



# FOUNTAIN CREEK WATERSHED

## Flood Control And Greenway District

Fountain Creek Watershed, Flood Control and Greenway District  
Monetary Mitigation Fund Advisory Committee (MMFAC)

### Meeting Minutes

Wednesday, February 15, 2023 – 10:00 AM

1. Call to Order, Introductions, and Establishment of a Quorum: The meeting was held electronically via a Zoom tele/video-conference call. A quorum was established, and the meeting was called to order at 10:11 a.m. The meeting was chaired by Mark Shea in place of Allison Schuch.

#### Committee Members in Attendance

Mark Shea	Colorado Springs Utilities
Annie Berlemann	Colorado Springs Utilities
Jason Messamer	Colorado Springs Utilities
Dominga Jimenez-Garcia	Pueblo County
Tanis Manseau	Pueblo County (Alternate)
Gregory George	Pueblo County
Emma Strong	Pueblo County (Alternate)
Terry Hart	FCWFCGD Citizens Advisory Committee

#### Others in Attendance:

Ian Paton	Wright Water Engineers (Consultants for Pueblo County)
Marci Day	Pueblo County Attorney
Jonathan Griffen	Pueblo County
Ian Hartley	Citizens Advisory Committee
Chuck Finley	Citizen

2. Approve Agenda: A motion was made by Terry Hart to approve the agenda. The motion was seconded by Gregory George and approved by unanimous vote.
3. Approve Minutes of the February Committee Meeting: A motion was made by Terry Hart to approve the January Annual Meeting and January regular meeting committee meeting minutes. The motion was seconded by Gregory George and both meeting minutes approved by unanimous vote.
4. Committee Member Comments: Terry Hart wanted to encourage everyone to chime in from a strategic planning perspective on what you would like the district to do. We are rapidly depleting our MMF money. We are going to have to work on some sustainable funding of some sort and the proposal right now is to consider going to the ballot in 2024 and if we do that, we need to do a lot of things between now and then. The first step is the strategic planning effort. Mark made an announcement at the TAC meeting suggesting that the TAC get involved in helping us identify what needs to be done in their particular jurisdiction particularly from a project perspective. This can fold into all the thing we are trying to do from a strategic planning perspective. Encourage everyone consider jumping in and let us know what you are thinking. Path forward MMF looked at the bylaws recently and to consider prioritizing the use of the MMF money but consider matching funds. Update on bringing someone on for support in the strategic planning effort. Interviewed 3 entities and asked them a series of questions with regard to their ability to help us with the

strategic planning process, their experience with doing that kind of thing et cetera et cetera, and all the mechanics that we need to follow in order to move forward but then also what we need to do from a financial perspective and with a discussion that as a government we can only do so much to prepare for a ballot question but we can get it fully prepared particularly from an educational perspective and then it needs to be handed off to the political folks. We interviewed all 3 of the top candidates and then we had a meeting to chew that up as a committee and we are now prepared in the upcoming board meeting I believe it will probably be an executive session to discuss what we did and then ultimately in an open session we will be making a recommendation or at least a motion on who to retain. We will be bringing out a Grant resource for the district. That resource could provide support for the district and pursuing Grant funds itself to supplement and grow the monetary mitigation funding available for projects but also potentially help provide support to government members that have needs and are interested in finding Grant funds to potentially help them with projects and their jurisdictions as well. Laura Kroeger the Mile High Flood District executive director will be speaking maybe as early as next month's meeting. That will be helpful for getting people's thought processes going in terms of strategic planning for the Fountain Creek District. We talked about not to limit her discussion because we do not want to hinder what she is going to be talking about but at the same time maybe we all have in mind specific questions we like to ask her in terms of areas where the Fountain Creek District could grow or the processes to do that. In the MMF the CIP we've got a map at the back that shows where all the different projects MMF projects have been completed and it seems like that could be a good map to go back to as part of this process and look at what's been done, what's been accomplished and you know to be thinking about big picture of what we want to be accomplishing in the water shed with MMF projects.

