

Fountain Creek Watershed, Flood Control and Greenway District
Technical Advisory Committee

Meeting Minutes
Wednesday, October 7, 2015 – 1:00 P.M.

1. Call to Order and Introductions: The meeting was held at Fountain City Hall, 116 South Main Street, 2nd Floor, Fountain, Colorado. A quorum was established and the meeting was called to order at 1:00 p.m., by Nancy Keller, Chairwoman.

In attendance were:

Joan Armstrong, Pueblo County Planning and Development
Jeff Bailey, City of Pueblo, Stormwater
John Chavez, El Paso County, Stormwater
Shelly Cobau, City of Manitou Springs, Flood Control Manager
Keith Curtis, El Paso County, Floodplain Administration
Jim Heckman, Fountain Sanitation District, Wastewater
Kim Gortz, Colorado Springs Utilities (Alternate)
Duane Greenwood, City of Fountain, Public Works
Nancy Keller, City of Pueblo, Water Quality
Irene Kornelly, Citizen's Advisory Group
Greg Langer, NRCS
Bob Miner, At Large - Palmer Lake
Rich Muzzy, Pikes Peak Area Council of Governments
Jeff Rice, El Paso County, Engineering (Alternate)
Mark Shea, Colorado Springs Utilities, Water Supply
Fred Williams, U.S. Air Force Academy

Those members absent were:

Pat Coffee, Pueblo County Public Works and Engineering
Jeff Besse, City of Colorado Springs, Engineering
Elaine Kleckner, El Paso County Community Services Parks
Dennis Maroney, Pueblo Conservancy District
Kevin Niles, Arkansas Groundwater Users Association
Suzanne Rohrs, Fort Carson, Stormwater Program Manager

Others in attendance were:

Mary Barber, Fort Carson and Citizen's Advisory Group
Gary Rapp, Recycling Coalition of Colorado Springs
Larry Small, Fountain Creek Advisory Board

2. Approve Agenda: A motion to approve the agenda of the October 7, 2015 meeting was made by John Chavez, seconded by Irene Kornelly, and approved by unanimous vote.
3. Approve Minutes: Mr. Shea stated on 6.c., the minutes state that "Tim Mitros has presented his name as an alternate for the City of Colorado Springs. John Chavez made a motion to recommend Mitros to the Board." He questioned if the minutes should clarify that this was to

the Committee as opposed to the District Board. A motion to approve the minutes of the September 2, 2015 meeting, with the above change, was made by Irene Kornelly, seconded by John Chavez, and approved by unanimous vote.

4. Presentation:

- a. Digital Flood Insurance Rate Maps for the NFIP Communities of El Paso County. Mr. Shea stated before Mr. Curtis gets started he noticed this was because the Fountain Creek Watershed includes both Pueblo and El Paso counties and if there was a chance to get someone from Pueblo County to make a presentation. Chairwoman Keller stated Pueblo County's maps are not available yet and are being worked on. Mr. Bailey stated he heard that they are working on it.

Mr. Curtis reported as part of the Digital FIRM update process FEMA comes to the community and offers an opportunity for the community to comment on the maps. They issued them in July. The slides are extracted from their presentation to the community. There were a handful of community officials who showed up to the afternoon meeting, and 50-60 citizens for the public meeting held in the evening. Regional Building initiated a couple of Letters of Map Revision (LOMR) to accelerate some of the positive changes they knew were coming along Fountain Creek where the laws were revised downward to a third of what they were previously mapped. In answer to a question, Mr. Curtis stated it was a study that Michael Baker did, which was based on the gauge data correlation to actual storm, noting they used revised, more advanced modeling methods. It primarily was centered on validating the flows, gauge data, and storm data to correlate to one another. The community's role in the preliminary maps is to review them, which he has done and has generated 150 comments back to them, noting they were centered on line issues. When they digitized the DFIRM panels they created the ARC/GIS and they basically had to trace out a paper copy and then lay them into ARC/GIS, noting he found where some of them were slightly off and they caused an adverse impact on owners. FEMA accepts appeals and there has to be something wrong with the modeling or methods used to generate the overlays. Currently, they are collecting comments of the process. His comments have already been submitted and the city and county are trickling theirs in, noting he didn't expect much change. The remapping included new hydrology for Fountain Creek and Black Squirrel Creek. No detailed studies existed, meaning the base flood elevations weren't defined or previous studies were superseded with newer more accurate information. Mr. Miner asked about Monument Creek. Mr. Curtis replied he didn't know FEMA's rationale for selection of drainages, noting the mapping effort has been going on for 10 years. Mr. Miner stated in the upper part of the creek there are significant areas that impact the community. Mr. Curtis responded he didn't think much changed along Monument Creek unless there was a LOMR already done, noting those happen periodically. FEMA generally doesn't initiate map revisions, noting this was the first time it's been done since the early 1990s. They are supposed to do it every five years, but they haven't been able to meet that. They operate at a significant deficit and have been attempting to correct that and become more solvent. On the FIRM information in the county, the GIS didn't have any of the LOMRs. They are now incorporating all of the map revisions they have already approved and more accurately defined more of the "A" zones, noting they are trying to align those more accurately with the actual drainages. He stated out of 6,000 parcels affected by changes in the county, about one-half dozen came into the flood zone, and a lot of the

