

Fountain Creek Watershed District
Citizens Advisory Group
Corrected Meeting Minutes
August 14, 2009

This meeting was held at:
City of Fountain, City Hall
116 S. Main Street, 2nd Floor
Fountain, CO 80817

1. Call to Order and Introductions

The August 14, 2009, meeting of the Fountain Creek Watershed Citizens Advisory Group (“CAG”) was called to order by Chairperson, Ms Ferris Frost, at approximately 9:37am. In attendance were the following designated members of the CAG.

Ferris Frost – Chairperson
Jay Winner – Vice Chair
Tom Evans
Ross Vincent
Richard Skorman
Irene Kornelly
David Kinnischtzke
Dan Henrichs
Eva Montoya
Carol Baker
Dennis Maroney
Mary Barber
Kevin Walker
Juniper Katz (arrived at approximately 9:52am)

A quorum was noted.

2. Approve Agenda of August 14, 2009

Mr Cole Emmons, El Paso Assistant County Attorney and CAG Legal Advisor, suggested that the agenda be amended to include a report out of the District Board meeting. Following discussion, upon motion duly made, seconded and unanimously carried, the agenda for August 14, 2009 meeting was approved as amended. The item “District Board Report Out” was inserted into the agenda as Item #6 thus Items 6 through 12 were renumbered as Items 7 through 13.

3. Approve Minutes of July 10, 2009

The format and detail of the meeting minutes was discussed at length by the CAG members. The discussion centered on whether or not the minutes should be recorded in a narrative format with detail sufficient for a general understanding by the public of the discussion and views expressed in the meeting or whether minutes should be a concise record of actions taken.

Mr Emmons explained the basis for the format of the minutes submitted. The form of the minutes described a summary of the actions taken by the CAG. Mr Emmons noted that the electronic record (the audio recording) is the official record of the meeting. The minutes presented are in a form similar to that used by those kept in both counties [El Paso and Pueblo]. The reason behind this format is that a very real potential exists that the District Board may get sued at some point in time on any given item, particularly a land use item. The basis of a suit is the decision made by the District Board. The substance of the litigation is the record on which the decision that has been challenged has been made. The record includes the proceedings of the advisory boards as well as the decisions of the District Board. The more detailed the meeting minutes the higher the potential that the minutes will be inconsistent with the official record. Mr Emmons recommended that the minutes be very concise and in the format of a summary of the actions taken.

Regards this agenda item, CAG members expressed concerns, asked questions and discussed whether or not the minutes should:

- provide transparency
- reflect the discussion
- help understanding of issues
- help understand citizen input
- help understand basis of decisions
- reflect what happened not what was said

A question was raised as to whether the CAG has decision making authority over the format of the minutes. Mr Emmons noted that the CAG serves at the pleasure of the District Board. The District Board has authority to give direction. The CAG has the ability to make decisions and have discussions with the District Board. Format of the minutes is a CAG decision. Mr Emmons counseled they should be summary format.

During the course of the discussion a concern about access and availability of documents presented by other parties was made. Discussion was delayed until later in the meeting.

Action: Following these discussions and upon motion duly made, seconded and passed (12 For; 1 Against), it was resolved to recommend to the District Board that the CAG minutes reflect more detailed conversations in the public and to request their guidance on format. Guidance from the District Board will be requested at the next meeting scheduled for August 28, 2009.

Mr Emmons advised that the CAG needed to take an action on Item #3, Approve Minutes of July 10, 2009. He advised that the minutes could be approved as written, approved with amendments, disapproved or tabled/continued.

A motion was made to continue the minutes based on the direction from the Board. Prior to a second, Mr Emmons advised that the CAG use motions to guide/formulate the discussion. Make a motion, second it, follow with discussion, and then take the action.

The motion on the floor to continue approval of the Jul minutes based on direction from the board was seconded. A question was asked as to what is meant by "continuance." A continuance means that the action to approve the minutes will be taken at a future meeting.

Action: Upon motion duly made, seconded and unanimously carried, it was resolved to continue the minutes of July 10, 2009 pending further guidance from the District Board.

4. Election of CAG Secretary

Action: As no other nominees were entered for the election, upon motion duly made, seconded and unanimously carried, Ms Mary Barber was elected CAG Secretary.

