue.
- One participant expressed a willingness to reach out to other watershed groups to discuss the challenges of creating a watershed authority and how to overcome them. It was also reported that Jeff Chostner is currently working to put together a discussion on creating a Fountain Creek Watershed Authority. The Consensus Committee will hear reports on these two issues at its May meeting.

**Fountain Creek Vision Task Force
Consensus Committee
June 15, 2007
Final Meeting Summary**

Attending

Larry Atencio, Tom Autobee, Carol Baker, Elise Bergsten, Vickie Broerman, Jeff Chostner, Sallie Clarke, Russ Clayshulte, Rusty Cochran, Casey Davenhill, Thorne Davis, Billy Edwards, Heather Elliot, Paul Fanning, Shanna Farmer, Ferris Frost, Mark Glidden, Jane Green, Terry Hart, Dennis Hisey, Loretta Kennedy, Irene Kornelly, Priscilla Lucero, Heather Maio, Dennis Maroney, Bruce McCormick, Bob McGregor, Bruce Miller, Jim Munch, Larry Patterson, Tom Ready, Jane Rawlings, Jane Rhodes, Richard Skorman, Larry Small, Paul Thomas, Jeff Tucker, Juan Trujillo, Ross Vincent, Ray Wells, Jay Winner, Niki Koszalka, and Heather Bergman

Action Items

Richard Skorman, Jeff Chostner, Jay Winner, and Heather Bergman	Meet to determine what topics are to be discussed at the July 20, 2007 meeting.
Jay Winner, Gary Barber, and Loretta Kennedy	Issue a mapping RFP to three contractors on behalf of the Consensus Committee

New and Pressing Issues in the Watershed

- ❖ The request for proposal (RFP) for the Fountain Creek Corridor Master Plan (FCCMP) went out on Thursday.
- ❖ Colorado Springs Utilities (CSU) recently commissioned an 18 million gallon reservoir to divert spilling into Fountain Creek.
- ❖ There is a Streamside Systems presentation today. There is hope that elected officials will show up for the presentation.

Presentations

Chatfield Watershed Authority, Russ Clayshulte

- ❖ There have been over eight authorities that Russ Clayshulte has helped create. Currently, he is involved in Chatfield and Bear Creek Authorities. There are authorities in four other states with which he has been involved.

- ❖ The Bear Creek Authority in Lakewood dates back to 1984. Chatfield Authority dates back 22 years. These entities were brought together to help with watershed issues. Each one has had to deal with differing personalities and communities.
- ❖ The Bear Creek Authority has expanded its mission and vision. They are willing to move forward. They have encompassed land use into their vision. This is a big step as land use would not have been included at the beginning. They have also brought together water quality and quantity. There is a group of folks, including wastewater dischargers, Home Owners Associations (HOAs), government officials, and other agencies, that has been able to resolve some issues. In addition, some new issues have come up, such as the temperature of the reservoir and the state of the trout. They are working with Sierra Club and Trout Unlimited to come up with a collaborative solution.
- ❖ There is an extensive amount of monitoring, and there are control regulations. There is \$140,000 combined for primary and secondary monitoring. The State control regulation is “you shall monitor.” There are lots of politics and financial woes to address. The authority cannot afford to have “players” step out because it has significant negative impacts on the budget.
- ❖ The Chatfield Watershed Authority was formed due to adversity. At one time, there was a desire to have a watershed that was good for recreation. The Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) did a Clean Lake Study and found that there needed to be more controls over water quality. If this did not happen, it would not meet the specifications for recreational use.
- ❖ In terms of phosphorus, it was important to determine how much was coming into Chatfield Reservoir. The South Platte is a major contributor. A line was drawn in the river, which divided the amount and flow. The load was a way to base a split in regards to the total maximum annual load (TMAL).
- ❖ There was also a growth issue occurring in Douglas County and the Chatfield Watershed Authority did not want to be caught up in land use issues. They were more interested in water issues.
- ❖ Chatfield is a smaller group. There are fewer players and less involvement from the government. Lockheed Martin is a big player. There is a higher assessed evaluation that results in a large bill that needs to be paid. A wastewater pipeline brings water around the reservoir.
- ❖ There is a decision to make about how the group wants to be viewed both internally and externally. Does the group want to be an association or an authority? Bear Creek wanted to be low key, so they labeled themselves an association. Chatfield saw that the Cherry Creek Watershed Authority had more strength and decided to become an authority. Both associations and authorities are long-term processes and should be around in 50 years to regulate activities in the watershed.
- ❖ The Bear Creek Association and the Chatfield Authority have funds generated by having an assessed membership. All players are potential sources of income. There was a fine given to Jefferson County and the money paid as penalty went to the Chatfield Authority resulting in a new set of wetlands with handicapped ramps.

Cherry Creek Watershed Authority, Ray Wells

- ❖ Ray Wells has spent 35 years in land development, special districts, and authority businesses.
- ❖ Cherry Creek Reservoir should have never been allowed to have water put in it. It is not technically a reservoir, because it leaks a lot of water per year. It was built to keep Denver from flooding and is now a community amenity. Without water running through it, Cherry Creek is a collection of stagnated water that will grow algae.
- ❖ One hundred percent of phosphates can be removed via wastewater treatment. However, 600 feet down river, there is the same amount of phosphate in the soil before the removal.
- ❖ If the Fountain Creek Vision Task Force wants to have an advisory group, they should choose to have an association. If the Fountain Creek Vision Task Force is looking to form a group to get things done, there needs to be the formation of an authority.
- ❖ The Clean Lakes Study in 1984 really put the action people together. The Cherry Creek Watershed Authority was formed in 1988 and amended in 2000. The authority was restructured in 2000 to reflect better membership for the government entities as well as wastewater treatment facilities.
- ❖ The Cherry Creek Watershed Authority will have a community effort to work toward keeping the reservoir in recreational shape. The Fountain Creek Vision Task Force will need to start and authority and bring in the community.

Cherry Creek Stewardship Partners, Casey Davenport

- ❖ There is an extra \$3 charge at the park entrance that helps to fund the Cherry Creek Stewardship Partners (CCSP). People used to balk at the additional charge, so CCSP produced a brochure to explain it. The brochure provides information and points out pollution-reduction facilities in the park and shares information regarding how the authority works.
- ❖ The original partners of the CCSP include the manager of the park, the EPA, and some engineering folks. The group formed with a mission to promote stewardship in the basin. In 1999, there were obvious growing pains. The CCSP felt they were being more controlled by funding and not their mission. CCSP decided against chasing money. They decided to have a voluntary assessment. Anyone who wanted to participate had to pay a fee.
- ❖ CCSP chose not to go non-profit and to have a voluntary stakeholder forum. The Colorado Watershed Network is their fiscal authority and is in charge of the financial and signing aspects of the entity, as well as bank accounts and tax returns.
- ❖ CCSP has no authority. It is more of a networking type of organization, working a lot through outreach and education. CCSP will work with homeowners doing presentations, showing what works best in fieldwork. CCSP does restoration projects, explores recreational possibilities, and works with plants and animals.
- ❖ There was not much community enthusiasm for the group at the beginning. It became clear to CCSP that they could not solve any problems without first identifying what the problems were.
- ❖ There are technical training opportunities for the counties so that knowledge can be shared on a broad basis regarding land use opportunities. It is important to have

access to best management practices (BMPs) on water quality, to explain innovative design ideas, and to know what the available opportunities are.

- ❖ CCSP spends lots of time in the schools. Many of the schools have stormwater permits, and it is important to build up knowledge about stormwater and infrastructure. It is an effective idea to use the watershed as a learning tool and outdoor classroom.
- ❖ All of the area municipalities participate financially. CCSP has the executive branch and three working groups. The working groups are water quality, education/outreach, and open space.
- ❖ There were many lessons learned by the CCSP while working on the formation of their entity. One lesson is that building rapport is imperative.
- ❖ The best advice that the CCSP could offer to the Fountain Creek Vision Task Force is to look into the Urban Drainage and Flood Control District model. It could be very helpful.

Questions/Answers

Should the Fountain Creek Vision Task Force work to form an authority or an association?

An authority has more weight politically. Considering the rivalry between Colorado Springs and Pueblo, it may take them joining an authority to come together. It is apparent that some of these questions are so big today that it is going to take a lot of interaction between entities. Waiting for an intergovernmental agreement is a waste of time. Many of the watershed problems cannot be solved through regular government channels. These problems need to be dealt with by an entity that was formed with specific goals in mind. It is important to focus on people and make them responsible. People will filter in and out of the authority. A large list of issues will come down to priorities. There will be the development of key players. Mistakes will be made while forming and during the tenure of the authority. There is no way to divide Fountain Creek. It needs to be dealt with as a whole. The Fountain Creek Vision Task Force is not equipped to solve issues manually in the watershed. Special districts have been very well received in Colorado, despite some push-back from some cities.

What is the difference between an authority, an association, a district, and a partnership?

Specific government people form special districts. Cherry Creek took it a bit further than this and approached the legislature. This was done to gain help in managing and to help as a planning agency. Because of the Cherry Creek legislation, there are specific things that they have to do. Bear Creek created watershed management and intergovernmental agreements (IGA). The IGA was signed by all saying how they are going to participate in the watershed entity. Cherry Creek Watershed Authority has more power and more money as an authority. Both Chatfield and Bear Creek were created as management tools. Both are covered under state regulation. There are specific rules as to how the watershed can be used. State control regulations mean that there are specific roles and responsibilities to meet state law.

Is Fountain Creek similar to the Barr Lake and Milton Reservoir (Barr-Milton)?

Yes, in terms of area. Barr-Milton encompasses a much larger area, similar to Fountain

Creek. When the Barr-Milton boundaries were drawn, they included all tributaries and went all the way to Summit County. It is a very large group. Barr-Milton decided to go with 501(3)c status. They are recognizing that the cost of implementation is staggering. They are calling on different entities, working with them to establish agreements on boundaries, and working together to provide collaborative data on the watershed.

Would it be the best course of action to put together the FCCMP and identify financing mechanisms?

One of the great things about the Fountain Creek Vision Task Force is that there is already forward motion. There is an awesome assembly of different people. Bear Creek did not have this advantage. It was too focused on water dischargers. The Task Force needs to figure out a course of action. If an authority is established, it will help get income and revenue. There will be the need for the Task Force to have data and to manage what is going on with the action plan.

Are authorities in other states similar to those in Colorado, and do they deal with the same kinds of issues?

In Ohio, they are dealing with large, complex issues including upstream and downstream cities that do not get along.

In terms of producing a watershed plan, what are the components that will help determine which structure is best?

The 2003 Basin Authority did a master plan, which is available on line. It is a great tool to use as a model.

How does a private property owner get protection if the cities, employees, and developers are the only ones on an authority?

In terms of citizen representation, it would be of benefit to have an HOA be part of an authority. There is also the option of having a private citizen pay an "in-kind" fee. It could be their job to take any messages back to the neighbors and citizens, which would help to foster better communication. Conservation districts, like Urban Drainage, would be a good tool for communication with landowners. They need to be heard as well. The Basin Authority Board does have members of the public appointed.

How are authorities funded?

Mill levies and membership fees fund some. The fee can be determined on a population basis or the costs can be divided evenly among the members.

What are the drawbacks of an authority?

A drawback of an authority is that the group has to commit to getting together every month. There are personality conflicts, politics, complex issues, and surprises that come up in terms of regulations. Another drawback can be getting the military to buy in, which is important. They are no different in importance from other entities. A large drawback is the "kickers and screamers." The best thing to do with a difficult participant is to make them chair the group.