structures are coming out because of the lowering the Fountain Creek. They didn't revise any of the panels associated with protection by Templeton Gap in Colorado Springs, noting a lot of these panels remained the same. Mr. Curtis stated the only void occurs where the four panels along Templeton Gap occur and you can use the current map because nothing changed. FEMA's map shows where base elevations were raised and lowered. Mr. Muzzy asked if there is one layer that has all the mapping for the county. Mr. Curtis replied there is one that has all the preliminary information covering the whole county minus the Templeton Gap area. He stated the current map is on their website. The new preliminary information isn't going to be validated until probably 2017. He stated he could provide the two GIS layers and someone's GIS department could compile what they want. The preliminary can be downloaded GIS data from FEMA's website. The layer the Building Department has was purchased by them, noting there are rights and usage agreements associated with it. Mr. Muzzy questioned if the two layers might be merged after 2017. Mr. Curtis replied in the end it should be done and the hole will be gone, noting nothing has changed in this area and you can view the old data. Mr. Miner asked what part of the Templeton Gap levee failed the standards. Mr. Curtis replied that should be directed to city engineering because he didn't know what's wrong with the levee. Mr. Miner stated it must have passed at some point in time because it was built to some standard. Mr. Curtis stated that maybe the standard has changed. Mr. Miner stated when somebody changes the standards you have to pay for the upgrades. Mr. Shea asked if he could provide the current status of the levee and how it is reflected in the current maps. Mr. Curtis replied it is the red square. Mr. Shea asked what the standards are behind the red square as far as the previous maps and the lack of certification and what would it mean for those maps if they are revised accordingly. Mr. Curtis responded the last he heard was that FEMA was going to zone the levees as a different letter (e.g., "D"), and that zone meant that there was no mandatory purchase requirement; however, there were risks associated with it and if you chose to purchase the insurance it was going to be elevated. They didn't just say the levee was ineffective and everybody behind the levee is required to buy flood insurance. They said we don't know how effective the levee is so; therefore, we are not requiring insurance, but if you want it, it is a higher risk grade. In terms of the levees not being de-certified, all of those were the City of Colorado Springs' conversations and projects and the changes were between them and FEMA.

Mr. Miner asked how they set up the new standards for the Cherry Creek watershed in the northwestern part of El Paso County above Woodmoor and east, noting there is a lot of drainage which goes into Cherry Creek. Mr. Curtis replied in the county all of the blue lines indicate re-delineated approximate "A" zones. They took "A" zone floodplains and matched them against actual contours they had on the ground and shifted them. There was a good amount of new area that was shifted. Mr. Miner asked if there was any coordination between Douglas, Elbert, and El Paso counties as far as FEMA was concerned. Mr. Curtis replied all of the mapping was done by Anderson in Fort Collins. This is a FEMA contract between their consultants and who they coordinate it with. Mr. Miner stated there is a considerable amount of storm drainage/flight control structures in the area. Mr. Curtis replied if it is not FEMA regulated and not a special flood hazard area, noting there is a lot of storm drainage all over the county that is not part of anything, it is done by the local stormwater management.

Mr. Curtis stated the results were released in July and sent to the community CEOs and him. The CCO meeting was held yesterday and they are in the middle of a 90-day appeal and comment period for citizens and community officials. FEMA will issue a letter of final determination and there is about a six-month period where Congressional action has to take place for the maps to be adopted, or late 2016 or early 2017 for the new maps to become effective. Mr. Miner asked if this only for El Paso County. Mr. Curtis replied El Paso County only. The links are available on their website. Mr. Chavez asked if they should receive phone calls from citizens regarding their property being in a floodplain what they should do. Mr. Curtis replied if the question is about being in a floodplain, then they should be sent to him. Mr. Chavez questioned about going back to the realignment of lines where the water is flowing outside of the lines. Mr. Curtis replied they hardly get a 100-year event, and they probably will never fill up to where the lines are shown. Mr. Chavez asked if a citizen should call and say the map is not correct if the question should go to him. Mr. Curtis replied the question could go to him and he will help them formulate their appeal or their concern. An appeal can't be done unless there is a study to back it up. The worst case scenario is if they are higher than where the water occurs, then there is a process to do a Letter of Map Amendment (LOMA) per structure, which would probably cost under \$1,000.

