

Fountain Creek Watershed District
Citizens Advisory Group
Meeting Minutes
September 23, 2009

This meeting was held at:
El Centro Del Quinto Sol
609 Erie Ave
Pueblo, CO 81003

1. Call to Order and Introductions

The September 23, 2009, meeting of the Fountain Creek Watershed Citizens Advisory Group (“CAG”) was called to order by Chairperson, Ms Ferris Frost, at approximately 9:43am. In attendance were the following designated members of the CAG.

Ferris Frost – Chairperson
Ross Vincent
Irene Kornelly
David Kinnischtzke
Dan Henrichs
Eva Montoya
Carol Baker
Dennis Maroney
Mary Barber
Kevin Walker
Tom Ready
Jack Johnston

Members not present:

Jay Winner – Vice Chair
Tom Evans
Richard Skorman
Juniper Katz

A quorum was noted.

2. Approve Agenda of September 23, 2009

Upon motion duly made, seconded and unanimously carried, the agenda for the September 23, 2009 meeting was approved.

3. Approve Minutes of Prior Meeting(s)

Minutes of July 10, 2009, were held in abeyance to allow multiple versions to be distributed for consideration at a future meeting.

Action: Following discussion and upon motion duly made, seconded and unanimously passed, it was resolved to approve the minutes as corrected.

Primary discussion items:

-Member Henrichs expressed concern about the narrative minutes in regard to the questions he posed at the meeting. Referring to page 6, he stated that the minutes miss the point of what he was asking about and that he did not think the minutes reflected the exact nature of where the questions were coming from, for example his specific questions about: "Where is the water coming from for dust control and evaporative losses"? He expressed his concern with narrative minutes and potential conflicts later on with the official recording. He believes the minutes should reflect the actions that take place and not the discussion that happens. Otherwise the minutes should be verbatim.

-Member Ready commented that sometimes including the bantering in the minutes is good and sometimes not; he preferred to keep the banter in the minutes.

-Chairperson Frost reported that the District Board approved the recording of the narrative form for the minutes.

-Corrections/Changes to the minutes for the August 14, 2009 meeting:

-Member Henrichs clarified his questions, page 6:

-"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?"

-Member Vincent corrected the spelling for Mr Jim Lockhart, page 9.

4. Report regarding August 28, 2009 Fountain Creek Watershed, Flood Control and Greenway District Board Meeting and status of Sundance/LaFarge land use applications.

Member Frost reported a summary of what happened at the Fountain Creek Watershed, Flood Control and Greenway District Board ("District Board") meeting on August 28, 2009:

-The District Board entered into Executive Session on the conflict of interest issue. No further action was taken by the District Board in full session.

-Chairs of both the CAG and Technical Advisory Committee ("TAC") gave their recommendations relative to the LaFarge project.

-The District Board discussed the LaFarge/Sundance special use and variance proposal(s). LaFarge agreed to withdraw its proposal to mine in the 100-year floodplain. After further discussion the issue was postponed to September 25, 2009,

primarily due to the change in the plan from no longer mining in the floodplain and thus more time needed to study the project, the CAG representative had not been seated yet, and a consensus that more members of the Board needed to be present to discuss such an important issue.

-The District Board voted to approve the CAG use of narrative minutes.

-A committee was appointed to define the Executive Director job and to determine the procedures for hiring.

-Meeting dates, agendas and minutes are now posted on the Fountain Creek Watershed (www.fountain-crk.org) web site. Individuals may be referred to this site for information.

Questions/Discussion/Comments:

-Member Baker informed the CAG that the three-party Intergovernmental Agreement (“IGA”) (Lower Arkansas Water Conservancy District – “Lower Ark”; Fountain Creek Watershed, Flood Control and Greenway District Board – “District”; and Colorado Springs Utilities – “CSU”) to fund staffing of the District and continue the Fountain Creek Corridor Master Plan, was approved by the District Board. The Utilities Board/City Council approved the IGA on September 22, 2009. All three parties have approved the IGA. The only thing left to do is next Tuesday the Pueblo County Commissioners will meet to determine whether they will approve the funding from CSU as part of the monetary mitigation for Southern Delivery System (“SDS”). Should that go through, then money can start coming.