5. Public Comments: None

6. Presentation: None

7. Current Business/Discussion:

7.a. MMF Balance: After the project work, we recommended and approved for 2023, that left us with a 9-to-10-million-dollar balance in the monetary mitigation fund. Taking the amount that we have left the commitment that we have and the commitment that we are making and what is netted out. What we have in the bank right now is close to \$18,000,000. That is the total number and then the amount that we have approved as far as the board for projects, but those projects are going through the bidding process, so we got to see how that shakes out ultimately to see the specifics. Do we want to ease up a little bit, do we want to double down and really go you know full throttle? We are going to have a lot of other things going on you know in 2023 and then really heating up in 2024 if the district is going to be going for that ballot measure. We want to appear to be very active and maintaining the work that the district is doing especially if we can be demonstrating the work that the district can do and in many different parts of the watershed and partnerships with the different jurisdictions, but I think we need to be thoughtful and what that work is and then again what that means for the monetary mitigation fund beyond 2024. What I am seeing on all our capital projects appear as costs or continuing to escalate, supply chains continuing to be more expensive, boulders are getting more expensive and frankly the permitting side of things is taking longer. We have got projects that are taking 12-18 months to get through the permitting process through the Corps of Engineers and that is on average right now. I have got one that I was supposed to start spreading fall last year and we are confident that we are going to start this so we're behind schedule because of the permitting but the permitting is costing more as well.

One would hope that going into the 2024-2025 period that there's multiple millions left in the budget because I think it could be a good carrot to take to the voters to say here, we have an MMF fund with the X millions of dollars that can be the beginning seeds for this new tax supported district.

7.b. 2024 Projects: We've got a couple of alternative analysis occurring at the Frost and Wood focus areas within the watershed. We will have some work product coming out of that analysis for those two focus areas. That will potentially help inform what kind of projects would we want to do there; do we want to do which of the wetlands or which of the channel stabilization elements that are part of those focus areas. We build on that analysis being done in those focus areas. At the same time keeping an eye open for other areas where project work could add really good value to the watershed to Fountain Creek downstream specifically Fountain Creek in Pueblo County. But ideally at the same time find some opportunities to highlight how the district can do good work in a lot of different parts of the watershed. One thing that I think is always a good thing to do is I'm a big believer in saying OK we're now getting ready to start the new process let's backup and take a look at what we've already done so we have the totality of the work that we've already done so we've got a pretty good feel for that particularly with the fact that we have anybody new that's coming on they could say OK here's what we done in the past here's when we did it et cetera et cetera and then compare that to what we have in the works for coming out of the 2022 and 2023 actually Southmoor might be a 2021 project I can't remember when it started but the ones that are still ongoing. Then look at our prioritization process that we have used our criteria to say without any other information if we were simply to choose the next 3 or 4 projects in the queue here, this is what they would be. That helps us have that big picture understanding of what we've done in the past, what we're doing today and it helps us understand of but for any other new facts and factors that we want to consider these are the ones that would be teed up and I really like your conversation tossed out earlier about you know the timing of what do we do with the MMF and Chuck's comment about you know this potential being seed money. All of that is part of the strategic planning process literally which projects we choose are going to have to have all the components of our current criteria. But do we can help with this political conversation. This is another important topic for Laura Kroeger to speak about because they just had a recent successful ballot initiative that the past and really helped their funding that bumped up their mill Levey. They could reflect on their successes back in the 2013 flood where the district projects really helped their district members prevent flooding. Make sure we as a committee take forward lessons learned from the Barr farm project and especially in our agricultural areas where we have where we are going through other people's property on their land and there's diversions there are irrigation channels things in that nature and being mindful that we need to take that into consideration to ask those questions of our design engineers and make sure that we're not impact and we're being good neighbors on these projects on properties that we don't own. I would like to get back to kind of where we were when we made our selection of projects for 2023 to revisit what are the projects that we did not move forward because we picked the other ones and I think Ian it might make most sense just to revisit the presentation that you all were given us in support of that 2023 CIP recommendation. Is that something that we could ask for you all to dust off and share with us again. We can do that and that makes sense. That is internal discussions we need to have amongst county folks to identify projects we think makes sense to bring forward. It seems that we take a lot of time to work on the next year CIP and we never have time to discuss a 5-year plan, a 10-year plan. Jurisdictions how have they reacted successfully to certain ballot questions. How they have worked successfully in the past is a very straightforward black-and-white plan of these are the projects that we would like to accomplish these are the costs associated with it and here is the ballot question we need to have approved in to be able to do that and that has worked extremely well in both jurisdictions. In support of a ballot measure I think that's a great question and something that needs to be discussed as part of the strategic planning process and if I think that it will be important to have something like that developed