5. Colorado Sunshine Law Compliance

Mr Emmons suggested using the same designations as the District Board and Technical Advisory Committee ("TAC"). He offered for consideration the following specific suggestions in relation to Colorado Sunshine Law Compliance.

- A. Designate place where meeting notices will be posted – *Use of the same locations as notices of meetings posted by El Paso and Pueblo Co Boards and County Commissioners*
- B. Fix the time and place of regular meetings – *Dates, times and locations are to be set by the CAG on an as needed basis but with the expressed desire to meet regularly on the 2nd Friday of the month at 9:30am, City of Fountain, City Hall*
- C. Designate Secretary as the custodian of the records – *So designated*
- D. Designate where minutes and records will be maintained – *To be maintained by the Secretary with a copy to Legal Counsel*
- E. Designate the audio recording as the official record of meetings – *So designated*
- F. Order the audio recording of executive sessions (except attorney/client communications) – *So designated*
- G. Designation of Official Newspapers for publication of required notices (if necessary) – *So designated, using the same newspaper as the following Counties*
 - 1) El Paso County
 - 2) Pueblo County

A motion was made and seconded to approve suggestions as presented by Mr Emmons subject to further discussion. Discussion items included going above the minimum required by the Sunshine Law; enhancing the distribution and/or posting of meeting notices; providing public access to documents; developing procedures for notices other than the minimum; maintaining an email distribution list; posting documents on the Internet; funding for suggested enhancements; and the possibility of using existing sites such as Pikes Peak Area Council of Governments (“PPACG”) for documents and notices.

Action: Following a discussion, motion duly made, seconded and unanimously carried, it was resolved to accept the suggestions made by Mr Emmons for CAG Colorado Sunshine Law Compliance (as stated above).

6. Report from CAG Representative to the District Board

Ms Ferris reported on the District Board meeting. The Board was asked their views of what the CAG should be. They are open to whatever CAG members want to do. She believes they’d like our ideas to be presented and then they would take a position.

Mr Emmons added that two reports should probably be added to the next meeting agenda. The CAG District Board Representative and the TAC representative will report out at the next meeting.

Mr Emmons reported two additional items from the District Board meeting:

- The Confluence Vista land use item was approved.
- The Attorneys are reviewing an Intergovernmental Agreement (“IGA”) concerning an offer of funding by Colorado Springs Utilities and the Lower Arkansas Valley Water Conservancy for the Corridor Master Plan Study, administrative costs and staffing. It is not certain whether the IGA will make it on the August District Board agenda for action.

7. Review, Public Comments, Discussion and Recommendations to the District Board Concerning:

- A. Request by Lafarge (Applicant) and Sundance Investments (Land Owner) for approval of a special use for mineral and natural resource extraction of sand and gravel; and
- B. Request by Lafarge (Applicant) and Sundance Investments (Land Owner) for a variance of use to allow concrete and asphalt batch plants in the I-2 zone.

Ms Frost turned the meeting over to Vice Chair Winner and recused herself from Items 7A and 7B to address the body as a private citizen.

Mr Emmons read both Items 7A and 7B (previously Items 6A and 6B) into the record, gave members some directions, made some suggestions concerning the format of the hearing and answered Committee member questions.

-He suggested having one hearing to consider both items, but advised at the end of the hearing separate actions would need to be taken.

-A special use is a use allowed within the zoned district but must get approval and meet certain conditions. A variance is required for a desired use that is not allowed or authorized in the zoned district.

-The members should consider the following land use questions in making recommendations on the land use matters:

-Why should the applicant be allowed to do what no one else is allowed to do in the zoned district?

-What are the peculiar, exceptional, practical difficulties or undue hardships (the two standards for variance of use) that create an injustice that would preclude the applicant from proceeding? The variance action is about doing justice.

-As a citizen body and given the varied interests brought to the table the focus should be on these questions:

-Is there an anticipated impact(s) to Fountain Creek?

-Has the Applicant looked at ways to avoid impact(s)?

-If impact(s) cannot be avoided, are there ways the impact(s) can be mitigated?

-The members should use as references the following documents:

-The Fountain Creek Watershed District Strategic Plan

-The Army Corps of Engineers study

-El Paso County land use regulations

-The suggested process is the Applicant presentation, public comments (those in support, followed by those in opposition), followed by applicant rebuttal.

-Individuals are asked to speak into the microphone for the record.