-Member Frost asked about IGA funding. Member Baker explained that there are two different monies. \$100,000 has been deposited to study flood control for Fountain Creek already determined by SDS. The IGA identifies funding of \$100,000 a year for two years for staffing the District; then \$200,000 a year for two years to fund continuance of the Corridor Master Plan. Member Baker stated that she was asked by a Utilities Board Member about funding after two years, and she reported that the expectation is that the District will have its own funding and will be on its own two feet.

-Member Ready asked if criteria have been established for the Manager position and has anyone applied for the job not knowing the criteria. Member Frost reiterated the District Board has assigned a committee to address the Executive Director position. No one knew if anyone has applied. Member Maroney clarified he thought the Board was evaluating whether the position would be a full-time or contract position and such a determination needed to be made before they started accepting applications.

-Member Johnston asked about how the money was being shared by the IGA parties or whether it is armed against the future of SDS funds. Member Baker responded that the first \$100,000 was part of the original 1041 agreement which was \$100,000 a year for three years for the flooding part. Of the remaining \$600,000, half comes from the Lower Ark and the other half from CSU. The half from CSU, assuming it goes through next week [by Pueblo County Commissioners], would apply towards the monetary mitigation that otherwise would not be received until 2016. It would be early payment on the future proceeds of SDS.

5. Report regarding September 9, 2009 Fountain Creek Watershed, Flood Control and Greenway District Technical Advisory Committee Meeting

Member Maroney reported the following from the TAC meeting:

-One item related to the study ongoing with Colorado Springs in developing a low impact development (“LID”) manual. There was some funding from a Water Conservation Board Grant to be matched by Colorado Springs, which would allow for a workshop after the manual is developed whereby it would be presented to land use officials and politicians from both areas to consider for adoption watershed wide. It’s a process that probably for the next six months we won’t see much development because that is the timeframe in which the manual will be brought forth.

- The other issue addressed was the criteria to be used by the TAC for future projects on Fountain Creek brought forth for review. Committee members will recommend the Board adopt the following criteria to be used by the TAC:

a) Strategic Plan for the Fountain Creek Watershed, dated March 10, 2009;

b) Fountain Creek Watershed Study and Watershed Management Plan, dated January 2009; and

c) Appropriate zoning and land use regulations for El Paso and Pueblo Counties.

TAC members discussed that at some future date there will be further regulations recommended to the District Board for consideration. Until that time the three aforementioned documents will be used as the criteria for review of projects.

Questions/Discussion/Comments

-Member Frost asked about her understanding that the county land use codes of El Paso and Pueblo would be followed as appropriate. When the LID manual is finalized will it take precedence over the county land codes? Member Maroney stated that has not been determined yet. The possible result of the workshop bringing land use people together would be consideration of the manual for adoption by their respective jurisdictions.

-Member Baker clarified the manual is called a Drainage Criteria Manual rather than a LID Manual.

-Member Vincent asked about the public process for review of the manual, preferably a draft manual to be presented to the public for comment. Member Baker responded there is public comment ongoing throughout the process. They (Colorado Springs) have different periods where they invite the public to make comments. A group of people meet regularly to review the effort. Colorado Springs is inviting others to make sure it is a region-wide agreement in how it is written. It could be adopted by the District. Colorado Springs will adopt the manual. Each entity within the watershed would also have the opportunity to adopt the manual if they so choose. Member Vincent stated he thought it would be helpful if the CAG could help facilitate broader public awareness about what’s going on and opportunities for comment at public meetings as the plan is in development. He encouraged a mechanism for making sure people who need to understand what is involved and who may ultimately want to see the manual’s influence expanded beyond Colorado Springs be a part of the process. Member Baker reiterated there is a public process associated with it. There is a group

of technical folks throughout the watershed that have been part of it. Member Baker will contact the City folks and ask them to send out emails to the CAG and the TAC when something is going to happen.

6. Review and discussion regarding the purpose of the CAG and establishing review criteria, structure, and procedures for submittals to be presented for CAG consideration

The tables were rearranged for the discussion of the proposal.

