

**Fountain Creek Watershed, Flood Control and Greenway District
Citizens Advisory Group**

Meeting Minutes

July 12, 2013

The meeting was held at:
City of Fountain, City Hall
116 S. Main Street, 2nd Floor
Fountain, CO

1. Call to Order, Establish Quorum and Introductions

The July 12, 2013 meeting of the Fountain Creek Watershed, Flood Control and Greenway District (“FCWD”) Advisory Group (CAG) was called to order by Ms. Irene Kornelly, Chairperson, at approximately 9:30 a.m. A quorum was noted, with the following members of the CAG in attendance:

Irene Kornelly – Chairperson
Richard Skorman – CAG Representative to the Fountain Creek Watershed, Flood Control and Greenway District (“FCWD”) Governing Board
Ferris Frost – Alternate CAG Representative to the FCWD Governing Board
Jack Wallick – CAG Secretary
John Chavez – TAC Chair and Representative to the CAG
Mary Barber
Nancy Stone Bernard
Lois Illick
Jordan Vana
Ross Vincent
Dan Henrichs
Jerry Cordova

CAG Members not present:
Perry Cabot – Vice Chairperson
Carol Baker
Tom Ready

Irene Kornelly introduced Lois Illick, a CSU Extension Agent in Pueblo County, and requested that Larry Small nominate her to the CAG along with Jordan Vana at the next Governing Board meeting.

Also in attendance:
Larry Small, Executive Director Fountain Creek Watershed District
David Mau, USGS Pueblo
Mike Cohen, USGS Denver

2. Approve Agenda of July 12, 2013 Meeting

Chairperson Kornelly suggested a revision of the draft Agenda to place the USGS modeling presentation ahead of the general monthly reports so the presenters could return to their duties. **Upon motion duly made, seconded and unanimously carried, the revised July 12, 2013 Agenda was approved.**

3. Approve Minutes of Prior Meeting

Upon motion duly made, seconded and unanimously carried, the June 7, 2013 minutes were approved.

4. Reports

a. USGS Study Report. Chairman Kornelly placed the USGA Report on Fountain Creek Modeling ahead of the general monthly reports for the convenience of the presenters, David Mau and Mike Cohen. [5.0]

- The presentation focused on a modeling effort begun in 2010 at the request of the FCWD. The purpose was to investigate the effectiveness of management scenarios on peak storm flows and sediment transport in the Fountain Creek Basin.
- David Mau spoke at length on the model's design and calibration, details of which will be available in the written report.
- Scenarios were developed to model the effects of side detention facilities (SDFs), drop structures, diversion of water to the Chico Basin, and a dam across Fountain Creek near Pinon. The storm event was a 100-year event around the centroid of the watershed, near Colorado Springs.
- SDFs were added to the model until significant reduction in peak flows were noted at Pueblo. A total of 24 (10,000 acre-feet of storage) were modeled on the various tributaries and main streams of the watershed before an 18 percent reduction in storm flow at the Pueblo gauge was achieved.
- Additional structures were added up to a total of 38, at which the peak flow was reduced 42 percent.
- At 44 structures the flow at Pueblo was less than 15,000 Cubic Feet per Second (CFS), well below the target of 20,000 CFS.
- Diversion of flood waters to the Chico Basin (without any SDFs) had the expected result of lowering the peak flow at the Pueblo stream gauge, as Chico discharges below that gauge.
- A dam across the main stem of the Fountain, approximately 10 miles above the Pueblo gauge, would reduce peak flow to about 21,000 CFS. The dam face be 85 feet high, impounding 27,000 acre-feet of flood storage and 25,000 acre-feet of permanent storage (total of 52,000 acre-feet), and the water would back up about 4 miles behind the dam. The results were peak flow of 16,000 CFS, but sediment would be a problem behind the dam – a recurrent maintenance problem.
- Additional scenarios were examined, with all results available in the draft report.
- Larry Small will distribute the draft report to CAG members via CD, at the August meeting. The report contents are confidential until the final version is released by the USGS.
- Dan Henrichs commented that water rights will be a large part of any discussion of implementing SDFs. Irrigators will always want to know whose water it is and how do we get it to them? If those questions are adequately answered, they are likely to be amenable to a project. There was general agreement that users and water rights must be included in any planning for storm water management. The current study does not incorporate water rights issues, environmental impacts, project permitting, and a host of other real-world considerations.[41]

b. [48]TAC Meeting. John Chavez reported on the July 3 TAC meeting.