-The CAG is an Advisory Committee that makes recommendations to the District Board.

The Applicant (Lafarge) introduced four individuals who presented information and responded to specific concerns and questions raised by the CAG. Mr Sean Frisch, Land Coordinator for CO, Lafarge; Mr Steve Brown, Director of Land Management, Lafarge; Mr Corey Hanson, Environmental Manager for CO, Lafarge; and, Mr Paul Banks, Consultant, Banks and Gesso LLC. The Applicant described the scope of the project and special studies accomplished; referenced Technical Memorandum, Strategic Plan Compliance; and addressed some of the concerns expressed in previous presentations.

Questions and concerns from the CAG members were made and responded to by the Applicant:

Member Kornelly:

-air emissions, from asphalt and concrete plants, roads, and diesel from trucks

Applicant: Portions of Old Pueblo Road will have an overlay. Other areas will be subject to permit control measures. Diesel emissions will be regulated through regulatory air quality checks. Emissions will not be in addition to existing.

-exit 122 & I-25 interchange, increase in truck traffic and proposed short and long-term improvements

Applicant: Lafarge views safety first and foremost. They have conceptual approval by Colorado Department of Transportation (“CDOT”) for reconstruction of the interchange, which includes widening turning radii and lengthening of acceleration and deceleration lanes. CDOT needs a design to approve. If other development occurs in the area CDOT may require a full diamond interchange.

Member Henrichs

~~-water for dust control and evaporative losses~~

~~-water into and out of the lakes after operation completed~~

-Where is the water coming from for dust control and evaporative losses?

-Did they have any plans for being able to get water into or out of the lakes in the future?

-Was there any possible use of the lakes for flood control by taking a portion of the water off and returning it later?

Applicant: Process water will come from the pond. A substitute water supply plan will be in place to ensure the hydraulic system remains whole. There is no current plan for water into and out of the lakes.

Member Katz

-checking for compliance and follow through on Applicant commitments or agreements

Applicant: Lafarge intends to comply with permits and conditions of approval.

Member Evans

-response to citizen questions concerning perceived or possible downstream effects of the project

Applicant: Lafarge is open to addressing questions and concerns by the public.

Member Skorman

-number of truck trips

-length of operation of the site

-types of air pollution produced by batch plants apart from required air permits and are they located near urban areas

-noise levels

-Land Owner intentions concerning pits/lakes

Applicant: The permit requests a maximum 780 truck trips in and out equivalent to 390 trucks per day. Hitting maximum will be rare; 780 is worst case. They always try to co-locate batch plants with source because it cuts down on truck trips and miles. The intention is to close the existing site, then open this site the next day. This is a time limited special use for 15 years which matches the lease. The timeline depends on the

market, but Lafarge is artificially constraining themselves at 15 years. Lafarge is the tenant; the Land Owner has not made any commitments for the property. Equipment operates at about 85db; noise modeling indicates 55db at the property boundary and less further away. Batch plants are located in populated areas including Colorado Springs. All sites are synthetic minor sources, which emit less than 100 tons of criteria pollutants. The plants and quarry will each be permitted.

Member Vincent

- availability of PowerPoint
- FTP site access was problematic; insufficient review time for documents provided
- no meaningful opportunity for public review
- water quality impacts beyond discharge permit requirements
- flow control impacts
- responsibility for management of pits/lakes long-term
- ground water impacts from pits/lakes after operations
- ground water monitoring and availability to the public
- flooding outside the designated 100-year floodplain

Applicant: Today's presentation will be available. Lafarge will be given strict limits under the discharge permit. Overall impacts on water quality will be minimal. They are required to have a storm water management plan. Minimal testing is required for total suspended solids and pH. Very in depth controls will be installed and employee training will be extensive. Water discharged should be no dirtier than the water entering the pit. The Land Owner retains ownership of the property. Pits will be surrounded by an impervious slurry wall. Mining limits will be in historically disturbed agricultural areas, except in areas considered for bank improvement. Monitoring wells are currently in place and will be monitored throughout the project. Reports are available to the public. The floodplain boundary on the map actually denotes the 500-year flood based on available data generated by Federal Emergency Management Agency ("FEMA") and U.S. Army Corps of Engineers ("ACOE").

