



Board Meeting Minutes
November 12, 2009

MEMBER ATTENDEES:

Tim Friday (Castle Rock)	Martha Hahn (Plum Creek, Castle Pines)
Lissa Oelkers (PCWA, Castle Pines)	Harold Smethills (Dominion)
Paul Grundemann (Centennial)	Matt Krimmer (Larkspur)
David Van Dellen (Castle Rock)	Karen Sitoski (Army Corp)
Andy Hough (Douglas County)	Ed Kinerk (Sacred Heart)
Steve Miller (HRLETF)	Penny Wilkinson (Lockheed Martin via telephone)
Kristi Livedalen (Dominion, Jackson Creek, Roxborough)	

OTHER ATTENDEES:

- Amy Conklin (CWA Management Team)
- Julie Vlier (CWA Management Team)
- Peggy Bailey (Tetra Tech)
- Melanie Goetz (Hughes & Stuart)

Call to Order:

The meeting was called to order at 2:00 p.m. by Tim Friday. It was determined that there was a quorum.

Approval of September 23, 2009 Meeting Summary – Paul Grundemann moved and Steve Miller seconded approval of the meeting summary with the change in item 'C' to change the language to read "...the Board requested the TRC's recommended plan be modified to also include...". The vote to approve was unanimous. Kristi Livedalen abstained.

Approval of Invoices and Payments: Martha Hahn moved and Paul Grundemann seconded that the invoices be paid as presented. The vote was unanimous. The invoices paid included an invoice from GEI for \$1048.30. Because only Paul Grundemann was available to sign the checks, they were given to Amy Conklin to take to Bob Deeds for a second signature.

Financial Matters – The most current copies of the Bank Statement & Financial Report from the Bookkeeper were distributed.

New Business:

- A. Water Quality Control Commission Presentation** – Paul Grundemann and Tim Friday reported on the Annual Report presentation to the WQCC. They emphasized the concerns the Authority still has with the new standards. The Commission seemed more

engaged than other years. The only question asked was about the liability problems the Authority faces in receiving grants.

B. Colorado Watershed Assemble Conference Presentation – Tim Friday reported that Amy Conklin's presentation had gone very well. The audience seemed engaged and asked relevant questions. Amy Conklin reported that she had several action items for the Board pursuant to things she learned both at the conference and at the all-day training she participated in.

1. **Posting videos on You Tube** – The Board requested that the fly over video Tetra Tech prepared for the presentation on the US 85 Study be posted on the Authority web page for the Board's review before it was posted on You Tube. The flood video is already on the web page. The Board will review that video as well and be prepared to make a final decision at the December 9th meeting about whether to post both videos to You Tube.
2. **Story and Event ideas** – Amy Conklin suggested that the PR Task Force be resurrected in 2010 to develop both a list of target audiences and messages for those audiences.
3. **Natural Resource Conservation Service** – One of the key note speakers at the conference was a gentleman from the NRCS who said that they may have resources for watershed groups. Amy Conklin will follow up with Andy Hough about the possibility of working with the NRCS to assist with the Authority's Manure Management project.
4. **Consider a nonprofit/foundation arm** – Kristi Livedalen suggested we confer with Ronda Sandquist or someone else with expertise in this area before making a determination, as there could be ramifications that have not been considered. The Management Team will do a little research about the Greenway Foundation specifically reviewing their master plan. This item will be brought back to the Board in December.

C. Capital Projects – The Board had requested a preliminary list of capital projects which was listed in the agenda as the following:

- Sediment control and streambank stabilization along East Plum Creek - \$500,000
- West Plum Creek water quality and ecosystem improvements - \$250,000
- Enhancing wetlands habitat and trail corridor - \$120,000
- Livestock and stable management - \$45,000
- Convert ISDS to conventional wastewater treatment - \$950,000
- Automatic samplers for Massey Draw data collection - \$20,000

The Board concluded that the prioritization of the projects would occur as part of the watershed planning process and segued immediately (and smoothly) into the next agenda item.

D. Update on 319 Grant Proposals– Julie Vlier and David Van Dellen reported on the status of the 319 Grant proposals being prepared with Castle Rock as the lead agency. There are two (2) grants; one is for Watershed Planning; the other is for Stream Restoration along East Plum Creek. Both proposals are due by December 4th.

1. **Watershed Planning Grant Proposal** – Julie Vlier reported that the proposal includes a request for \$25,000 in grant money; \$12,000 in in-kind participation from

a long list of entities; and \$15,500 in match money from the Authority. Paul Grundemann commented that developing a watershed plan is the critical piece required to be successful in obtaining grant money for actual water quality projects. Castle Rock will be the lead agency on the grant because they can accommodate the liability and insurance issues required by the State of Colorado. Kristi Livedalen asked about the management and coordination of the grant proposal. Julie Vlier reported that Castle Rock would provide \$3,000 in-kind service to act as the fiscal agent for the grant. Tetra Tech would act as the project manager for the work of putting the plan together. There was a discussion about how specifically the contracts would be structured but those details have yet to be determined.

Paul Grundemann moved and Martha Hahn seconded to move forward with the Watershed Planning grant proposal as presented. The vote was unanimous.

2. **East Plum Creek Stream Restoration Project Grant Proposal** - David Van Dellen reported that usually there is already a watershed plan before a grant proposal for this type of project is made. Therefore, part of the proposal includes the Authority endorsing the project as a high priority. The project includes stream restoration for about 2 miles of East Plum Creek immediately downstream from downtown Castle Rock. This section of the stream is the highest priority for Castle Rock because the surrounding area was developed prior to requirements for detention and water quality enhancements being included as part of the development process. The grant proposal includes a request for \$600,000 in grant money with approximately \$1.3 million match from Castle Rock. The proposal also includes a request of \$45,000 of match money from the Authority to be used as part of the project monitoring costs.