Member Kornelly presented proposed review criteria, structure, and procedures for submittals to be presented for CAG consideration. She was assisted by Members Vincent and Baker, who reviewed and commented individually. The document is intended to be a “strawman” and not intended as “the end all and be all”. She reviewed the draft document (copy provided), which includes information from the Army Corps of Engineers plan and the vision of the Fountain Creek Vision Task Force. Member Kornelly also tried to address in the document ideas resulting from proposals that have come to the CAG such as:

- Lead time for review of proposals, e.g. two weeks
 - Material be readily available
 - Appointment of a point of contact for more information
 - Applicant should be present to answer questions
 - Questions of a technical nature of interest to the public
- Member Kornelly also posed questions the CAG may wish to address:
- How much do we want to look at public opinion?
 - How much public opinion do we want to take into account?
 - Where does public opinion come into the process?
 - How do we quantify public opinion?

Closing comments from Member Kornelly:

- Not all criteria will apply to all proposals
- May be other things to add/change
- This is a “strawman”, a place to start

Questions/Comments/Discussion

- Member Vincent thinks the proposal is a good place to start. He believes the responsibilities of the CAG go beyond reviewing projects and making recommendations that come before the District Board, but in terms of reviewing projects this is a good place to start. He thinks we should distribute the current draft criteria fairly widely and encourage public comment. He suggests posting the draft on the web site, encourage public comment in writing and schedule a public comment period for our next meeting.
- Member Ready asked if the CAG is the organization that does all the public comment, or is the District Board going to be doing the public comment. It behooves us to figure that out because he doesn't want to repeat. If they are doing public comment, why are we doing it? He believes we need to give recommendations on projects to the District board, but he doesn't think we need a public process on the same issue.

-Chairperson Frost requested the members stay focused on the document before us and whether it is a complete explanation of what we want to do as the CAG and then build up from there. Member Vincent pointed out that the document addresses only review of projects and that is not what we are all about. She asked that we address public engagement in the context of what we want to do.

-Member Kinnischtzke commented with respect to the document that it doesn't really involve or engage the public. Two things stand out to him. One is he believes as a CAG our responsibility is to be proactive not be reactive. Our duty is to engage the public in order to be proactive. He distributed to the members a highlighted copy of "Citizen Advisory Groups, Citizen Participation Strategies for Municipal Planning in Vermont," by Will Sawyer and tried to encapsulate some of the pertinent items in the document relative to citizen engagement. Benefits and anticipated outcomes of a CAG:

- empower community members
- institutionalize citizen participation
- engender agreement and ownership in process
- instill planning awareness and leadership
- reflect legitimacy back on the planning commission
- shoulder some of the burden of municipal planning process
- create healthier community and stronger government
- put out public-reaction "fires" before they start

He reviewed the course of information flow between a CAG and planning commission, and the need to include a balanced cross-section of primary stakeholders. He considered the need for local stakeholder involvement important because many CAG members do not live in the neighborhoods along Fountain Creek. Patience, leadership, clear goals, perseverance and time are necessary in community planning.

-Given the extensiveness of the document distributed by Member Kinnischtzke, Chairperson Frost requested the members review the document for discussion at future meetings.

-Member Kinnischtzke wished to point out a section on page 4 relative to group processes to consider in making reviews – interactive brainstorming, nominal group process, the Delphi Technique, and devil's advocacy. The second thing that stands out to him is the issue of partnerships. As a CAG we have an excellent opportunity, and if we are going to make the Fountain Creek Watershed concept and master plan a success we have to think as citizens in terms of partnership. Technical committees make reviews of technical issues; the District Board makes decisions like a planning commission or county commissioners, but our role is unique. Member Kinnischtzke believes we are tasked to develop partnerships up and down the Fountain Creek. That means we have to develop a rapport with land owners. We have to identify their long term ideas and build relationships with them. He felt like we blew it with the LaFarge project because we had a golden opportunity for partnership and now they have pulled out of the floodplain. We could have worked something out there he believes. If we could try to emphasize partnership, take a fresh perspective and not be another level of technical advisory committee, we can take this in a much better direction.