- The meeting included a mill levy discussion update, which the CAG will get from Larry Small later in this meeting.
- The TAC discussed approaches to the 30-day review of the USGS draft report, choosing to use a divide and conquer approach to maximize each member's expertise and cover as much ground as possible in limited time.

- While acknowledging the limited likelihood for editing, John expects the review will identify where qualifying language is needed in reference to some scenarios, e.g., the dam/reservoir or Chico Basin diversion.
- He anticipated a possible request for a 30-day extension of the review, citing upcoming MS-4 permit reviews as an additional burden on the TAC during the same timeframe.
- In response to a question regarding the depth of the report's review process, Larry spoke up to clarify that the USGS is performing a full internal review typical of any USGS report. The TAC and CAG reviews are the only outside reviews being performed. [58]
- Larry also stressed the confidential nature of the draft report, allowing no disclosure to anyone outside the District. Upon final publication by the USGS, the report is fully accessible by all.
- The value of the information in the study to other entities working the storm water and flood management issue is unquestioned, but the information must remain confidential until the USGS (the study owner) releases it.

c. [57.2]Pikes Peak Regional Stormwater Task Force. Richard Skorman reported on the most recent meeting.

- There is a consensus on the Task Force to continue focusing on what is possible to put to the voters in November 2014 and how to present the question. At the mayor's request, there is a time-out while the CH2M Hill study is underway. The study is due in October, the same time that budgeting processes at the city and county will give a view of funds available for the coming fiscal year.
- On the topic of the long-term regional solution, there seems to be a willingness to have a November 2014 ballot question, whatever form it takes. The details of such a measure are unclear, being that so much is still in flux.
- [60.0] Larry spoke to the future of the Task Force, stating that the objectives of Phase 2 have been met, leaving it to someone (the county, most likely) to put together an IGA with the regional governments and entities. At that point the Task Force can come back into the picture and start the campaign.
- The District would have no role in the regional IGA, its role currently being a dotted line to an undefined Authority.
- [60.4.20] Richard spoke to a glitch that has recently been found in the funding equation. The Authority would not have the ability to levy sales or property taxes, only a fee-based structure, likely based on impervious surface. This wrinkle adds a lot of political risk.
-

d. Governing Board Meeting. Larry reported on the Board's recent retreat, the focus of which was the District's role in the ongoing regional discussions.

- The Board reviewed the funds available from various incremental mill levies, what the costs to typical homeowners and businesses would be, how those funds could be used, campaign and election costs, timing options, 1041 permit funds avail in Jan 2017,
- Option for funding by represented governments
- Board discussion reached the same conclusion as recommendations from CAG/TAC
- Board will request funding from the nine represented governments in 2014.
- Board will request funding from Pueblo County and CSU in the form of index revenues from the SDS 1041 funding at a producers price index of 1.9% (\$184,300 for 2014). We will request that rather than accruing, that it be paid to the District annually.
- The Board will formally request a voting seat on the Arkansas Valley Roundtable.
- The Board approved the purchase of a laptop for Mary Barber to use while administering the District's website.

- e. **Outreach Group.** The Outreach Group will meet July 25.
- Irene called for participation in the meeting, which will put together a proposal for Outreach Group purpose, along with a ‘round numbers’ budget, for eventual presentation to the Board.
 - Mary Barber signed for and received a new laptop computer and drive from Larry Small. The equipment was purchased with District funds for the purpose of administering the District’s website.
5. **New Business: Report on USGS Modeling Study.** The USGS Study was presented under Reports.
6. **Public Comment:** There were no Public Comments.
7. **Announcements and Next Meeting:** The next scheduled CAG meeting will be August 9, 2013 at 9:30a.m., Fountain City Hall.
8. **Adjourn:**
Upon motion duly made, seconded and unanimously carried, the meeting adjourned at approximately 11:17 a.m.