Andy Hough asked how much of the stream erosion is from development and how much is natural. The response was that the differentiation has not been made but the stream restoration project would improve water quality regardless of the source of the erosion.

Paul Grundemann commented that the project looked very good and he supported it, but was concerned about the Authority's ability to contribute \$45,000. The managers responded that as long as there was some flexibility about the timing of the funds, the Authority should be able to commit to that level of effort. There was a request for input from Ronda Sandquist about the level of legal services anticipated in 2010 and as far out as was possible to project.

Steve Miller asked if the project would impact Preble's Jumping Mouse habitat and require a contingency plan. The response was that the project was considered an enhancement project so no contingency was required.

David Van Dellen moved and Martha Hahn seconded that the Authority endorse the East Plum Creek project and the contribution of \$45,000, beginning in 2011 for monitoring. The vote was unanimous. There was discussion about the Authority writing a letter, for the Manager's signature, to be included in the proposal stating our commitment.

- E. **Update on Regulatory Activities** – Paul Grundemann reported that, as expected, the WQCC had postponed hearings on nutrient standards until 2011. Sarah Johnson had drafted a document outlining how the process for establishing nutrient standards should

progress. Paul also reported that the proposed revisions to the Basic Standards included footnotes for Arsenic and Nitrate that may prove problematic. The revisions include moving the point of compliance from the downstream drinking water intake to the point of discharge. Such a move in the compliance point would make the standards much more difficult to meet. Paul Grundemann added that the existing temporary modifications to the Basic Standards are proposed to be extended, in response to a question from Steve Miller.

- F. Monitoring Report or Updates of Monitoring Activities** – The Management Team reported that we are waiting for the results from the September 28th sampling to compile the averages for the 2009 growing season. So far, the results should be under the newly adopted standards. The Management Team has been discussing the differences in analytical results from Denver Water and GEI. Based on these discussions, the Management Team is confident that both laboratories are providing an excellent service. The purpose of collecting duplicate samples was to quantify the variability injected into the data base by switching from GEI to Denver Water. With the final results of the growing season samples, we should be able to do that and will revisit this issue at our December meeting.

Executive Session: Paul Grundemann moved and Ed Kinerk seconded a motion to go into Executive Session pursuant to C.R.S. 24-6-402(3)(a) to discuss attorney-client privileged information to develop strategy for nutrients in association with future Rulemaking hearings before the Colorado Water Quality Control Commission. The vote was unanimous.

Ed Kinerk moved and Andy Hough seconded a motion to come out of Executive Session. The vote was unanimous. No one objected that anything discussed during Executive Session was not pertinent to developing strategy for nutrients in association with future Rulemaking hearings.

Old Business:

- A. 2010 Expenditures** – The Management Team had prepared two (2) Scopes of Work for Services in 2010; a Watershed Management Program Scope of Work, and a Public Outreach Services Scope of Work. Martha Hahn requested that a summary of changes from year to year in the Management Scope be included in the document and that a task be added to 'Seek Other Sources of Funding (in addition to grants)'. Kristi Livedalen commented that a new contract should be drafted because the scope of work and budget are substantially changed. Harold Smethills will verify that the amounts identified for membership dues from Roxborough and Dominion are correct. Kristi Livedalen reported that Ronda Sandquist requested that the discussion about the line item for legal services be postponed until the December meeting. Penny Wilkinson reported that recent presentations from [the Finance Department](#) at Lockheed Martin has indicated that Lockheed Martin may not be able to participate in the Authority in the future. She will report back to the group as soon as possible. In the mean time, the Management Team was directed to develop a contingency for the 2010 budget in case Lockheed Martin does not pay its membership dues. The Management Team was also directed to develop some talking points for all board members to use in discussing the value of their participation in the Authority.

The Board requested that both Scopes of Work be revised and resent to the Board as a separate message for their review as soon as possible after Thanksgiving.

Amy 12/4/09 3:17 PM

Deleted: management

B. Scope for the Chatfield Summit – Melanie Goetz reported that after listening to the previous discussion, the Scope should be revised and brought back to the board in December. Specifically the issue of donating funds to the Greenway Foundation should be revised. The emphasis on outside sources of funding to subsidize the event was discussed. Amy Conklin reminded the group that funding request letters had been sent to CDPHE as well as CWCB. CWCB will be attending the December meeting.

C. Updates from Agency Staff – No agency staff were available to report.

D. Updates on Massey Draw Sampling – The Board directed the management team to bring this issue back during the December meeting. If the effort continues, the sampling locations should be re-evaluated. The group commented that the automatic samplers the Authority had agreed to buy as part of the East Plum Creek 319 Grant could be used in Massey Draw when they are no longer needed for the East Plum Creek project.

Management Team's Report – There were no questions for the Management Team about their report in the packet.

Meeting Schedule – The next Authority Board meeting is scheduled for Wednesday, December 9, at 2:00 p.m. at PCWA. This will be the last board meeting for 2009.

The first Board meeting in 2010 is scheduled for **Wednesday, January 27th**.

The next **TRC meeting/ Budget Subcommittee** the first TRC meeting in 2010 is tentatively scheduled for **Thursday, January 14th**, 2:00 p.m., at PCWA.

Other:

Martha Hahn moved and Ed Kinerk seconded to give Board approval to the Manager to send a letter to Senator Mark Udall in support of the 'Good Samaritan Cleanup of Abandoned Hardrock Mines Act of 2009.

The Board had no edits to the article about World Water Monitoring Day. It will be distributed to the press as soon as possible.

Adjournment – The meeting was adjourned by acclamation at 4:30 p.m.