-Member Montoya grew up on Fountain Creek and partnership is what she is working on with the Eastside Neighborhood Association. She thinks partnership is important

because many families live generation to generation along Fountain Creek, and the Creek is important to the people who live along it.

-Member Frost suggested there are other partnership opportunities such as with environmental or business groups. She believes that this perspective is what is missing from the criteria, the broader view of reaching out to other stakeholders. She would also suggest getting volunteers for projects involving school children and educational efforts.

-Member Henrichs stated that with respect to the suggestion of having a contact person to be able to respond to email, he thinks it would be great if we had a little bit more time instead of the two weeks, maybe six weeks. They get this stuff to us, they come to a first meeting and have a person come to answer questions we all have instead of emailing that person and emailing everybody back and forth because we may have the same question and six of us want an answer to it and we're all emailing the same question back out whereas if we're at one meeting and we're asking the question everyone hears the answer at the same time. Then we come back and make a decision on it at the next meeting.

-Member Walker did not think adding six weeks to the process of land development was a good suggestion. He thinks we could be open to having them come early, but doesn't think we need to have fixed criteria as to when they bring the information because they might be very simple items that don't need a lot of hearing or a whole lot of questions. He feels it is important that we try to fit our process into existing land use review processes so that we're not creating something where you get held up another 30 or 60 days because of scheduling.

-Chairperson Frost requested that the conversation be expanded from the criteria to what else the CAG will be doing.

-Member Baker suggested meeting with the Fountain Creek Foundation to see what they are doing and find out how they would like to work with this group. They would like to get involved in educational type things – family, children, outreach and those sorts of things. She thinks that is a key partnership for what we're doing. They might want to have some more community input and between the two of us we can make that happen for both entities.

-Member Kinnischtzke suggested getting hold of or meeting with land owners in the Fountain Creek area.

-Member Baker added that it's not just the land owners along the Creek. There are hundreds of miles of creeks in our watershed, and there are people upstream we want to influence to make good choices (e.g. for low impact development) so really it's everyone in the watershed that is affected. Member Frost clarified the suggestion that in addition to the Fountain Creek Foundation we should be reaching out to other groups.

-Member Vincent sees two major roles for the CAG. The first is related to the number one challenge facing the District Board and that is to identify and mobilize a body of public support for the vision of the Fountain Creek Watershed, and in particular the Crown Jewel/Fountain Creek corridor. He doesn't think the District Board has yet taken up this concept or challenge. They will eventually have to go to the voters in both counties for support and if they don't have that constituency behind them their chance of success is very slim. He thinks the CAG has a unique role in helping to make that

happen. That gets to some of the things we've been talking about such as building partnership, helping people understand what the vision is, trying to figure out how their interests relate to the vision, and mobilizing constituents for the future of the watershed. The other role is that of public conscience of the District Board. One that helps the board do better in recognizing and understanding what the issues are in the decisions that they make that actually affect people in the watershed. The CAG can assist these in a unique way.

-Member Ready asked if we had met with the Fountain Creek Foundation, which the CAG has not. He thinks it would be a good idea for the CAG to invite them to a future meeting, get a better understanding of our respective visions/goals and then we're both going in the same direction.

-Member Maroney pointed out that this is a watershed authority; it isn't an authority over the floodplain between Fountain and Pueblo. We have to recognize that what happens in the watershed affects Fountain Creek. How do we look at projects somewhere in the county and relate it back to Fountain Creek? The influence of those projects in the watershed is very significant in terms of water quality, sedimentation, erosion, etc in the Fountain Creek corridor. How do we set up process so that we're not burdened with so many projects for review? How do we get the existing reviewing authorities up to speed on the District's strategies/criteria or the Army Corps of Engineers study so that they can relate to the principles against which we're to judge projects and then refer projects that are not in accord with the criteria basically in those two studies? That process has to be thought out some more.

-Member Frost thought it was a good suggestion to make sure planning agencies are familiar with the plans in order to weed out some of the projects we don't need to review. Member Maroney thinks it will simplify the developers concerns as well in that we all are reviewing projects against the same criteria.

-Member Walker hopes that city and county reviewing agencies are incorporating these plans into the other projects they are doing. They are another resource we need to look to for implementing these things.