Do Chatfield or Bear Creek use any multi-supply usages or is reuse involved?

Chatfield does reuse. The control regulations make it very hard for wastewater treatment facilities. Care needs to be used when dealing with water quantity and water quality. This is a fine line. Reuse can be dealt with in terms of quality but not in terms of water rights.

Could some of the \$300,000 from the FCCMP pay a person to spearhead the authority discussion?

The \$300,000 comes from Colorado Springs Utilities (CSU) and the Lower Arkansas. The request for proposal (RFP) is to come up with a plan and a strategy for implementation. There could perhaps be potential for some of the money to go to help in the organization of an authority. However, this was not the original intention for the FCMCP.

Next Steps for the Watershed Authority Discussion

- The group agreed that more discussion of a watershed authority or some sort of funding mechanism for Fountain Creek is needed.
- The group discussed the need to first determine if the elected officials in the watershed will buy into the overall Task Force process to date.
- It was agreed that a meeting should be held on July 20th to update the elected officials on the progress of the Task Force (including the efforts of all the working groups) and to ask if they think the Task Force should begin a conversation about funding options. Both elected officials and other interested parties should attend this important meeting.

Consensus Committee Business

Keystone Budget Update

\$17,000 of original \$43,000 provided by Consensus Committee members remains. This will carry the cost of The Keystone Center through mid-August or so. Once this money has been exhausted, the Fountain Creek Vision Task Force will have to tap into the Colorado Water Conservation Board (CWCB) money to pay for facilitation.

CWCB Grant Mapping

One of the stipulations of receiving the grant from the Colorado Water Conservation Board (CWCB) was that the Fountain Creek Vision Task Force would use some of the money to make maps. The group needs find someone with mapping expertise to do this. There are a few options:

- Staff from the entities around the table could work together to produce the necessary maps. This approach would be free, but could be taxing and time consuming for staff.
- Some portion of the CWCB money could be used to pay a third party.

The group agreed that Jay Winner, Gary Barber, and Loretta Kennedy should issue a Request for Proposals to three contractors for the mapping work.

Next Full Task Force Meeting

The discussed options for the next full Task Force meeting, included a possible land use visioning workshop. It was decided that this discussion should wait until after the July 20th meeting of elected officials, as the group may have a better sense of the best path forward then.

Fountain Creek Vision Task Force Consensus Committee July 20, 2007 Final Meeting Summary

Attending

Carol Baker, Gary Barber, Mary Barber, Elise Bergsten, Sallie Clarke, Rusty Cochran, Tom Gallagher, Loretta Kennedy, Carole Lange, Dennis Maroney, Bruce McCormick, Bob McGregor, Bob Miner, Mark Morlany, Larry Patterson, Jane Rawlings, Tom Ready, Jane Rhodes, Lisa Ross, Larry Small, Paul Sobiech, Parry Thomas, Paul Thomas, Graham Thompson, Barbara Vidmar, Ross Vincent, Jay Winner, Pam Zubeck, Niki Koszalka, and Heather Bergman

Action Items

Carol Baker	Send Heather Bergman copy of the top 10 fun facts
Kristin Flannery	Work to get vision board to Sallie Clarke for the El Paso county fair
Dennis Maroney	Let Heather Bergman know the where, when, and why of state

	fair
Dennis Maroney and Lisa Ross	Get started on the policy review process
Loretta Kennedy	Contact Department of Local Affairs (DOLA) about grant money
Larry Smalls	Contact Colorado Municipal League (CML) about grant money
Niki Koszalka	Prepare a calendar of meetings of elected bodies in the watershed
Bruce McCormick, Bob Miner, Jay Winner, and Heather Bergman	Create a document that shows the convergence of all the groups and the benefits
Tom Ready and Heather Bergman	Work together to procure meeting space for next Task Force meeting
Gary Barber, Jay Winner, Parry Thomas, and Heather Bergman	Work together to determine the details for the next Task Force meeting
Heather Bergman	Contact Juniper Katz about a Peak to Prairie area map
Heather Bergman	Send copies of Colorado Open Lands (COL) proposed letters to Task Force and Consensus Committee lists
Heather Bergman	Send out survey asking for availability for the Funding Options Working Group meeting

New and Pressing Issues in the Watershed

- ❖ The group requested that Niki Koszalka prepare a schedule of meetings of elected bodies in the watershed to help in scheduling presentations on the Fountain Creek Vision Task Force.
- ❖ The Fountain Creek Corridor Master Plan (FCCMP) will include the border of Colorado Springs to the confluence of the Arkansas River. FCCMP has been accepting proposals up to Wednesday of this week. The FCCMP is willing to take ideas and suggestions from the Task Force. Bruce McCormick, Bob Miner, Jay Winner and Heather Bergman will work together to create a document that shows the convergence of all the groups and highlights the benefits of the various processes in the watershed.
- ❖ The CSU water treatment facility is in the permitting phase and will likely be approved. However, CSU is still working with the City of Fountain to see if there is a way to have just one treatment facility instead of two.
- ❖ Colorado Open Lands (COL) is requesting letters of support for the Peak to Prairie Legacy Project proposal to Great Outdoors Colorado. Juniper Katz is asking that each of the entities provide a letter of support by August 1, 2007. Heather Bergman will contact Juniper to see if there is a map showing the Peak to Prairie Legacy Proposal area; she will also send the other materials explaining the proposal and the specifics to include in a letter of support.
- ❖ The State Fair is at the end of August, and several participants suggested that having a booth at the Fair would give the Task Force great exposure and would

further community involvement. At least one participant would like to see the list of the Top Ten Lessons Learned (prepared by the Outreach Committee) made available to the public at the Fair. The Consensus Committee will review the draft of the Top Ten list at its next meeting.

- The Turkey Creek Conservation District has an informational board that can be used at the State Fair.
 - The vision board created by the Outreach Committee can also be used.
 - The booth will be in the Conservation Building, across from the large watershed model. This is a great location with excellent foot traffic and exposure.
 - Dennis Maroney will send Heather Bergman the details of the State Fair. Heather will distribute a sign-up sheet for members of the Task Force who are willing to staff the booth.
- ❖ The El Paso County Fair starts today and will run through the weekend. Kristin Flannery will work to get the vision board to Sallie Clark.

Recommendation from the Water Quality Working Group

The Water Quality Working Group has been discussing stormwater runoff, with a particular focus on mitigating runoff. Identification of strategies for mitigating runoff is difficult because it is unclear what land use policies currently exist in the watershed and how they affect runoff. The Working Group would like to get more information on what the cities and counties require by assessing existing policies based on the “Better Site Design” handbook, and then discussing the results with planners and elected officials.

The Working Group suggested two ways of doing this:

- Issue a request for proposals (RFP) to get a contractor to do the policy assessment and host meetings with planners and elected officials to share the results and determine how best to proceed in the different geographic and political contexts in the watershed.
- Have members of the working group do the policy assessment and have Heather Bergman and the working group host meetings with planners and elected officials to share the results and determine how best to proceed.

Since no funds are presently available for this effort, the Consensus Committee agreed that members of the Working Group (led by Lisa Ross and Dennis Maroney) should begin the policy assessment process. In the meantime, Loretta Kennedy will contact the Colorado Department of Local Affairs, and Larry Small will contact the Colorado Municipal League.

Mapping and Funding

Background

Gary Barber summarized the requirements of the \$75,000 Colorado Water Conservation Board (CWCB) grant to the Fountain Creek Vision Task Force. In general, these requirements track with the current plan for the Task Force, but there are a few changes. The grant:

- Adds an assessment of consumptive and non-consumptive water needs in the watershed to the current scope of work
- May require maps to provide the final product CWCB desires
- Likely extends the timeline of the Task Force's work into 2008

The funding situation is complicated by the fact that The Keystone Center will be out of facilitation funds by mid-August. Although this tracks with the original budget prepared for the Consensus Committee, Keystone provided several inaccurate spending reports to the Consensus Committee indicating that existing funds would last into the fall. These errors were due to accounting problems at Keystone that have now been corrected.

This raises a series of related questions for the Consensus Committee to answer:

- Should the CWCB grant be accepted (with the addition to the scope of work and the extension of the Task Force timeline)?
- If not, how will ongoing facilitation be funded?
- If so, should a portion of these funds be given to Thomas and Thomas to prepare maps?
- If so, this could mean a shortfall of funds for Keystone later in the process.

Decision

The Consensus Committee agreed to accept the CWCB grant with gratitude for the agency's support of the work of the Task Force. \$25,000 will be given to Thomas and Thomas for the mapping effort, and the remainder of the funds will go to Keystone for ongoing facilitation. If the need arises, additional funds for Keystone can be discussed by the Consensus Committee at a later time.

Update from the US Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) on the Fountain Creek Watershed Study (Charles Wilson)

- ❖ At meetings in June, USACE identified more stakeholder concerns. It was beneficial to learn the issues that are on the minds of the stakeholders, like water quality and water rights (among others).
- ❖ USACE also heard discussion about projects like the Colorado Department of Transportation's (CDOT) work on Highway 24 and different projects in Colorado Springs and Manitou Springs.
- ❖ USACE spoke with the Pueblo *Chieftain* and Ray Petros about a dam on Fountain Creek. USACE will look at one plan that includes a single dam on Fountain Creek above Pueblo.
- ❖ USACE has received all of the geographic information system (GIS) data and modeling data from URS (the primary contractor on the Fountain Creek watershed Study). All of this (and other) data will be available through the Pikes Peak Area Council of Governments (PPACG) after August 17, 2007.
- ❖ URS is doing a pre-screening to show areas with high potential for wetlands.
- ❖ USACE will give a presentation of initial recommendations at the August meetings of the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) and the Consensus Committee.

Questions/Answers

Is the range of recommendation options constrained by funding?

There are funding limits. Pre-screening will show USACE more than ten areas that are suitable for work. USACE will take these ten options to see where they fit in the study best. USACE will leave the others as suggestions but will not be able to develop or complete them as projects. There is not enough money to cover the ten USACE-approved watershed projects.

In the final report, will USACE discuss the other options it looked examined?

Normally, USACE does not do this.

August Full Task Force Meeting

- ❖ There will be a September meeting with the full Task Force. The Consensus Committee would like to have a visioning and map-based workshop. The workshop might include other visual representations of the watershed. During the August Consensus Committee meeting, it might be useful to get Thomas and Thomas involved in the discussion about what the Consensus Committee would like to see.
- ❖ The meeting planning team will talk about this meeting in August. Tom Ready and Heather Bergman will work together to procure meeting space. Gary Barber, Jay Winner, Parry Thomas, and Heather Bergman will decide how the meeting will go.
- ❖ The Consensus Committee will need to coordinate with the TAC to make sure that there is the electronic data needed for the mapping information.

Next Steps for Key Issues

- ❖ A date will be set for the upcoming Funding Options Working Group meeting. It was agreed that the new Funding Options Working Group must have political and elected officials as members, in addition to other individuals who are interested in this issue and the members of the previous Ad Hoc Finance Committee.
- ❖ The Consensus Committee clarified that the Funding Options Working Group should address fundamental policy questions about how to pursue funding for implementation of the strategic plan. The Funding Options group will not be discussing funding for facilitation.
- ❖ Heather Bergman will send out targeted initiations to elected officials in the watershed and to the full Task Force listserv. This email invitation will provide clarification of the purpose of the meeting.
- ❖ To ensure that as many people as possible can attend this first meeting, Heather Bergman will send out a survey asking when the invitees are available.