Member Walker

- selenium monitoring
- mitigation of selenium spikes
- moving operations out of the floodplain

Applicant: Lafarge is committed to evaluating the site for selenium and minimize/mitigate impacts; initial documents indicated selenium is not an issue. Pierre shale is the bedrock under the sand and gravel; Lafarge will look at how to conduct operations so as not to expose the Pierre shale. Moving operations out of the floodplain is a possibility.

Member Maroney

- dewatering operations, selenium and sediment mitigation

Applicant: Lafarge will evaluate the selenium issue and will look at avoiding the exposure of the shale. A dewatering trench is placed around the mine then ground water is pumped directly to the river, but the discharge is still sampled to make sure it is

clean and there is no problem with the pH. As water in the pit decreases, water in the dewatering trench decreases and that is how the water table near the pit is kept low.

Member Maroney and Member Baker, CAG members, provided reports from the TAC. Two memoranda summarizing the TAC meeting relative to the Lafarge-Sundance proposals were entered into the record. Exhibit 1: Fountain Creek Watershed District, Technical Advisory Committee, August 12, 2009 Meeting Minutes. Exhibit 2: Lafarge Gravel Mine Review by the FCWD Technical Advisory Group, Dissenting Opinion, August 2009.

No public spoke in support of items 7A and 7B.

Questions, concerns and comments from the public were made:

Mr Bill Park:

- traffic studies don't address projections or potential impact of proposed Pikes Peak International Raceway development project
- responsibility for the bridge
- responsibility for debris from trucks

Ms Nancy Keller:

- selenium, sulfate, and 303d list
- selenium in ground water
- depth of ground water monitoring wells
- selenium, sulfate and temperature not required by general permit but should be monitored; a site specific permit for gravel can and should include additional monitoring
- selenium mitigation
- temperature being applied to all segments state-wide; being implemented basin by basin; temps in Fountain Creek an issue

NOTE: Mr Emmons clarified the record that Ms Frost, Chairperson of the CAG, recused herself for purposes of the Lafarge-Sundance items.

Ms Ferris Frost representing Frost Livestock Company, Hanna Ranch, and Concerned Citizens of Fountain Valley:

- variability of creek meander in vicinity of proposed site
- bank scouring and erosion during flood events in relation to processing area
- moving the processing area from 50 feet to 400 feet away from the edge of the bank is appreciated
- batch plant (concrete and asphalt) emissions
- fuel storage
- adequacy of the permit taking into account future standards or emissions where there are no standards currently in place
- discharge location for process water from batch plants and cement truck washing
- use of process water for dust control

- particulate matter
- toxicity of calcium oxide especially on aquatic life
- location of batch plants in proximity to the creek
- noise impacts on wildlife, herons/heron rookery, frogs
- strategic plan - ecosystem health
- traffic noise on the site
- I-25 interchange modifications needed at exit 122 and bridge/overpass integrity for trucks
- less than 100 year flooding events may be underestimating impacts
- debris on banks there now because of erosion
- strategic plan – preserve the natural channel thru floodplain preservation, preserve the natural drainage way, streamside setbacks
- sediment/gravel moving downstream
- recommend denial of mining in the floodplain and denial of items 7A and 7B
- if not inclined to deny, then require:
 - no mining in the floodplain
 - no batch plants
 - annual review based on monitoring results
 - public disclosure of hazardous chemicals
 - state of the art plans for hazmat emergency spill response and containment
 - hazmat response special training
 - setback from creek edge
 - mining operations plan
 - interconnected water source flow study, relationship between surface and alluvial ground water
 - surface water quality, water monitoring for hazardous chemicals from batch plants processing and pH
 - ground water quality and levels
 - stream flow volume and velocity
 - \$3,000,000 reclamation bond needs to remain set aside for reclamation
 - would like an independent third party study to determine projected reclamation requirements and the bond amount to cover costs
 - remediation bond for landowners along the creek
 - what we do here does matter, are we business as usual or not
 - this is the wrong project, at the wrong time, in the wrong place

Mr Jim [Lockhart](#): ~~Lockert~~:

- give great consideration to previous remarks by Concerned Citizens of the Fountain Valley, CAG should adopt their recommendations
- may want to ask for a continuance since this is a new group with a tough decision right at the very beginning so may want to go slowly and ask for a continuance so understand role, what questions need to be asked, presentations needed
- lot of elevation drop between Colorado Springs and Pueblo; this slope means the Fountain Creek has a lot of erosive potential; erosion does not occur by carving a canyon but by meandering, which is an important consideration in this process; very

concerned about reliance on last 50 years map because then Colorado Springs was much smaller, now it's a large metropolitan area and the creek hydraulics have changed; need to consider current and project future impacts

- look at impacts on the whole of Fountain Creek not just this site
- recommend industrial activities not be allowed in the floodplain

Ms Roberta Rengstrom:

- water quality pollutant discharges to the creek
 - recommend no decisions until have at least basic water quality data, in accordance with a Colorado Department of Health and Environment ("CDPHE") monitoring plan
 - selenium from mining area
 - 303d listing one segment down; cannot have new sources into listing area; could mean ending up in a Total Maximum Daily Load ("TMDL") process – expensive, detailed, long term
- flooding
 - pond adjacent to the creek, possible breaching, water quality concerns
 - increase of water from Southern Delivery System ("SDS") into the creek not addressed
 - storm water discharge into the ponds/creek, water quality concerns
- water quality baseline and flooding big concerns
- request decision be deferred

Applicant responded to concerns:

- Many of the same concerns were raised by the TAC. The TAC has recommended approval of the project with conditions. Many of the concerns are addressed by the conditions. The Applicant is generally okay with the conditions.
- Setbacks: Okay with additional setbacks identified in the TAC conditions.
- Floodplain: Okay with additional setbacks for the riparian canopy for freshwater pond
- Flooding (and erosion control): Proposing bank full bench for bank stabilization; prepared to go forward with design at four locations
- Environmental:
 - pH testing required at all discharge points and will be done;
 - required to disclose chemicals on site thru Environmental Protection Agency ("EPA") Toxic Release Inventory ("TRI") Tier 2 chemical reporting, done annually; barely meet reporting requirements;
 - concrete-lined wash out pits for trucks and the water is reused in the concrete mix to reduce water consumption;
 - chemicals that might spill from asphalt, cement plant are the same used in any petroleum combustion process
 - asphalt is much like tar; it solidifies almost instantly when it leaves the tank; asphalt is used for lining fish hatcheries and drinking water storage; asphalt is not soluble in water, will not mix with water;
 - controls will be on site to keep storm water separate from process water pits;

-increasing flows to river while dewatering – at a certain point will be dewatering from flows into the trench; there will be an equilibrium reached between the dewatering and ground water in the trench;

-won't be increasing selenium because measures are in place to minimize impact to the [Pierre] shale so won't be increasing sulfate or selenium discharges;

-employees go thru extensive spill prevention training and other training;

-Lafarge has an environmental policy committed to preserving wildlife in these areas; have an agreement with Wildlife Habitat Council ("WHC") to screen sites for biodiversity; if there is certain potential for improvement, then go thru project called "Wildlife at Work" to improve operating facilities for biodiversity; have already started this process for this site and will be applying for WHC certification next year; improvements may include such things as perches for raptors;

-described extensive public notice required thru various application processes.

During follow up questions from CAG members, the Applicant clarified the following:

-Member Baker asked about whether there were batch plants and discharges on the current mine site. The answer from the Applicant was that there are neither.

-Member Maroney asked if there had been selenium testing to ascertain if there are issues with it on the existing properties. The Applicant stated he was not aware of any. The Applicant said that issues have been raised during this meeting that they haven't heard in the previous four iterations with the county. These comments are welcome. If the county had said four years ago to test for selenium, they would have. They are committed to make this project work and think it is a good match with the strategic plan, especially end use after 15 years.

-Member Henrichs asked whether the pits could be used for flood control. The Applicant indicated this had been done elsewhere. The end owner will not have the rights to detain the water on the site. It could be designed for flood control and water released later at a slower rate.

The Chair asked for comment from the members:

Member Walker – Not certain understands criteria which is a concern; seems to be a lot of fear about things we don't know about and why testing, desire for baseline data, monitoring and mitigation plans has come up; not at all in favor of waiting for additional information, especially water quality studies. Not inclined to postpone. It is private property, it is narrowly within our area, the use is allowed with some mitigation. Supports the project with conditions outlined by the TAC.

Member Barber – Leaning toward continuance for period not to exceed 90 days because some concerns raised for which this body may wish to recommend conditions and lack information as to what those are, e.g. water quality baseline study.