-Member Kinnischtzke mentioned that municipalities have a big influence on Fountain Creek. We don't seem to have any authority over what municipalities do with their projects that funnel water into the Creek. Member Frost said that the focus of the District is to change that situation and get everyone on the same page. Member Baker clarified that when we had the Vision Task Force, members representing the entities made commitments to work together to agree to adopt common drainage criteria or educational outreach for example. We have so many things to be done, but we don't have the staff to do them all. She agreed with Member Vincent that educating the public should be one of the first things we do to get them educated, aware and get them excited about the possibilities. That's why the demonstration projects and working together with the Foundation are important. And then the second priority is working on the drainage criteria so we all adopt a similar thing. We need to take a stepwise approach.

-Member Kornelly stated she will add a paragraph on outreach and the CAG as the public conscience of Fountain Creek to the criteria document. She also cautioned to not

clutter the criteria with the how-to-dos. First we need to figure out what we're going to do and get it approved by the District Board. Then we can talk about how to do it.

-Member Barber asked how the proposed criteria relates to the TAC criteria, are we duplicating and if so is that appropriate. Member Maroney responded that he thinks the TAC approach will be more technically oriented, not necessarily the way a citizen would look at it. He considers the criteria to be valid for both committees.

-Member Kornelly clarified that she selected more citizen oriented criteria when developing the document. She said we do not conflict in our criteria but we look at the criteria in a slightly different way.

-Member Henrichs asked in terms of public meetings aren't we the public? From the standpoint that each of us comes from a different area, we each have our own opinions and where we're coming from, so aren't we the public? Member Frost stated that we can be the conduit; we can represent the interests represented on the CAG, but not the entire public. Member Henrichs pointed out that we never get all of the public at the meetings anyway. His point is that we are the citizens. He doesn't think we need to do outreach on every single issue, on every single topic that comes before the CAG. Member Frost clarified that we were not proposing to outreach on every single project. It is more about general educational outreach.

-Member Johnston considered 'how much of the public opinion do you take into account in terms of what passes through us and to the District Board' to be a great question. He thinks we have to be open and accessible to public opinion. Sometimes we may take a contrary stand to public opinion, which the public could then take to the District Board and we should be prepared for that. He would like to know more about what the Fountain Creek Foundation is doing in terms of outreach to avoid duplication or overlap. Ultimately we are the public and we represent them. Member Ready said he has talked to the Foundation and they really want to work with us.

-Member Kornelly clarified she will add the outreach and public conscience roles to the criteria but she won't actually describe how we will implement it. We will leave the approaches until after we talk with the Fountain Creek Foundation and perhaps other groups.

-Member Kinnischtzke asked if we as the CAG want to get involved in implementing the list such as the process of funding and protection of open space. Member Kornelly clarified that the criteria are for CAG use in reviewing projects and making recommendations. We may want to use the criteria when looking at a project, not that we as a CAG are going to implement the list. She suggested that projects should contribute to one or more of the six criteria listed.

-Member Ready told the group that Great Outdoors Colorado ("GOCO") does a lot of grants for open space and they like to see a lot of entities in support of a project. We don't have to be the funding source. We can support other projects and write a letter of recommendation as part of our process.

-Member Baker added that we will be the ones making recommendations. Assuming the IGA goes through, we will have the Corridor Master Plan going forward and they are looking for matching funds. We will be the ones moving projects forward that align with our goals. At some point we might be the funding source. We might use our funds as matching funds for projects.

-Member Frost clarified we are not just using the criteria to make recommendations on projects, but we are going to look for projects that match our criteria to move forward.

-Member Vincent reiterated that it is critical that we use these opportunities to get public support.

-Member Maroney reminded that all projects will go through a public review process. Our role is to give comment on those projects. He's not sure how much public involvement we need when each project will be considered in a public process by the entities involved. Member Ready reiterated this was his concern previously made. Member Kornelly said that we may not need a public process depending on the project. The procedure is intended to be pretty general.