**Fountain Creek Vision Task Force
Consensus Committee
August 17, 2007
Final Meeting Summary**

Attending

Tom Autobee, Carol Baker, Gary Barber, Mary Barber, Vickie Broerman, Sallie Clarke, Scott Cowan, Mark Glidden, Dan Henrichs, Juniper Katz, Loretta Kennedy, Carole

Lange, Heather Maio, Dennis Maroney, Bob McGregor, Rex Miller, Bob Miner, Rich Mitchell, Jim Munch, Rich Muzzy, Cynthia Peterson, Gary Rapp, Jane Rawlings, Tom Ready, Kathleen Reilly, Gary Rutherford, Kevin Shanks, Richard Skorman, Ross Vincent, Tim Williams, Charles Wilson, Jay Winner, Meggan Yoest, Pam Zubeck, Niki Koszalka, and Heather Bergman

Action Items

Ross Vincent, Loretta Kennedy, and Margaret Mora	Connect with Scott Cowan and Heather Miles to discuss the grant opportunity with Colorado Department of Public Health and Environment
Dennis Maroney, Carol Baker, Scott Cowan, Ross Vincent, Dan Henrichs, and Carol Lange	Discuss “top ten” list, make changes, and distribute via email for Consensus Committee
Tim Williams	Prepare a map showing the Army Corps of Engineers’ proposed projects
Rich Muzzy, Jay Winner, Cynthia Peterson, Bob Miner, Mary Barber, Margaret Mora, Carol Baker, and Heather Bergman	Schedule a meeting to discuss the Colorado Department of Public Health and Environment’s 319 funding opportunity and update Consensus Committee at next meeting

New and Pressing Issues

- ❖ The next full Task Force meeting is September 6, 2007. Colorado Springs Utilities (CSU) is hosting a two-day water tour. Several Consensus Committee members were invited. It was agreed that the full Task Force meeting on September 6th should be rescheduled for September 27th to accommodate the water tour. The meeting on the 27th will be from 6:00 to 9:00 PM at Lake Pueblo State Park.
- ❖ As of the end of July, the remainder of The Keystone Center’s funding was \$3,800. This is enough money to pay for approximately half of August; Keystone will cover the rest of the facilitation costs for August. Keystone will need to begin billing to the Colorado Water Conservation Board (CWCB) grant to cover facilitation costs beginning on September 1. It was agreed that to expedite the dispersal of the CWCB funds, Keystone will bill the El Paso County Water Authority rather than both El Paso County and Pueblo County.
- ❖ Colorado Springs Utilities and the Lower Arkansas Water Conservation District received very good proposals in response to their request for proposals (RFP) regarding the Fountain Creek Corridor Master Plan. The contract was awarded to THK, and the team is currently working to get up to speed on the project. The team includes experts who have worked together on other projects from the visioning to implementation. This team includes Graham Thompson of Matrix Designs, who is working on the Fountain Creek Watershed Study with the US Army Corps of Engineers and has provided much technical assistance to the Task Force in the past. THK is currently working on a project on Highway 24 with the Colorado Department of Transportation (CDOT)._The Consensus Committee decided it would like to meet

with THK at its next meeting (September 21st from 1 p.m. to 4:00 p.m at Fountain City Hall).

❖ **Grant Opportunities**

- Juniper Katz and others are working to submit the Peak to Prairie project proposal to Great Outdoors Colorado (GOCO) by August 27. Entities in the watershed who have not yet submitted letters of support for the grant are encouraged to do so. Several communities have also committed matching funds, which will strengthen the proposal.
- There is a grant available from the Colorado Department of Public Health and Environment's (CDPHE) Water Quality Improvement Fund (WQIF). Pueblo would like to apply for this grant to:
 - Continue education efforts in surface water, stormwater, and urban runoff.
 - Encourage a change in protocols for septic tanks and agriculture
 - Continue E. coli testing and monitoring (though this would change from once a week to once every two weeks; it is expected that the predominant pattern will remain the same with monitoring every other week)

Several members of the Consensus Committee expressed concerns about decreasing the frequency of E. coli testing. These individuals will meet with Scott Cowan and Heather Maio to determine how best to move forward with this grant application.

- Kathleen Reilly spoke briefly about the opportunity associated with CDPHE's Section 319 grant program. The 2008 funds target two river basins: the Arkansas and the Rio Grande. The 319 funding focuses on non-point source pollution impacts, and projects need to provide measurable impacts on water quality. There are two pots of money. One is for projects in the Arkansas and Rio Grande basins, and the other is for projects elsewhere in the state. This grant needs to have a 40% match. The CWCB funds to support facilitation of the Task Force can be counted as part of the 40% match. There is \$1 million dollars available for these grants, and project funds would be available in March or April of 2008. The application is due in the fall of 2007. Rich Muzzy, Jay Winner, Cynthia Peterson, Bob Miner, Mary Barber, Margaret Mora, and Carol Baker will meet to discuss appropriate projects that could be submitted for 319 funding and update the Consensus Committee at its next meeting.

Presentation

Fountain Creek Watershed Study: Preliminary Recommendations (Charles Wilson, US Army Corps of Engineers)

Charles Wilson reported on the preliminary recommendations from the US Army Corps' Fountain Creek Watershed Study. The objectives of the watershed study are to improve water quality and reduce flood risk, sedimentation, and erosion. The general recommendations are:

- modify development policy to include more consideration of open space needs in development (focus on more habitat development within traditional parks);
 - rehabilitate riparian areas to a healthy and functioning condition, preserve existing wetlands, and create additional wetlands where opportunities exist;
 - limit sediment sources during construction by minimizing overload gradient in large scale developments;
 - modify development policy to include the concepts put forth by the Center for Watershed Protection (cwp.org) and Low Impact Development (lowimpactdevelopment.org);
 - modify development policy to require the post-development hydrographs to match the pre-development hydrographs for peak, volume, and timing;
 - modify development policy to require the post-development sediment transport to match the pre-development sediment transport;
 - 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;
 - modify development policy to require assessment of downstream impacts, particularly the impacts due to small, frequently occurring storm events such as the two-year event;
 - modify development policy to include involvement by regulatory agencies and stakeholders as soon as possible in the development process;
 - entities must follow through with review of development plans, adherence to approved plans through the construction process, and inspection/maintenance of completed projects;
 - 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;
 - entities should use the hydrologic and hydraulic models developed as a part of the Fountain Creek Watershed Study to update their FEMA floodplains;
 - entities should use the models developed as part of the Fountain Creek Watershed Study to certify their levees;
 - remedial projects that affect Fountain Creek or its tributaries should utilize stable channel design;
 - entities constructing remedial projects in the watershed should develop a consistent approach and methodology for project design and construction; and
 - a Fountain Creek Watershed Authority should be created to serve as a funding source for large-scale projects and to assist entities with training, review, and/or maintenance.
- ❖ Some potential project recommendations to address flood risk reduction, ecosystem restoration, and channel stability:
- Both ecosystem restoration and channel stability contribute to reducing sedimentation and erosion.
 - Some options and/or sites for flood risk reduction include building a Pueblo levee, a dam above Pueblo, Highway 24 corridor (including Manitou Springs), Fountain/Monument confluence to city limits, Old

Where are good areas for ecosystem restoration using wetlands?

The best option is to find areas on the main stem. The tributaries are not the best option as there is not much water flow.

With implementation of all the general recommendations, will there be any attempt in the matrix to show the cumulative effects of these projects?

Yes, to a degree.

Is the Corps able to share any information including scientific research about dams with the Task Force?

The Corps will try to get information to the Task Force about dams in the late fall. The idea of a dam came up in the Fountain Creek studies in 1972 as a recommendation to stop the flooding. Until experts and engineers weigh in, the concept of one or more dams needs to be on the table.

Following the question and answer session, the group agreed that there will need to be a more comprehensive conversation about the possibility of building a dam on Fountain Creek. The questions that need to be answered in this future discussion are: how many dams, what kinds of dams, how big should it/they be, where should it/they go, who would pay for a study of the options and how would they do that, who builds and pays for construction, and what are the water rights and other impacts? Also included in dam presentations need to be a vocabulary list, so that the Consensus Committee members are all on the same page of understanding terms.

It was also agreed that such a discussion about a dam must wait until the Army Corps completes its own study of a dam. This report is expected later in the fall of 2007. Once that document is available, the Fountain Creek Vision Task Force will hold a public meeting in Pueblo to discuss the report and to hear other viewpoints and ideas on this issue.

Outreach Committee Needs: “Top Ten” Lessons Learned

The group reviewed the current draft of the “Top Lessons Learned” document that the Outreach Committee prepared for distribution at the State Fair. The Outreach Committee had asked many entities and people to send their thoughts and ideas on what the top ten lessons are. After receiving the ideas, the committee came up with this list. The Outreach Committee also created a survey to hand out at the State Fair booth to find out the most important and surprising issues to the public. At the State Fair, in addition to the Top Ten list, the Outreach Committee would like to show the vision board and play the voice-over PowerPoint presentation. Several members of the Consensus Committee voiced concerns about the Top Ten document. The Outreach Committee agreed to revisit the list with the help of a small, representative group and resubmit the list to the Consensus Committee via email. It was agreed that the list would not be distributed at the State Fair unless Consensus Committee approval is achieved.

**Fountain Creek Vision Task Force
Consensus Committee
September 21, 2007
Final Meeting Summary**

Attending

Tom Autobee, Carol Baker, Gary Barber, Mary Barber, Sharon Brown, Ron Enserro, Kristin Flannery, Ferris Frost, Jane Green, Jeri Howell, Juniper Katz, Irene Kornelly, Carole Lange, Bruce McCormick, Bob Miner, Heather Maio, Steve Miller, Rich Muzzy, Larry Patterson, Jane Rawlings, Sandy Rayl, Ken Sampley, Kevin Shanks, Larry Small, Ross Vincent, Jay Winner, Chris Woodka, Niki Koszalka, and Heather Bergman

Action Items

Heather Bergman	Ask Charles Wilson to come to a meeting, in person or on the telephone, once the revised recommendations are released.
Heather Bergman	Add a discussion of participation and a review of the protocols to the agenda for the next Consensus Committee agenda.

New and Pressing Issues in the Watershed

Colorado Water Conservation Board (CWCB) Grant

- ❖ The CWCB asked the Fountain Creek Vision Task Force for more clarity in the grant application. The Task Force submitted a letter, further explaining the grant proposal.
- ❖ The Task Force will be required to quantify consumptive and non-consumptive uses of water in the watershed, establish the status of existing plans and projects for consumptive and non-consumptive uses, and propose potential projects. There is existing data to quantify consumptive and non-consumptive uses.

319 Grant Proposal

- ❖ The goals for the Section 319 grant proposal to the Colorado Department of Public Health and Environment are water quality improvements in the watershed through reduction of sediment and E. coli and the use of the Streamside Systems sediment removal technology.
- ❖ Approximately \$259,000 from the Lower Arkansas Basin Roundtable would support the Streamside System hardware and \$300,000 from the 319 grant would support the stream and sediment sampling. This money would also support the research of best management practices (BMP) for sediment and E. coli reduction.
- ❖ The 319 grant needs a 40% match, which can be in-kind.

Report on the Watershed Tour

The watershed tour was a great success. There were presentations on and off the bus by speakers from most of the major entities involved in the Task Force. The most consistent feedback was that tours should occur more often.

State Fair

The survey given at the Fountain Creek Vision Task Force booth had 420 responses. Overall, the response was supportive though there was some frustration with existing problems.