Member Maroney – Believes there are impacts to Fountain Creek that have not been sufficiently addressed particularly in the area of water quality, therefore lean toward continuing the project.

Member Baker – Agreed with Member Maroney

Member Montoya – Agrees with continuance to further understand downstream impacts in Pueblo.

Member Katz – Agrees that water quality concerns are new and agrees with recommendation to continue.

Member Kinnischtzke – Knows these families on Fountain Creek. Sundance has protected utilities and the creek. Loves the strategic plan and also understands property rights. Concerned about treating people like a project. Not mentioned today, they are improving the railroad crossing, including removing bank. Hanover School has no income; sees this project as a possible benefit to the school. Concerned about infrastructure costs to community if this project is not located in the county. Likes most of what Lafarge had to say. Likes that the TAC moved ahead with guidelines; doesn't think continuance is a good idea. Concerned about how much can possibly be understood and at what point do we become sufficiently comfortable. Perhaps we can add some conditions such as a water sampling plan.

Member Winner - Continuance is a cop out. We are the conscience of the creek. What would the creek want? We put together a District; if we don't take a stand what are we doing here? We need to make Fountain Creek the jewel we want it to turn into. We need to make a statement on this.

Member Kornelly – Continuance would probably answer more questions. Liked what the TAC put together. Agrees with Member Winner.

Member Skorman – Personally doesn't support this. Our charge is not to protect private property rights; it is to protect the creek. Doesn't see this as a compatible use. Industrial uses such as this should not be adjacent to the creek.

Member Vincent – The Board should ask, "What will your project do to enhance what this district was set out to do?" This project is at the northern end of the District, and this use is not compatible with the greenway aspect or long-term goals of the District. Recommends denial within the 100 year floodplain, but it is also a larger issue of how this fits with the vision for the creek overall.

Member Evans – Chemical mitigation should probably cause a continuance. There are a lot of factors to consider (economy, temporary nature of the project, etc).

Recommends the Applicant formalize a public relations program for this project if it goes forward to document on the record issues the public has raised over time.

A motion was made to approve Item 7A with the recommendations of the TAC, seconded, followed by discussion. Primary discussion items: private property; perception by other land owners; end use; compatibility of use; Fountain Creek Corridor Master Plan implementation in this area over time; landowner perspective; stability of the creek bank; waiting for more information has merit.

Action: A substitute motion was made and seconded to recommend disapproval of mining operations within the 100-year floodplain and that the Board recommend to other agencies with responsibility for other parts of the proposed project either disapproval or continuance if the parties involved are willing to continue discussing the many unanswered questions associated with the project. Mr Emmons advised that a vote on the substitute motion takes precedence over the original motion. The substitute motion was restated for clarity as follows: to recommend denial of the project and recommend to other jurisdictions with authority over the project to disapprove or if inclined not to

disapprove to continue the request before making their decisions in order to get additional information to address concerns raised by the TAC and CAG. The substitute motion on Item 7A failed.

Action: Following a vote on the substitute motion, a vote on the original motion to approve with the recommendations of the TAC failed; thus Item 7A was denied.

Action: Following a discussion, motion made and seconded, it was resolved to recommend continuance [of Item 7A, Special Use] to allow the land owner the opportunity to consider committing to long-term recreation and restoration of the Fountain Creek and to address issues presented in the conditions of approval made by the TAC.

Following a discussion, motion made and seconded, it was resolved to recommend continuance [of Item 7B, Variance] to allow the Land Owner the opportunity to consider committing to long-term recreation and restoration of the Fountain Creek and to address issues presented in the conditions of approval made by the TAC.

8. Review and discussion regarding establishing review criteria, structure, and procedures for submittals to be presented for CAG consideration.

Ms Frost resumed the position of Chair for the remainder of the meeting.

Action: Upon motion made, amended and seconded, it was resolved to move Item 8 to the next meeting and that a small group would develop straw man procedures for discussion.

Members Kornelly and Vincent volunteered to develop the straw man.

9. Other Business: None

10. Public Comment: None

11. Executive Session (If Required): None required

12. Setting Date, Time, and Location of Next Meeting

After discussion it was agreed the CAG will meet on September 23rd, at 9:30am in Pueblo at a location to be determined.

13. Adjourn

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned.