-Member Kinnischtzke wondered whether we should narrow our focus in on the public relations aspect of the process. He suggested rather than getting bogged down and possibly duplicating what the TAC or District Board is doing that we look at a proactive approach to engage the public. We could focus on the public, partnership and relationships. Member Frost was concerned about the CAG focusing solely on public relations. Member Kinnischtzke clarified his idea is to engage, educate, connect and inform the public and we should make that our job. We can do reviews and have our guidelines but ultimately our job should be to build the public into the process. Member Montoya added as a classroom teacher that we should involve schools to familiarize children with the Fountain Creek, help make them responsible citizens and educate families.

-Member Baker commented that this initial document is to say that these are the kinds of things we are headed towards and the kinds of things that are our overarching goals. The specifics of how we carry those out are the next stage. Public relations, working with others, looking at projects and how they affect the public, and giving feedback are really important as overarching goals. We need to focus on Member Kornelly's document, make sure we have the goals in it, and then begin to address how much effort we put into each one and how we find the partnerships to carry them out.

-Member Kornelly reiterated she will include a paragraph about outreach. Member Henrichs comments concerning the time needed for CAG review of submittals (2 weeks or 6 weeks) and the meeting process for review (one or two meetings) should be decided by the group. She did not note any other comments.

-Members Kinnischtzke, Montoya and Frost emphasized the opportunity and need to involve schools and children in our outreach and education efforts.

-Member Vincent considered it this group's fundamental responsibility/primary role to advise the District Board. Our job is to keep them on track and focused, make sure they're getting it right, and make sure the public understands what they are doing and ultimately, hopefully the public can support what they're doing. That's what it is going to take to keep this thing going beyond a couple of years from now.

-Member Ready stated in response to the question about the number of weeks for review that it depends on the complexity of the issue. It might take more than six weeks for review or just a few days. He suggested not including a timeframe in the document. Member Kornelly suggested leaving in the minimum of two weeks requirement and if more time is needed for review the CAG could vote to continue the item. Member Henrichs stated as far as the timing, he was trying to narrow the applicant's ability down

to have conversations with all of us at one time instead of being bombarded with each and every one of us making personal contact. We need the personal contact as a group. It doesn't need to be six weeks. He doesn't want to increase the timeline to move projects forward; those criteria are established by the zoning boards and he wants to be able to work in our comments. They would come to one meeting and we ask questions before the next meeting; then we come back with our perspectives to give to the District Board on the project. Member Kornelly suggested including on the second page, paragraph 3, "The Applicant should make available for the CAG a point of contact and should be prepared to present to the CAG at the appropriate meetings." Member Henrichs was satisfied that this was the point he was trying to make. Member Frost agreed with him that there is not enough time to review big projects like we just did but stated we will take it project by project and come up with the criteria later. Member Walker commented we are advisory to a group that has jurisdiction in the 100-year floodplain outside the municipalities. He thinks we have to have criteria and a process by which people can get through this step. We can't be vague about whether it's two or six weeks; we need to be more specific on the process. He thinks it is inappropriate for advisory board members to have the ability to contact an applicant because we don't know what is happening as a group. If this is a quasi-judicial body, individual contact is not allowed outside a public meeting. Attorney Kogovsek clarified decisions are made by the District Board; the CAG is advisory. Members Frost and Kornelly reiterated the change in language to "make available to the CAG a point of contact" and remove the other sentence ["This individual should be willing to answer questions from a CAG member via email or phone."] to address this issue.

-Member Kinnischtzke suggested establishing a criteria sheet that fits with our review process, can be given to the applicant ahead of time and shows our priorities and what we are evaluating. The applicant can provide a summary in response to the criteria. Member Kornelly suggested once we agree to the criteria, we should be able to send it to the applicant. It would be a good way to communicate with the applicant what we are looking for.