Fountain Creek Master Corridor Plan Update

THK will have a contract for the Fountain Creek Master Corridor Plan by the week of September 24, 2007. Carol Baker, Jay Winner, Kevin Shanks, and Heather Bergman will sit down once contract is signed and work on where the intersection of the two groups will occur.

Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) Meeting and Recommendations from the Army Corps of Engineers (Army Corps) Study Review

- ❖ There was a discussion of the project specific recommendations, general recommendations, and the expectations of the Army Corps. The recommendations are preliminary and no final decisions have been made. The TAC requested additional data on the recommendations including feasibility, rationale, and the likelihood of funding.
- ❖ The Army Corps is looking for project specific input from the cities and counties. They would like this information by the end of September. The Army Corps would like to wait for city and county input before doing any draft changes so there is only one revision. There will be public meetings to review the draft with the public.
- ❖ A few members of the Consensus Committee expressed concern that it is not clear what the recommendations are going to accomplish. The recommendations focus on the upper reaches of Fountain Creek, and it is not clear to some what the impacts of the projects will be on the watershed as a whole. The Consensus Committee also found recreation and water rights to be missing from the Army Corps recommendations.
- ❖ Heather Bergman will ask Charles Wilson to come to a meeting in person or by telephone to explain the updated recommendations once released.

Update on the Peak to Prairie grant proposal to Great Outdoors Colorado

Colorado Open Lands submitted a grant proposal for \$7.4 million. December 2007 is the date for the GOCO funding decision.

Next Full Task Force Meeting

- ❖ Rescheduling of the Task Force meeting on September 27, 2007 is necessary.
- ❖ The Consensus Committee agreed that it is best to have a meeting in each community.
- ❖ The Consensus Committee wants to use the upcoming Task Force meeting to catch the members up with where the Fountain Creek Vision Task Force is, introduce the Top Ten, and spend a shorter amount of time with maps having the Front Range Trail as the focal point.
- ❖ The Consensus Committee also agreed to pay for better advertising for the Task Force meeting.
- ❖ Ross Vincent and Carole Lange will work on a meeting space in Pueblo.
- ❖ Walter Lawson will work on a meeting place in Fountain.
- ❖ The next Task Force meetings are October 22, 2007 from 6:00-9:00 pm in Pueblo and October 23, 2007 from 6:00-9:00 pm in Fountain.

**Fountain Creek Vision Task Force
Consensus Committee
October 19, 2007
Final Meeting Summary**

Attending

Carol Baker, Gary Barber, Mary Barber, Jeff Chostner, Dennis Darrow, Mike Fink, Ferris Frost, Mark Glidden, Jerry Heimlicher, Dan Henrichs, Juniper Katz, Irene Kornelly, Carole Lange, Dennis Maroney, Bruce McCormick, Tom Ready, Jane Rhodes, Kevin Shanks, Richard Skorman, Larry Small, Parry Thomas, Ross Vincent, Jay Winner, Meggan Yoest, Niki Koszalka, and Heather Bergman

Action Items

Jeff Chostner	Present the Colorado Department of Local Affairs grant opportunity to Pueblo Area Council of Government (PACOG)
Rich Muzzy	Present the Colorado Department of Local Affairs grant opportunity to PPACG
Heather Bergman	Provide Consensus Committee with a list of working group attendees and whom they represent

New and Pressing Issues in the Watershed

- ❖ Pat Edelmann presented a report on the Fountain Creek watershed at the USGS. Heather Bergman will contact Pat about the electronic availability of the report.

Funding Updates

- ❖ For September, there is a \$6,100 unpaid balance due to The Keystone Center. An estimated \$8,400 is due for October. The Keystone Center is unable to continue working without payment and needs commitment on receiving past due payments.
- ❖ Consensus Committee members agreed to discuss funding with their respective boards, councils, and organizations.

Full Task Force Meetings

- ❖ The Task Force meetings will be based on a review with the public of the Top 10 Lessons We Have Learned about Fountain Creek.
- ❖ Heather Bergman will use the polling software to find out what issues are most important to the public. She will also invite the public to provide ideas about how to get information out to the public.
- ❖ Richard Skorman will start the meetings with a short introduction and the vision for the Fountain Creek watershed.
- ❖ These meetings determine if the public feels the Task Force is on the right track.

Fountain Creek Corridor Master Plan Contractors (THK and Associates)

- ❖ The Fountain Creek Corridor Master Plan (FCCMP) is the implementation plan for part of the watershed while the Task Force works on the strategic plan for the entire watershed.

- ❖ THK plans to produce maps by mid-November. THK will need the help of the Fountain Creek Vision Task Force. THK will need information learned from the Army Corps of Engineers (The Corps) and the Task Force. Specifically, THK wants a summary of goals, objectives, and strategies by Thanksgiving. With this information, THK can move forward and report its progress to the Task Force in March or April.
- ❖ THK will also provide technical support to the Funding Options and Implementation Working Group. This support will be non-directive and provide background information. THK's goal in assisting the Funding Group is to help find a management and/or funding entity for the watershed.
- ❖ The Greenway Foundation and Urban Drainage have extended an invitation to the Task Force to take a tour of their work on the South Platte River in Denver.

Questions and Answers

It was suggested that the master plan would be done in 2 years. Is there a concrete plan to achieve that?

The hope is to have the plan done in one year and the actual implementation phase in the second year. THK will debrief the Task Force on the implementation phase as soon as it is applicable.

Does THK want to be in partnership with the Task Force?

Yes, THK does want to work with the Fountain Creek Vision Task Force.

If THK's scope is less than the full watershed, what is the scope?

The scope is from the southern city limits of Colorado Springs to the confluence. THK also plans to look at the riparian areas. THK and Thomas & Thomas are both mapping but their scopes of mapping are different.

Are copies of the project schedule available?

Yes. The end date will not change but some of the dates and options may change. THK will consider putting the schedule on a website that could reflect the changes.

If the scope is starting south of Colorado Springs and ending at the confluence, are you going to talk to the property owners?

Yes, THK plans to do a lot of outreach.

Will THK work with the stormwater enterprise?

Yes.

Funding Opportunities

Update on 319 proposal to Colorado Department of Public Health and Environment (CDPHE) (Scott Hobson, City of Pueblo)

- ❖ Scott Hobson has taken on responsibility of the 319 grant. The Task Force asked him to put together a proposal on sediment removal along Fountain Creek. The Streamside System is a 20-foot structure to remove sediment without dredging. The

Streamside System separates the sediment according to size and removes it from the river. It is necessary to determine if there is a commercial value in selling the gravel.

- ❖ The location of the Streamside System is in the City of Pueblo, upstream from the Eighth Street Bridge, and two miles from the confluence of Fountain Creek.
- ❖ There are maintenance and ongoing costs for the Streamside System. The test period is only 30 days. If there is the possibility of self-funding (from the gravel), there could be an option of installing several more in Fountain Creek. The Fountain Creek Vision Task Force would like to submit the 319 proposal at the end of 2007.

Questions and Answers

Is it important to look at E. coli as well as sediment?

There will be testing for E. coli and source information will also be included.

When will this testing happen?

The testing will probably occur in February or March.

Will the Fountain Creek Vision Task Force own this structure?

That is not clear at this time.

What are the results of this technology in other markets?

On the east coast, it has been very successful.

Do you have to get a mining permit in order to resell the gravel?

This is a good question. There is needed investigation to determine if there are mineral rights associated with the property and if there are permits required for the removal.

Can you accurately estimate how much sediment will be removed in a 30-day test period?

Yes, and this would be important to include in the grant application.

Colorado Department of Local Affairs Opportunity

- ❖ The Consensus Committee needs a group of participants willing to take on writing a grant to the Colorado Department of Local Affairs. Rich Muzzy from Pikes Peak Area Council Government (PPACG) is willing to present it to his board. Jeff Chostner would be happy to take this back to Pueblo Area Council of Government (PACOG).

Working Group Progress Review and Assessment

- ❖ Water Working Group update
 - Key activities in recent months:
 - ❖ Did a policy review to assess opportunities for improvement in permitting and other decisions
 - ❖ Outlined better policies that can guide improved decision making affecting stormwater runoff and other key issues
 - ❖ Decided to plan a policy workshop to share findings of review and improved policy ideas with elected officials and staff planners

- ❖ Looked at 319 grant opportunity to begin addressing E. coli and sedimentation
 - Upcoming discussions include erosion, stabilization, and sediment transport.
 - The Consensus Committee feels that the Water Working Group is on target.
 - The Colorado Water Conservation Board (CWCB) grant has work for the Water Working Group. The Water Working Group must prepare a written summary of current conditions in the watershed regarding issues the Working Group is addressing. Assignments will be discussed at the next Working Group meeting.
- ❖ Land Use/Environment Group
 - The Task Force says the key interests are:
 - ❖ Watershed as an asset and an amenity
 - ❖ Greenway connector between communities and commuting opportunities
 - ❖ Recreation opportunities
 - ❖ Agriculture, as part of the cultural heritage and quality of life of this area, needs to be protected, preserved and enhanced
 - ❖ Wildlife for its own sake and as an indicator of ecosystem health needs protection
 - ❖ Viewshed maintained
 - The Consensus Committee feels addressing current and future development is important.
 - The Consensus Committee wants, in the long term, a chart with interests in one column and strategies in the other. A small group of the Water Working Group is currently working on benchmarking. Heather Bergman will provide the Consensus Committee with a list of who is attending meetings and whom they represent.
 - The Colorado Water Conservation Board (CWCB) grant has work for the Land Use and Environment Working Group. The Working Group must prepare a written summary of current conditions in the watershed regarding issues the Working Group is addressing. Assignments will be discussed at the next Working Group meeting.
- ❖ Funding Options Working Group
 - The Funding Option group is working toward funding for long-term implementation. Some members of the Consensus Committee were not clear about this, and Heather will be sure to send a clarifying email to the Task Force listserv.

Consensus Committee Protocols Review and Assessment

- ❖ The Consensus Committee discussed the need to maintain high levels of participation in Consensus Committee meetings. The group discussed the possibility of having alternates attend meetings, changing meeting times, and other mechanisms for maintaining participation. It was agreed that Consensus Committee members can send alternatives if they desire, but there will be no formal system for designating “official” alternatives. Members and their alternates are responsible for keeping one another informed of activities at meetings. It was also agreed that Consensus

Committee members should RSVP to all future meetings, and the facilitator will cancel any meeting at which attendance will be low or lacking in diversity.

- ❖ The Consensus Committee would like further education on the “consensus model” of decision making at the next meeting. Heather will prepare a presentation so the group can review this approach.

**Fountain Creek Vision Task Force
Consensus Committee
November 16, 2007
Final Meeting Summary**

Attending

Tom Autobee, Carol Baker, Gary Barber, Mary Barber, Jeff Chostner, Sallie Clark, John Cordova, Dennis Darrow, Ferris Frost, Kim Headly, Dennis Hisey, Jim Hook, Jeri Howells, Mary Jaurequi, Irene Kornelly, Carole Lange, Dennis Maroney, Bruce McCormick, Steve Miller, Bob Miner, Rich Muzzy, Larry Patterson, Joe Rall, Gary Rapp, Sandy Rayl, Tom Ready, Jane Rhodes, Henrietta Robinson, Richard Skorman, Larry Small, Parry Thomas, Ross Vincent, Niki Koszalka, and Heather Bergman

New and Pressing Issues in the Watershed

- ❖ The Water Quality Control Commission posed and approved an amendment to El Paso 208, allowing for a new water treatment plant.
- ❖ The City of Pueblo is beginning discussion of the annexation of McCullough Ranch. There is the possibility of a donation of 350 acres on Fountain Creek to State Parks or the City of Pueblo for the Front Range Trail. Between State Parks and the Great Outdoors Colorado (GOCO) grant, there may be \$5 million available for the Front Range Trail.
- ❖ Anderson consulting is mapping the floodplain on Fountain Creek and is planning to remove an old railroad bridge.
- ❖ Discussed at the October Task Force meetings in Pueblo and Colorado Springs were outreach mechanism ideas. Please submit further ideas to Heather Bergman, Carol Baker, Carole Lange, or Irene Kornelly. Carol Baker will ask the Outreach Committee to ponder drafting a consistent opinion-editorial (op-ed) piece. This piece would be a non-technical update on the public process and then personalized for the entities that are collaborating and working together.
- ❖ In December, there is an agriculture water workshop. Bob Miner will find out more information.