that's a different conversation and we'll need to be bringing in folks from different jurisdictions to say what's this look like in your part of the watershed because you know previously the district's not really looked within your all's jurisdiction for project needs but we want to have projects on that list. 2023 could be a fascinating evolutionary year on crystallizing what we think works and what does not work as we move forward. Well maybe that puts a bit of a fine point on my discussion with the TAC. This exercise should help lead to what could be a longer term say 5-year project plan throughout the entire watershed and I know for a fact the city of Colorado Springs Storm Water Program they have got their projects lined out they have to right under the IGA and our commitments to others within the watershed. That is something we can talk with Richard about is what are those projects that the city would identify as good examples of this is the kind of work that talking about being further supported through partnership with the district and you know when the conversation specifically turns to a ballot measure and mill Levey. Which of the projects would be most attractive to the City of Colorado Springs voters? There's already the storm water enterprise and a fee being charged to all of our property owners and so people are already paying for what they're getting as far as stormwater management so I think a project list for projects within the City of Colorado Springs that would be a district oriented list of projects would have to go above and beyond that it's not just kind of what they're already getting what they're already paying for nobody wants to pay twice for the same thing right so it's going to be a little bit of a different discussion you know with folks here within Colorado Springs than perhaps not the parts of the watershed but again I think there's opportunity to build on what's already being done in a way that would hopefully be effective in that respect. We need to start that conversation Kevin and if you can help facilitate that discussion with Richard, I think that would be great we need to figure out how we can thread-the-needle and walk to look at other parts of the El Paso County as well. Maybe the county itself has a project list that we should be discussing with them again how did those projects line up with what El Paso County taxpayers are already kind of funding you know projects that go above and beyond that in a similar way.

- 7.c. Grant Support: If we can find grant funding and other resources to support the district's involvement in projects that is a viable path forward. This led to the solicitation of proposals. The district received a couple of proposals for the district to consider in grant support. Three different contractors provided proposals. They included Matrix, THK, GEI, and Stantec. They all have experience with the district. Based on the information we have available in these proposals do we feel comfortable making a recommendation to look at working with THK in this capacity. Kevin made a motion that the MMF committee recommends THK as selected grant proposal, not that we are approving just identifying as our selection and then with the caveat that Alli has a conversation with THK make sure she is comfortable setting that ceiling coming out of the gate. Kevin made a motion to move that the MMF committee recommends THK for the grant writing solicitation. Greg stated based on the knowledge that Kevin shared that they were behind the master planning he second the motion. Motion passed unanimously. None opposed to the motion. The motion carries.
- 7.d. We are interested in continuing the conversation of when we get this group together in person. It's suggested perhaps the MMF committee members would like to tie in with the TAC and the CAG and I think other district participants for a field trip on the June 7<sup>th</sup>. That would be down in Fountain I think the idea was to get out and look at the Southmoor Drive project and then conduct some business as needed at the Fountain Creek Nature Center and then potentially visit a local establishment down there to perhaps have a beverage after. It would be good to kind of think about when and how frequently we might get together as a committee in person. I think what we probably want to do is figure out a way where we could do it hybrid so folks that still need to attend virtually would be able to continue to

attend that way and stay engaged. But then we would also have the opportunity just to see each other in person.

8. Confirm Next Meeting Time and Location: The next meeting will be held Wednesday, March 15, 2023, at 10:00 via Zoom.
9. Adjourn: The meeting was adjourned at 12:24pm.