-Member Maroney questioned how we know what is happening in the watershed. Projects have to be referred to us by some source. There are a lot of things happening in the watershed we are not aware of. But various entities have the ability to refer projects to us. If something was awry with a checklist, maybe that project should be referred to us for review. But if you have a checklist and the criteria are met, then we wouldn't need to review a project. Member Walker suggested asking jurisdictions what they think. Each jurisdiction needs to inform the applicant they need to come to us. Jurisdictions are already deciding which projects are referred to us. Member Barber stated she continues to be confused about the jurisdiction of the District Board and whether or not we are commenting on projects in the 100-year floodplain or the watershed as a whole. If it is the entire watershed, then education and outreach to others become all that more important. Member Frost clarified the district has jurisdiction over the 100-year floodplain south of Fountain and north of Pueblo. Everything else outside of that they have advisory capability. Everything in the watershed affects the creek, so we need to have input. The District Board should address the question about how to set up the system concerning which projects we

review. We could take them our ideas. Member Maroney thinks the checklist makes it simple for them to determine which projects to send to us. Member Baker stated that if everybody adopts the Drainage Criteria Manual we won't even need a checklist because the manual will incorporate what we care about. Member Kinnischtzke asked what we are here for if the Drainage Manual is adopted throughout. Member Baker responded it is one piece. Member Walker said it will be years before the manual is adopted by all jurisdictions. Member Maroney clarified the manual will contain procedures that may be adopted. The low impact development ("LID") technique is an option at this time; it is not required. Member Baker suggested that as the process goes along the CAG may wish to do an economic evaluation of LID techniques.

-Member Kornelly asked whether we want to table this item until the next meeting, adopt it now, or table it, revise it and bring it to the next meeting. Member Ready suggested the document be modified and brought to the next meeting for action. Member Baker asked if we wanted to have the Foundation here before we make a decision. Member Vincent requested we add to the motion to make the criteria available publicly and invite comments from the public.

Action: Following discussion, upon motion duly made and seconded, it was resolved to let Member Kornelly modify the plan and bring it back to the next meeting without public comment and without meeting with the Foundation (11 For, 0 Against, 1 Abstain).

-Member Ready moved to let Member Kornelly modify the plan, bring it back to us, let us vote on it and do so without public comment and without meeting with the Foundation; and if we find later on meeting with the Foundation it conflicts, we can modify it. It was seconded by Member Kinnischtzke. Discussion:

-Member Baker would like the plan before the meeting.

-Member Vincent expressed concern about the concept of adopting a document of this importance without public comment.

-Member Kinnischtzke would like public input, but he would like to do so when we get a little more organized.

-Member Kinnischtzke would like to start working on a checklist. Member Maroney said there are several checklists available. Member Kinnischtzke asked if a checklist(s) could be brought to the next meeting for review. Concerning the checklist, Member Kornelly said if we send out the criteria document a developer would know what our concerns are.

-Member Henrichs said as far as sending it out to the developers, we don't know who the next new developer will be. If it goes to the planning and zoning commissions of both counties and if they put it into their checklists, make it one step in their procedure, it would save a lot of duplication and time.

-Member Frost clarified Member Henrichs suggestion as sending the criteria to the planning commissions and they send projects based on that.

-Member Frost called for the question.

Member Kornelly will revise the criteria document. All Members were asked to review the materials provided by Member Kinnischtzke.

7. Other Business:

-Member Maroney reported the City of Pueblo received grant funding for two demonstration projects on Fountain Creek. One project is a streamside system; the other is an off-line detention wetlands project. Acceptance of the grants by the City is pending. The streamside project is proposed near the confluence of Fountain Creek in the creek. The project is designed with a bed load collector to collect sediment flowing down Fountain Creek. It removes the sediment to help determine the characteristics and amount of sediment. It is a full scale demonstration of the earlier pilot project. The other project is near the north side Wal-Mart. It includes a wetland area development, removal of tamarisk, and off-line detention.

-Attorney Kogovsek told the group when asked that Pueblo County nominated Richard Skorman as the CAG representative for the board. The expectation is that a CAG member will be seated on the District Board at the next meeting.

8. Public Comment:

-Mr Ronald Serna raised the question about what the Army has put in Fountain Creek. There has been concern about what other entities have put in the Creek but not the Army. He suggested the CAG pay more attention to Fort Carson.

9. Executive Session (If Required): None required

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

After discussion it was agreed the CAG will meet on October 9th, at 9:30am at Fountain City Hall.

Some members would like to meet at other locations once a quarter. The meeting 3 months from now will be in Pueblo.

11. Adjourn

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at approximately 1133am.