Update on Mapping for the Colorado Water Conservation Board Grant (Parry Thomas and Jim Hook)

- ❖ Thomas and Thomas will take information from the Consensus Committee (funneled through Heather Bergman) and create a basin-wide map.
- ❖ Thomas and Thomas is taking information from different cities and counties to compile into a map. Currently, they are working with a baseline map and will have continued and more formal discussions with entities. In January, Thomas and

Thomas plan to have a good map with baseline information including information from the Army Corps of Engineers (Corps).

Questions and Answers

Have you talked to any farmers and ranchers?

Not yet. However, Thomas and Thomas will assist Juniper Katz with the Front Range Trail planning, which will involve extensive work with farmers, ranchers, and landowners.

There is already a statewide map showing accepted and certified wetlands, would this help Thomas & Thomas' planning?

This information is included in the Corps study under wetlands and includes specific criteria as to what is an actual wetland. It would be helpful.

Will you focus on mapping existing conditions?

Thomas and Thomas will work on existing conditions.

How is the map to be available?

It will be available electronically but they will be large files. A GIS database for this project is to be developed.

Funding Update

Unmet Keystone Costs

- ❖ Originally, the estimated unmet Keystone costs were \$14,000. The actual amount is \$11,074. The Consensus Committee has committed \$10,463 leaving a shortfall of \$611.
- ❖ The Keystone Center and Thomas and Thomas will not receive their last payments until the Colorado Water Conservation Board (CWCB) receives the final document.

Grant Opportunities Update/Plan

Update from Scott Hobson on the 319-grant opportunity.

- ❖ On December 12, Rich Muzzy will attend a workshop by the Non-Point Source Alliance, which provides technical support to the 319 program.
- ❖ Dennis Maroney will work with Scott Hobson on the writing and reviewing of the 319 grant.

Colorado Heritage Grant, Department of Local Affairs (DOLA)

- ❖ The deadline for the Colorado Heritage Grant is November 30, 2007.
- ❖ Rich Muzzy will write the grant. Sallie Clark, Larry Small, and Dennis Hisey will work to determine sponsorship of the grant.

Funding Options and Implementation Working Group (FOIWG) Update

- ❖ The FOIWG has met three times. It has a preliminary list of functions/criteria for a funding/management entity for review by the Consensus Committee.
- ❖ The FOIWG also asked the Consensus Committee to review a preliminary list of substantive areas for a funding/management entity. Included in the preliminary list

are flood control, land use, water quality, water quantity, stormwater management, floodplain management, erosion, sedimentation, wetlands, and operations and maintenance. Additions the Consensus Committee agreed upon are recreation, wildlife habitat/ecosystem management, and flood/stormwater control.

- ❖ FOIWG had a primary list of functions/criteria for a funding/management entity for the Consensus Committee to review. The Consensus Committee wants the following additions to this list:
 - Apolitical entity/non-partisan
 - Innovative BMPs
 - Integral conflict resolution
 - Inventive construction, including retro-fitting
 - Administrative staffing/support for entity
 - Motivating incentives
 - Thorough collection and dissemination of data
- ❖ The Consensus Committee also wants to see prioritization moved up on the preliminary functions/criteria list.
- ❖ FOIWG has several options for the Consensus Committee to review for the best path forward in learning about the options for funding entities and informing the public.
 - Option One
 - FOIWG learns about options at its own meetings, determines next approach
 - FOIWG holds public meeting to summarize key elements of options, explains criteria, and explains recommendations
 - FOIWG gives presentations to elected bodies on options and asks for feedback
 - FOIWG takes feedback from public and/or elected officials and reconsiders/revises recommendations
 - FOIWG brings final recommendation to Consensus Committee
 - Option Two
 - FOIWG, with the help of THK, hosts an all-day workshop open to the public
 - FOIWG starts meeting with summary of criteria for a funding entity for Fountain Creek Watershed
 - FOIWG has experts available to discuss the different options
 - FOIWG hosts breakout groups to discuss which options work out best in light of criteria. The breakout groups then devise their own solutions
 - FOIWG has participants come back together in plenary to hear different options from breakout groups and discuss.
 - FOIWG takes options from breakout groups and feedback from discussion at meeting and prepares a recommendation for the Consensus Committee
 - Option Three
 - FOIWG learns about options and determines next approach (es)
 - FOIWG hosts possible meetings with elected officials in chambers to keep apprised

- FOIWG, with THK’s help, hosts an all-day workshop to present criteria and recommendation, learn about options from experts, do break-out groups to discuss, and come back to plenary to share comments/ask questions
 - FOIWG integrates comments from workshop into a refined recommendation for CC review
 - Options: Considerations
 - Will a review of the recommended options from FOIWG members pass muster with the community?
 - Will elected officials and residents want to learn about the options and generate ideas themselves?
 - Will elected officials and residents come to an all-day workshop, stay all day, and participate?
 - Will elected officials feel comfortable asking hard questions and having frank discussions in a public workshop?
 - What is the best use of THK’s expertise and available funding for this issue?
 - How is the Task Force best served, in terms of time, knowledge, and expertise?
- ❖ The Consensus Committee agreed that FOIWG should proceed in the following manner:
 - Learn about options at the FOIWG meetings
 - Give presentations to elected bodies, council of governments, and entities
 - Hold public meeting to explain the recommendation
 - Have Consensus Committee members present at small meetings
 - Take all the considerations and revise recommendations as necessary
 - Hold an evening meeting with revised recommendation

**Fountain Creek Vision Task Force
Consensus Committee
January 18, 2008
Final Meeting Notes**

Attending

Carol Baker, Gary Barber, Mary Barber, Sallie Clark, John Cordova, Deiter Erdmann, Dan Henrichs, Dennis Hisey, Juniper Katz, Greg Langer, Dennis Maroney, Bruce McCormick, Rex Miller, Bob Miner, Margaret Mora, Rich Muzzy, Vera Ortegon, Larry Patterson, Jane Rawlings, Tom Ready, Jane Rhodes, Henrietta Robinson, Larry Small, Ross Vincent, Niki Koszalka, and Heather Bergman

Action Items

Gary Barber	Email Heather Bergman an update about the Colorado Water Conservation Board (CWCB) grant
Gary Barber	Revise the Residential/Commercial Development, Wetlands, Recreation, Stormwater, and Municipal Water Needs and Return

	Flows papers
Rich Muzzy	Draft a letter of support from the Fountain Creek Vision Task Force for Gary Barber's appointment to the Colorado Watershed Assembly board
Rich Muzzy	Revise the Sedimentation/Erosion and Water Quality papers
Bruce McCormick	Email Heather Bergman the papers he offered his staff to revise
Juniper Katz	Revise the Recreation paper
Juniper Katz and Deiter Erdmann	Revise the Agriculture paper
Dennis Maroney	Revise the Flooding paper
Mary Barber	Committed staff to revise the Wetlands and Wildlife papers
Consensus Committee	Review 319 grant proposal, write, and send letters of support
Heather Bergman	Ask Ferris Frost to revise the Industrial Land Use paper
Heather Bergman	Email Consensus Committee update from Gary Barber

New and Pressing Issues in the Watershed

- The Colorado Watershed Assembly asked Gary Barber to serve on their board on behalf of the Fountain Creek Vision Task Force. They will require a letter from the Task Force indicating that Gary can represent the group. Rich Muzzy will draft a letter of sponsorship for the Consensus Committee's review.
- At its last meeting, the Consensus Committee heard a report from the City of Pueblo about its progress on the grant application to the Colorado Department of Public Health and Environment for Section 319 funds to assist with a demonstration project to address E. coli and sedimentation on Fountain Creek. Pueblo drafted and submitted the grant application. Members of the Consensus Committee are encouraged to submit letters of support for the grant within two weeks.
- As part of the Great Outdoors Colorado (GOCO) grant for Fountain Creek and the surrounding prairie area, land on the property of Jane Rhodes and her family will be protected.

Financial Update

- All contributions from the Consensus Committee for September and October facilitation costs have all been received. Keystone appreciates the group's generosity of prompt response to the billing situation.
- The state has yet to process the purchase order required for Keystone to bill against the Colorado Water Conservation Board grant for facilitation costs from November on. However, Gary Barber is in communications with the appropriate person and believes that the situation will be resolved shortly.

Reports on Group Discussions

The Consensus Committee discussed and reported on the "current conditions" documents prepared by the working groups.

- Wetlands
 - The group liked the following:

- The section relating to the creation of wetlands/opportunities
 - The group had the following concerns:
 - None
 - The group had the following questions:
 - How can wetlands be incorporated as part of working landscapes of ranches and farms?
 - Where is the predominance of wetlands? (Include the type and functional status)
 - Do utilities get credit for cleaning water with wetlands?
 - Do wetlands affect water rights or vice versa?
 - Is there a difference between natural and created wetlands?
 - Should there be more discussion of wetland vegetation, habitat, and wildlife?
 - Should wetland banking be described?
 - Are there any instances of wetland banking occurring in the watershed?
 - Are there any references that could be cited on wetlands filtration?
 - The group suggested the following changes:
 - Include a description of wetlands in Monument Creek Basin
 - Need more information on health and stability of wetlands; what are the dynamics of wetland loss and creation?
- Stormwater Management
 - The group liked the following:
 - Good information on National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit and water quality issues
 - The group had the following concerns:
 - Need to address existing watershed conditions
 - Address retrofit opportunities
 - Possible overlap on water quality issues
 - The group had the following questions:
 - What are the exact references?
 - The group suggested the following changes:
 - Address the Army Corps of Engineers recommendations
 - Address policy workshop including Low Impact Development (LID)
 - Thermal pollution
 - Add run-off volume concerns for increased impervious areas
- Recreation
 - The group liked the following:
 - Good general background information
 - Good information on existing trails/open space
 - Inclusion of what the Fountain Creek Vision Task Force wants accomplished
 - The group had the following concerns:
 - No implementation plan
 - Need to identify prioritized improvements in stretches of the creek

- Include the topic of dogs including on or off leash, access or not, and the impact on wildlife
 - No financial/cost information, area maps, timetable, or mention of equestrian use
 - Needs inclusion of details for the Front Range Trail including aesthetics, facilities, parking, and property right issues
 - The group would like the following added to the document
 - Subheadings
 - Hunting
 - Wildlife viewing including birding, access, and comfort
 - Upstream areas: Pikes Peak south slop access, top of Cheyenne mountain, Ute Pass, Black Forest, and Palmer Lake
 - ATV's and multi-use areas
 - The group had the following questions:
 - How will the trail be accessible to the community?
 - Are maps going to be created?
 - Are there going to be trails for motorized and non-motorized combined use?
 - The group suggested the following changes:
 - None
- Flood Control
 - The group liked the following:
 - Document covered the subject matter well
 - The group had the following concerns:
 - Current mitigation including NPDES and stormwater enterprise
 - Current condition on tributaries
 - The group had the following questions:
 - Who are the key players in the mitigation process?
 - What role does Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) play?
 - What improvements have been made to reduce the impacts of flooding?
 - How has recent development, in the past 5-10 years, affected the creek?
 - The group suggested the following changes:
 - Need more current conditions on the tributaries that contribute to Fountain Creek
 - Include information from prior studies
- Municipal Water Needs and Return Flows
 - The group liked the following:
 - Document was well written and very descriptive
 - The group had the following concerns:
 - Need to address the demand for municipal uses with a summary; non-native dependent uses; how to replace non-renewing sources like Denver Basin
 - The group had the following questions:

- None
 - The group had the following changes:
 - Add information on the recharge of alluvium and how this keeps well water available
 - Add water use by other than those listed; include Manitou Springs, Monument, and others within the drainage
 - Include an indoor water use percentage
 - Define and distinguish “used” and “consumed”
 - Clarify re-use accounting section
 - Include data from other watershed municipal users
- Wildlife
 - The group liked the following:
 - Good Endangered Species (ESA) coverage
 - Good background on current conditions
 - Well written
 - Addressed sedimentation and erosion
 - The group had the following concerns:
 - No coverage of non-ESA species
 - More habitat discussion concerning vegetation/food, cover, and diversity of habitat types
 - Focus more on the Creek rather than the watershed
 - No Colorado, United States, or County wildlife specialists were utilized for input
 - Balance in agriculture statements
 - Environmental Policy Agency (EPA) is not the only standard for healthy riparian habitat
 - The group had the following questions:
 - Is there hunting and fishing in the watershed?
 - What diseases appear in wildlife?
 - What is the status of healthy wildlife in the watershed?
 - What impact do invasive species have on wildlife and habitat?
 - What types of controls are being implemented by jurisdictions in the watershed?
 - What are the impacts of pollutants on habitat and wildlife?
 - Would including the water needs section in water quality or other papers be helpful?
 - The group suggested the following changes:
 - Address habitat as it specifically relates to existing aquatic and other wildlife species
 - Addition of educational programs for all wildlife issues
 - Remove the statement about thermal stability
 - Add a cross reference between wildlife and wetlands within the Fountain Creek watershed
- Water Quality
 - The group liked the following:

- Agree the paper was well written and described terms so that the lay person could understand
 - The group had the following concerns:
 - None
 - The group had the following questions:
 - None
 - The group suggested the following changes:
 - In the standards and classification section, where does Fountain Creek fit in
 - Need more information as to why nitrogen and phosphorus are higher in Fountain Creek than in the Arkansas River
 - Want more information on the unregulated pollutants
 - Address the quality and quantity of the data including how correct
 - Need to touch on the studies that are already in existence
- Residential and Commercial Development
 - The group liked the following:
 - Good description of problem and issues
 - Outlines impacts of development on watershed nicely
 - Structure of paper is good
 - Document discusses projected growth
 - Referenced development approaches to impacts including growth management and control
 - Discusses impervious surfaces
 - Explores the issues of water need
 - Talks about various municipalities, counties, and military bases
 - The group had the following concerns:
 - Length of the paper
 - The statement of issue did not mention public health
 - Consistency in description of cities, counties, and Fort Carson
 - Needs to address impact mitigation approaches including wetlands as a positive mitigation
 - Land planning related to watershed improvement, preservation, and health
 - Needs to identify government codes that pertain to watershed
 - The group had the following questions:
 - To what extent are recent employment numbers, especially in construction, reflective of temporary jobs?
 - How much of growth is permanent?
 - Is there a way the Fountain Creek Vision Task Force can influence the impact of existing development on the Creek?
 - The group suggested the following changes:
 - Communicate land planning along the Creek including future projects, utilities gravel pits and all infrastructure
 - Pueblo “city” needs inclusion
 - Growth planning
 - Property rights vs. develop rights as related to planning

- Eliminate the table as it is redundant with the text
- Sedimentation/Erosion
 - The group liked the following:
 - Consider paper well written and accurate but limited in scope
 - The group had the following concerns:
 - None
 - The group had the following questions:
 - None
 - The group suggested the following changes:
 - Need document to reference the different amounts of sediment in different areas of Fountain Creek; need more information on kinds of sediment and on bedload characteristics
 - Clarify the confusion around base flow (return flows) vs. channel forming (storms)
 - Need to reference work that has been done by the Army Corps of Engineers
- Industrial Land Use
 - The group liked the following:
 - Consider paper well written and accurate but limited in scope
 - Addressing of all of the current industrial projects
 - The group had the following concerns:
 - Concern is if Pueblo Springs proposes any industrial components and any impacts yet to be realized from the Lafarge gravel pit
 - The group had the following questions:
 - None
 - The group suggested the following changes:
 - Include information on future projects including all gravel mining, planned toll roads, Pikes Peak Raceway, and the highway project on Ute pass
 - Update or eliminate projects as necessary
- Agriculture
 - The group liked the following:
 - Well written document
 - The group had the following concerns:
 - Rely on statistics and tremendous amount of write up may have been taken out of the Basin Water Paper
 - The group had the following questions:
 - None
 - The group suggested the following changes:
 - Need to introduce a balance in the discussion of impacts to watershed and water use; there are seven paragraphs on wasteful water due to agriculture and two sentences on the positives
 - Need to include that small landowners and minor ranch operations with confined or corralled horse and cattle do not have a significant impact on water quality
 - Include the issue of water law discouraging efficiency in water use

- Change the section on vegetable production in the basin; it is quite limited
- Embrace the region as it once was a big and historical agriculture zone
- Clarify that land and water conservation practices are encouraged by the agriculture community in the Fountain Creek watershed
- Needs input from the Natural Resources Conservation Services (NRCS)

Next Steps for Current Conditions Documents

- Gary Barber offered to work on the revisions of the Residential/Commercial Development, Wetlands, Recreation, Stormwater, and Municipal Water Needs and Return Flow papers.
- Bruce McCormick offered his staff to revise the Municipal Water Needs and Return Flows paper.
- Juniper Katz offered to revise the Recreation paper.
- Juniper Katz and Deiter Erdmann offered to revise the Agriculture paper.
- Dennis Maroney offered to revise the Flooding paper.
- Rich Muzzy offered to revise the Water Quality paper.
- Mary Barber committed her staff to revising the Wetlands and Wildlife papers.
- Rich Muzzy offered to work on the Sedimentation/Erosion paper.
- Heather Bergman committed to ask Ferris Frost to revise the Industrial Land Uses paper and offer her the help of Larry Patterson and Bob Miner.

**Fountain Creek Vision Task Force
Consensus Committee
September 21, 2007
Final Meeting Summary**

Attending

Tom Autabee, Carol Baker, Gary Barber, Mary Barber, Sharon Brown, Ron Enserro, Kristin Flannery, Ferris Frost, Jane Green, Jeri Howell, Juniper Katz, Irene Kornelly, Carole Lange, Bruce McCormick, Bob Miner, Heather Maio, Steve Miller, Rich Muzzy, Larry Patterson, Jane Rawlings, Sandy Rayl, Ken Sampley, Kevin Shanks, Larry Small, Ross Vincent, Jay Winner, Chris Woodka, Niki Koszalka, and Heather Bergman

Action Items

Heather Bergman	Ask Charles Wilson to come to a meeting, in person or on the telephone, once the revised recommendations are released.
Heather Bergman	Add a discussion of participation and a review of the protocols to the agenda for the next Consensus Committee agenda.

New and Pressing Issues in the Watershed

Colorado Water Conservation Board (CWCB) Grant

- ❖ The CWCB asked the Fountain Creek Vision Task Force for more clarity in the grant application. The Task Force submitted a letter, further explaining the grant proposal.
- ❖ The Task Force will be required to quantify consumptive and non-consumptive uses of water in the watershed, establish the status of existing plans and projects for consumptive and non-consumptive uses, and propose potential projects. There is existing data to quantify consumptive and non-consumptive uses.

319 Grant Proposal

- ❖ The goals for the Section 319 grant proposal to the Colorado Department of Public Health and Environment are water quality improvements in the watershed through reduction of sediment and E. coli and the use of the Streamside Systems sediment removal technology.
- ❖ Approximately \$259,000 from the Lower Arkansas Basin Roundtable would support the Streamside System hardware and \$300,000 from the 319 grant would support the stream and sediment sampling. This money would also support the research of best management practices (BMP) for sediment and E. coli reduction.
- ❖ The 319 grant needs a 40% match, which can be in-kind.

Report on the Watershed Tour

The watershed tour was a great success. There were presentations on and off the bus by speakers from most of the major entities involved in the Task Force. The most consistent feedback was that tours should occur more often.

State Fair

The survey given at the Fountain Creek Vision Task Force booth had 420 responses. Overall, the response was supportive though there was some frustration with existing problems.

Fountain Creek Master Corridor Plan Update

THK will have a contract for the Fountain Creek Master Corridor Plan by the week of September 24, 2007. Carol Baker, Jay Winner, Kevin Shanks, and Heather Bergman will sit down once contract is signed and work on where the intersection of the two groups will occur.

Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) Meeting and Recommendations from the Army Corps of Engineers (Army Corps) Study Review

- ❖ There was a discussion of the project specific recommendations, general recommendations, and the expectations of the Army Corps. The recommendations are preliminary and no final decisions have been made. The TAC requested additional data on the recommendations including feasibility, rationale, and the likelihood of funding.
- ❖ The Army Corps is looking for project specific input from the cities and counties. They would like this information by the end of September. The Army Corps would like to wait for city and county input before doing any draft changes so there is only one revision. There will be public meetings to review the draft with the public.
- ❖ A few members of the Consensus Committee expressed concern that it is not clear what the recommendations are going to accomplish. The recommendations focus on the upper reaches of Fountain Creek, and it is not clear to some what the impacts of the projects will be on the watershed as a whole. The Consensus Committee also found recreation and water rights to be missing from the Army Corps recommendations.
- ❖ Heather Bergman will ask Charles Wilson to come to a meeting in person or by telephone to explain the updated recommendations once released.

Update on the Peak to Prairie grant proposal to Great Outdoors Colorado

Colorado Open Lands submitted a grant proposal for \$7.4 million. December 2007 is the date for the GOCO funding decision.

Next Full Task Force Meeting

- ❖ Rescheduling of the Task Force meeting on September 27, 2007 is necessary.
- ❖ The Consensus Committee agreed that it is best to have a meeting in each community.
- ❖ The Consensus Committee wants to use the upcoming Task Force meeting to catch the members up with where the Fountain Creek Vision Task Force is, introduce the Top Ten, and spend a shorter amount of time with maps having the Front Range Trail as the focal point.
- ❖ The Consensus Committee also agreed to pay for better advertising for the Task Force meeting.
- ❖ Ross Vincent and Carole Lange will work on a meeting space in Pueblo.
- ❖ Walter Lawson will work on a meeting place in Fountain.
- ❖ The next Task Force meetings are October 22, 2007 from 6:00-9:00 pm in Pueblo and October 23, 2007 from 6:00-9:00 pm in Fountain.

**Fountain Creek Vision Task Force
Consensus Committee
April 25, 2008
Draft Meeting Summary**

Attendance

Tom Autobee, Gary Barber, Mary Barber, Carol Baker, Sharon Brown, Perry Cabot, Jeff Chostner, Jerry Cordova, Dennis Darrow, Ferris Frost, Dwight Gardner, Jane Green, Merle Grimes, Dan Henrichs, Dennis Hisey, Jim Houk, Juniper Katz, Loretta Kennedy, Carole Lange, Dennis Maroney, Bruce McCormick, Steve Miller, Ron Mitchell, Margaret Montano, Rich Muzzy, Annie Oatman-Gardner, Vera Ortegon, Sal Pace, Jane Rhodes, Debbie Rose, Kevin Shanks, Larry Small, Casey Swanson, Ross Vincent, Niki Koszalka, and Heather Bergman

New and Pressing Issues in the Watershed

- The Raptor Center gave an award for environmental leadership to Margaret Montano.
- The Fountain Creek Corridor Master Plan (FCCMP) team is giving a presentation to the Water and Land Use/Environment Working Groups 1:30 p.m. - 3:30 p.m. on May 6th. They are also hosting an open house for landowners at 6:30 p.m. on May 28th.
- David Struthers and Richard Lawrence attended this month's Funding Options and Project Implementation Working Group to announce the creation of the Fountain Creek Foundation (FCF), which will work to garner funds for education and outreach projects on Fountain Creek. David and Richard both have ties to the area and hope to work with the Task Force as efforts move ahead.

Demonstration Projects in the Fountain Creek Corridor Master Plan (Kevin Shanks and Merle Grimes)

- The goals for the FCCMP are to:
 - Improve watershed health by reducing erosion, sedimentation, and flooding as well as improving water quality;
 - Create stable riparian and wetland ecosystems to attract and support native wildlife and vegetation;
 - Sustain productive agricultural lands along corridor;
 - Lay-out trail from Colorado Springs to Pueblo with recreational and educational opportunities; and
 - Gain public and private support through partnerships to facilitate implementation and future funding.
- The FCCMP will have demonstration projects to show people what can be done on the Creek. Urban Drainage took this approach and had great success. Demonstration projects are considered low-hanging fruit. The FCCMP will look for easy partnerships and opportunities. The partners will also have to be committed to the goals as well as be in the position to bring some money or resources to the project.
- **Demonstration Project: The Environmental Stewardship Center**
 - The Environmental Stewardship Center will be in Pueblo County and will represent man's interrelationship with the Creek including cultural, historical issues, and future development. A number of wetlands will be

created to show the opportunities for water quality improvements, flood capacity issues, and wildlife habitat. One goal is to educate people as to what makes Fountain Creek great. The vision is for people to have both a physical and electronic portal to the Creek. Small towers will be erected at tree level height allowing people to see the oxbow area, the beaver village, and the old Pinion Bridge. There is the opportunity to showcase a bank stabilization demonstration.

- **Demonstration Project: Eco-Fit Park**
 - Eco-Fit Park would take the concepts of the Environmental Stewardship Center and carry them through the watershed with several satellite parks. There will be camera views available online of the Environmental Stewardship Center and the Creek itself. The development will be near the Vineyards Golf Course. Any experience is enhanced if it is a hands-on project, even more so if it is a family project. Different aspects of the Eco-Fit Park include:
 - Play areas and hands-on education;
 - Back water channel with wetlands;
 - Towers will be connected to the internet; and
 - Trails.

Questions and Answers

Is the land in the Pueblo Springs Ranch area getting donated?

The landowner is donating it, which also provides the FCCMP with a tax benefit.

The area mentioned at Pueblo Springs Ranch and the old Pinion Bridge borders on a private landowner's property. Why have landowners not been consulted?

FCCMP has every intention of sitting down with the landowners and discussing their needs. Some funding opportunities came about, and THK decided to take on demonstration projects even though it seems other steps, like consulting with landowners, should have been taken previously.

These are interesting projects, but is it possible to see more projects to support the people with the most need, such as those on Pueblo's East Side?

The THK team is discussing work in Pueblo by the confluence. Eco-Fit is a perfect fit for Pueblo and would be a good way to encourage economic revitalization and urban redevelopment. It is a high priority to get something going in Pueblo.

Presentation of Opportunities and Constraints Maps (Jim Houk)

- The methodology going forward to create a vision maps is based on the methodology used by the Lower Arkansas Basin Round Table. The Task Force maps will build on the existing data that has emerged from the watershed study, city/county participation, and the work of other entities in the watershed.
- These maps aggregate positive and negative attributes in the watershed onto two maps, one showing threats or constraints and one showing positive attributes or opportunities. There is another map that shows the estimated net percent of

impervious coverage change over time, although there is some question as to when the highest levels of anticipated build-out and imperviousness will be achieved.

- The Working Groups will discuss and review these maps at their next meeting, and a small group of Working Group participants will sit down with Jim Houk to further refine and improve the maps.
- The next step will be to create a vision map for the Task Force. This step is contingent on completion of the goals and strategies in the strategic plan. Once these are complete, Jim can begin to work with participants in the Working Group and on the Consensus Committee to prepare a map of the Task Force vision.
- All of the attributes on the maps are weighted equally. The Consensus Committee agreed to complete an online survey to indicate which, if any, attributes might be more important than the others. This information will be shared with the team from the Working Groups who will be meeting with Jim to refine the maps. The Consensus Committee will receive an update on the maps at their May meeting.

Group Discussion of Current Conditions, Goals, and Strategies

The Consensus Committee reviewed the current conditions papers, goals, and strategies that have been prepared by the Working Groups. They provided the following feedback on these documents. The Working Groups will revise these documents at their next meeting and forward improved documents to the Consensus Committee in May.

Flood Control

Current Conditions Paper AND Goals and Strategies

- The goals and strategies were well done .
- One participant voiced concerns over reducing runoff and how it relates to junior water rights elsewhere in the system. This issue needs to be addressed in the paper and in the strategies. Some participants feel that water rights are personal property rights and that stormwater runoff (which triggers junior water rights) is a right that cannot be infringed. Others feel that if the pre- and post-development hydrograph match, there is no disruption to water rights.
- At the next TAC (Technical Advisory Committee) meeting, there will be a discussion of a feasibility study of a dam on Fountain Creek. The TAC will report back to the group. Any developments from this meeting should be included in the flooding report—perhaps in the current conditions paper AND in the goals and strategies.

Water Quality

Current Conditions Paper

- Further information describing what has happened since 1977 on Fountain Creek needs to be added.
- The Consensus Committee requested the insertion of references to dates concerning the 303(d)—which year's list is being referenced in the document?

Goals and Strategies

- The goals and strategies were well written.

- The paper should include one or more pilot projects to test sediment and bedload sediment and to prove the efficiency of the wetlands to remove pollutants. (Wetlands pilot project could be in wetlands paper instead.)
- There needs to be a complete understanding of where E. coli is coming from. Do the strategies address this?
- In terms of missing data, there needs to be a strategy for compiling available data and making it publicly accessible.
- The last strategy might be better as the second strategy.

Land Use Planning

Current Conditions Paper

- The Consensus Committee felt the paper was good.
- It is important the footnotes are not just comments from the working groups. They also need to contain permit information on the technical sources of information and data.
- State demographer's information needs to be included as well and will be available in mid June.
- There is more information available today on the Pueblo Springs Ranch—this section should be updated.
- The anticipated water needs do not jive with the numbers for Fountain.

Goals and Strategies

- The Consensus Committee requested rephrasing of the first two strategies. They were unclear what they meant. The approaches mean low-impact development (LID), best management practices (BMPs), and evaluation of policy review. LID needs to be further investigated to see if it will interfere with water rights downstream.
- Perhaps strategies 1, 2, 5, and 8 could be combined.

Recreation

Current Conditions Paper

- The current conditions paper was well written.
- Recreational opportunities in the north of the Pueblo need to be included.

Goals and Strategies

- There is a strong community/group of people in bird watching with much influence. A specific location for future bird watching plans need to be identified.
- What about non-motorized recreation including bikes, horses, and canoeing?
- The zebra mussel issue needs inclusion in the goals and strategies.
- Strategy #1 needs to be inclusive only of the Fountain Creek watershed, not Wyoming to New Mexico.

Wildlife

Current Conditions Paper

The paper should report on the positive impacts to wildlife of development (such as continuous flows in Fountain Creek).

Goals and Strategies

None

Wetlands

Current Conditions Paper

- The group felt the document as a whole could use some wordsmithing.
- The group requested a discussion around the relationship of creating wetlands and water rights.

Goals and Strategies

- Add the desire to establish a wetlands pilot project to show the different ways they can be helpful.
- The difference in goals and strategies need to be discussed and revised.
- It would be good to have a strategy on wetlands banking.

Agriculture

Current Conditions Paper

- Clarify the relationship between water rights and conservation efforts.
- Clarify the relationship between Southern Delivery System (SDS) and water rights.
- Increased efficiencies are mentioned and a few pages later the creation of habitat is mentioned. Both cannot occur. Maximizing efficiency is a tradeoff to enjoying the wetlands.
- The language stating “reducing the consumptive use” needs to be clarified.

Goals and Strategies

- Agriculture viability is not an appropriate goal for this group.
- Increasing the pool of agriculture labor is also not appropriate.
- The preservation and protection of agriculture land and agriculture water is great.

Municipal Water

Current Conditions Paper

- The Consensus Committee felt the paper was very well written.
- There are many numbers in the document that raised some questions and need to be clarified.

Goals and Strategies

On strategy #5, change language from “limit water demands” to “lower water demands.”

Outreach

Current Conditions Paper

The Outreach Committee is working on current conditions and will have it completed before the next Consensus Committee meeting.

Goals and Strategies

- Prepare strategies for public engagement on the actual strategic plan prepared by the Fountain Creek Vision Task Force

Next Steps

At the May meeting, the Consensus Committee discuss water rights and how they are or are not affected by the goals and strategies outlined by the Working Groups. Gary Barber will invite Steve Witte from the Colorado Division of Water Resources to join in the discussion.

Fountain Creek Vision Task Force Consensus Committee September 5, 2008 Final Meeting Summary

Attending

Tom Autobee, Gary Barber, Mary Barber, Jeff Chostner, Sallie Clark, John Cordova, Jane Green, Dan Henrichs, Denis Hisey, Juniper Katz, Loretta Kennedy, Bruce McCormick, Gene Michael, Bob Miner, Rich Muzzy, Annie Oatman-Gardner, Vera Ortegon, Larry Patterson, Joe Rall, Tom Ready, Jane Rhodes, Larry Small, Ross Vincent, Niki Koszalka, and Heather Bergman

New and Pressing Issues in the Watershed

- The group discussed the Water Quality Control Division (WQCD) meeting in July and the associated perspectives and actions of Task Force members.
 - The goal of the July hearing was to determine based on current water quality conditions in Fountain Creek if the current “use protected” status for several stream segments in the Fountain Creek Watershed should remain or the stricter “reviewable” status should be applied instead. This change would require the CDPHE to review all future projects involving point sources of pollution. Ultimately, the CDPHE-Water Quality Control Commission (WQCC) decided to remove the Use Protected Status for stream segments 2a, 2b, 4 and 6.
 - Several entities that are represented on the Consensus Committee opposed this change. These entities cited several reasons for their respective opposition to this change:
 - WQCD data were flawed and were therefore not an acceptable basis for making such an important decision.
 - Current data indicate that non-point sources are the primary cause of pollution in Fountain Creek, so additional reviews of point sources will not result in improved water quality in the Creek
 - This change is unnecessary and costly and will divert money from projects that could improve conditions in and along the Creek.

- Other entities on the Consensus Committee supported this change because it would allow the public to review any new discharges into Fountain Creek.
- The facilitator discussed with the group that members of the Consensus Committee were surprised to learn that other members of the Committee were involved in this hearing. Some members of the Consensus Committee have expressed concern about this issue and how it might have negative consequences for the cohesiveness of the Task Force and the success of its efforts going forward.
- The facilitator reminded the members of the Consensus Committee that keeping one another informed about their actions related to Fountain Creek is important and can increase trust and transparency. She urged them to consider notifying one another in the future whenever they are taking any actions that could be construed as affecting water quality in Fountain Creek.

Review of the Draft Intergovernmental Agreement (IGA)

- The IGA outlines the anticipated governance structure for a funding and management entity for Fountain Creek and is a bridge to legislation. The document, initially, is a two-party agreement between El Paso County and Pueblo County. Once the IGA is signed, the Governing Board of the entity would be one representative each from Pueblo County and El Paso County, as well as one citizen member. Later, once the entity was created by legislation (see below), the Board would be one member each from:
 - El Paso County
 - City of Colorado Springs
 - City of Fountain
 - Pueblo County
 - City of Pueblo
 - Lower Arkansas Water Conservation District (LAVWCD)
 - Citizen Advisory Group
 - Pueblo citizenry
 - El Paso County small municipalities or general citizenry

- The entity would also include:
 - A technical advisory committee (TAC) that will determine where money is spent; the model for this approach is the Denver Urban Drainage and Flood Control District (UDFCD), which pays professional engineers or other professionals to consult with the Board
 - A Citizen Advisory Group (CAG), which would be based on the membership of the Consensus Committee but could be expanded to include other entities in the watershed
- Legislation will need to be submitted to the State House of Representatives if a legal entity for Fountain Creek is to be created. The legislation will be based on the special districts legislation that allowed for the creation of UDFCD, Title 32: Special Districts. A new “Part 9” would need to be added to this title to make it specific to Fountain Creek.

Discussion

- Some participants questioned the appropriateness of LAVWCD having a seat on the Board and suggested that perhaps it would be better to have one of the ditch associations hold that seat instead. Others felt it is best to leave the Board configuration as is. It was agreed that individuals with this concern should sit down with the team who drafted the IGA to discuss options for addressing it. Heather will try to coordinate a meeting.
- The Consensus Committee agreed that if a solution cannot be found to address this disagreement, then the draft IGA should be put before the public as is, with a note indicating that the LAVWCD seat is under discussion. This will give the public an opportunity weigh in on the issue as well.
- A participant felt that land protection should included in the IGA “whereas” section. Juniper Katz will work with Gary Barber to find agreeable language.

Questions/Answers

Would the TAC have a floating membership?

The idea of the TAC was taken from UDFCD. The Board would appoint three members of the TAC, who would then determine what additional assistance will be necessary.

Where are the professional committee members coming from?

There would be a single staff person as the engineer in charge, and others would hired on a contractual basis.

On the initial governing board, there is one County Commissioner from El Paso County, one from Pueblo County, and one citizen. Where is City of Pueblo?

Per previous agreements by the Consensus Committee, the counties would be the initial signatories. Other entities, including the City of Pueblo, could join the Board by signing the agreement.

Should the TAC and the CAG include the stormwater enterprises?

Both the TAC and the CAG could include the stormwater enterprises. Adding one or two utilities opens the door to having others join the TAC and CAG. This was a hard line to draw while drafting the IGA. Perhaps the stormwater enterprises could contribute via an

advisory board that would consult with the TAC or CAG. It is also important to limit the TAC and CAG to small enough number to remain manageable.

Will the entity derive funding from taxation?

Ideally, yes. The goal is to get a tax passed by the voters of El Paso and Pueblo Counties, all of whom are viewed as beneficiaries of the improvements to Fountain Creek.

What will the interaction between the TAC and the CAG look like?

The details of this have not yet been determined. This will be discussed at future meetings of the Funding Options Working Group.

How will the IGA be enforced?

The IGA will be enforced through incentives rather than punishments, which is the approach taken by UDFCD.

What if voters vote down the tax?

There will have to be additional funding options. To avoid this, it is important that the FCVTG is in agreement and presents a united front to both communities and builds on each county's strengths and weaknesses.

Review of the Strategic Plan

The working groups have completed their revisions on the issue chapters for the strategic plan and have submitted for review by the Consensus Committee.

Flooding Paper

- Jane Rhodes will work with Dennis Maroney and Ken Sampley to ensure that sufficient information is provided on the history of flooding in the watershed.
- After any additions on history, this paper is ready to be presented to the public.

Water Quality Paper

- This paper is ready to be presented to the public.

Land Use

- This paper is ready to be presented to the public.

Municipal Water

- Carol Baker and Gary Barber will work on creating a few more objectives to address the municipal water supply gap.

Recreation

- The Fountain Creek Corridor Master Plan is planning several new parks in the watershed. These parks are not mentioned in the recreation document. Juniper Katz and Carol Baker will craft language about the parks.
- It would be good to add information about any anticipated projects in Pueblo south of Highway 47. Margaret Montano will draft language to add to the plan.
- After the above changes, this paper is ready to be presented to the public.

Wetlands

- Juniper Katz will edit the wetlands paper to make it more understandable by lay readers.
- Once that is done, this paper is ready to be presented to the public.

Wildlife

- The name of the biologist from the Colorado Department of Wildlife needs to be checked. Otherwise, this paper is ready to be presented to the public.

Agriculture

- There was substantial discussion about what is appropriate to include in the plan regarding agriculture. The group did want to give the perception of prescribing actions to landowners, nor did it want to engage on topics outside participants' expertise, like labor supply and farmer/rancher retention programs.
- Ultimately, the Committee agreed to keep the agriculture goals in the strategic plan (because they are an important statement about the group's interest in maintaining agriculture in the watershed), but to not list strategies or action items for this issue.
- Annie Oatman-Gardner will work on a paragraph for the introduction portion of the agriculture paper to explain this difference to the reader.

Outreach

- This paper is ready to be presented to the public.

Other Changes Needed in Papers

- All "responsible entities" need to be members of the Consensus Committee. Non-members can be listed as partners in implementation.
- All 2008 dates in action plans will be changed to 2009.
- Heather will add language to the beginning of the paper to summarize the plan for implementation if the funding entity is not created and/or is not funded by tax money.

**Fountain Creek Vision Task Force
Consensus Committee
December 5, 2008
Meeting Summary**

Attending

Tom Autobee, Carol Baker, Gary Barber, Mary Barber, Stephanie Carter, Jeff Chostner, Sallie Clark, Scott Cowan, Dennis Darrow, Cole Emmons, Ferris Frost, Dan Henrichs, Dennis Hisey, Juniper Katz, Loretta Kennedy, Irene Kornelly, Carole Lange, Dennis Maroney, Bruce McCormick, Cam McNair, Gene Michael, Rex Miller, Bob Miner, Rich Muzzy, Annie Oatman-Gardner, Vera Ortegón, Larry Patterson, Gary Rapp, Jane Rawlings, Tom Ready, Ken Sampley, Greg Severance, Mark Shea, Larry Small, Mary

Lou Smith, Barbara Vidmar, Ross Vincent, Jay Winner, Chris Woodka, Niki Koszalka, and Heather Bergman

New and Pressing Issues in the Watershed

- The Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) is going to publish a stormwater handbook. It will have the 303(d) list and recommendations on best management practices to help with daily load numbers.
- The Fountain Creek Corridor Master Plan has two new demonstration projects. One at Confluence Park in Pueblo and the other a three-mile stretch in Clear Springs Ranch.
- Colorado Department of Transportation (CDOT) and THK finished a project with Trout Unlimited on Highway 24 west.
- Gary Barber, Carol Baker, and Bob Miner met with the *Tribune* to raise awareness about the Fountain Creek Vision Task Force (FCVTF) for the citizens northwest El Paso County.

Update on the IGA/Next Steps

- Several months ago, the Consensus Committee met in Pueblo and agreed to pursue the Inter-Governmental Agreement (IGA) as a precursor to the creation of the Fountain Creek Watershed, Flood Control, and Greenway District (District).
- The Funding Options Working Group (FOWG) was created in July 2007 and took a field trip to visit Denver Urban Drainage.
- The Consensus Committee agreed to create an IGA with the hope of establishing a governing board and to capture the expertise of the FCVTF.
- The District will have a Technical Advisory Council (TAC) and a Citizens Advisory Group (CAG). The two signing counties and the other signatories will create the governing board with a TAC and CAG. El Paso County and Pueblo County are scheduled to review the document by December 16, 2008 for approval.
- Gary Barber, Jeff Chostner, and Sallie Clark will help with presentations to the counties and other potential signatories.
- In order to ask for tax dollars, the District needs to be statutorily created.
- A number of FCVTF members were tasked with planning for the CAG. They prepared a slate of nominees to deliver to the governing board. The list of nominees are possible choices, not a definite list of actual members. A member of the FCVTF suggested another member of the CAG could be an educator. The group agreed to the list but will not move forward until the IGA is signed.
- The northern region of El Paso County will be included in the board with the other small municipalities.

Review of Comments/Suggestions from November Public Meetings

- Public meetings were held in Pueblo and Colorado Springs to share the draft strategic plan with the public and receive input. Some people shared their thoughts about the plan on written worksheets, others responded to an online survey, and some spoke during the public meetings.
- The Consensus Committee discussed several suggested changes to the strategic plan, and recommended the following actions:

- Enforcement powers of the District: Remain vague in the plan, as this may change over time.
- Effects of imported water on sediment load: Ask working groups to review.
- Erosion mitigation: Ask working groups to review.
- Non-tax funding options for District to pursue: Indicate that District can take grant funds as well.
- District prioritization of projects: Governing board will address.
- Municipal water supply gap: Ask working groups to review.
- Role of the US Forest Service in projects and watershed management: Do not change plan.
- Specific linkages between FCVTF plan and projects proposed in the Corps Study: Rich Muzzy will write language for insertion into the plan.
- Top 10 projects (prioritized list for the District to do first): Let the Governing Board address this.
- Historical perspective through news clippings: CAG could address this after it is formed.
- Role of the District as an advocate for improved watershed management: Heather Bergman will add language to this effect to the plan.
- Include the IGA in the plan: If all parties sign the IGA before December 31, 2008, include the IGA as an appendix. If not, leave it out of the plan.
- Information about USGS water quality tracking: Include in the water quality appendix. USGS website tracks real time: Include www.dwr.state.co.us. USGS
- Role of federal and state agencies in the watershed: Do not change the plan.
- Hydrogen sulfide: Do not change the plan.
- Streamflow averages: Ask working groups to address.
- Alternatives to avoid potential negative impacts to Fountain Creek: Ask working groups to address.

Finalizing and Publishing the Plan

- The Arkansas Basin Round Table provided funding for the Vision Task Force. We will need to present our findings to them to complete this effort. The Consensus Committee agreed that Gary Barber should work to have the presentation to the Round Table in February or March.
- The final strategic plan and all the appendices will be posted on the website as soon as the above changes are made.
- Heather Bergman will continue to store electronic files for the Task Force until the District is able to store them.
- Several participants indicated that hard copies should be available at libraries in Pueblo and Colorado Springs.
- Juniper Katz will work to have an executive summary printed in a short and colorful document.

Interim Plan for Meeting Until the District Exists

- The group will continue working on getting the IGA signed.
- The governing board will hopefully begin meeting in January 2009.

- The Consensus Committee has completed its work and will no longer meet.
- Heather Bergman will continue to send email updates to all of the Task Force (including the Consensus Committee) until the governing board is able to take over that function.