Ms. Cobau asked if a landowner wants to process a Letter of Map Revision (LOMR) now during this period are they being accepted. Mr. Curtis replied they are being accepted. Mr. Miner asked if this would be until 2017. Mr. Curtis responded any LOMR which would occur now and until acceptance should be incorporated in the final release. If a LOMR comes in and we are three months from these becoming effective, then it will be like any other LOMR. Whether it gets incorporated into their GIS data doesn't matter because it will be effective and we will regulate based on it. You will never get caught up with the all the changes because they occur every couple of months. Mr. Miner asked who has the ultimate authority--the Corps of Engineers or FEMA. Mr. Curtis answered they have different jurisdictions. FEMA is in charge of the floodplain and Corps of Engineers is in charge of various activities of working with waters of the State. Mr. Miner stated there are problems getting approvals unless the Corps of Engineers puts its checkmark "good" on it. Mr. Curtis replied anytime you are working with any waters of the State they are going to add their comments. There are other considerations which are also taken into account such as wildlife, etc. He stated the PowerPoint presentation would be found on the Pikes Peak Regional Building website and look under the Floodplain page.

Mr. Muzzy stated beginning in 2017 it will be confusing for the district because it will have the updated DFIRM maps in El Paso County and the old maps in Pueblo County because they haven't been updated yet. Mr. Curtis replied it is occurring in El Paso County now because of the LOMRs that have come in and tie back into the affected floodplain into the LOMRS which were approved for Manitou Springs and Stratmoor. In answer to a question, Mr. Curtis stated the levee has been in limbo since he's been here for four years, and what he heard it's going to be a risk zone which doesn't require mandatory insurance. Mr. Miner asked if someone in the area should apply for flood insurance if they are going to be hit with a higher fee because FEMA didn't acknowledge the standards that the levee was built to. Mr. Curtis responded it would be easy to Google FEMA. What he recalls is the zone they were going to be in was a high risk zone with no mandatory purchase.

Mr. Shea stated they are looking at a draft scope of work that would include a task to adapt the City of Colorado Springs' revised drainage material manual into a form that might be used by the watershed district. It reviews projects and directs them forward. They also are doing spinoff projects, and another area of interest is floodplain administration. He wanted to know potential considerations they should take as far as what administration looks likely currently, and what the district might be thinking as far as having regulations for the corridor that would be protective or in line with its policy objectives that are identified in the various documents for a restoration master plan. Mr. Curtis replied Pikes Peak Regional Building Department provides building-related services and floodplain services for seven jurisdictions, including El Paso County, Fountain, Monument, and Green Mountain Falls. Any one of the jurisdictions is free to amend the building code and the floodplain code. The current floodplain code is accepted by FEMA and satisfies all the national and State minimums and, in some cases, exceeds those. Mr. Shea asked what the structure of the relationship between regional building and those different jurisdictions is; noting is it through intergovernmental agreements. Mr. Curtis replied yes. Mr. Shea stated it might be something to consider at some point to get some type of agreement between the district and regional building. The corridor also extends down into Pueblo County, although there is an issue where the district needs to be looking at issues rather throughout the entire reach. He asked if through the IGA if it would be possible for regional building to be involved in floodplain administration outside of El Paso County. Mr. Curtis replied he would have to ask, noting he is not in a position to make those kinds of decisions. He stated Woodland Park was just added to the IGA.

Mr. Shea stated in the draft scope of work they are developing there is task related to floodplain administration. He wondered how they can collectively get that dialed in to be what it needs to be. He questioned what are they hoping to achieve through a review of the applicable floodplain administration occurs in the corridor in El Paso County and Pueblo County as part of this potential study. Mr. Curtis replied you are funding a study to relook at the way things in the floodplain are administered throughout the whole county and the seven jurisdictions. Mr. Shea stated the land use authority for the district is within the 100-year floodplain south of the City of Fountain down to the City of Pueblo, or unincorporated El Paso County and Pueblo County. Mr. Curtis replied the best way to go is to come up with your own amended rules. Mr. Chavez stated if they come with a new floodplain policy which has them looking at the channel, it would then be a water quality issue. He stated they don't worry about how much erosion of the bank is occurring as long as it stays within the lines. He stated we don't want the erosion to occur, we want to preserve banks. Mr. Curtis stated they work with getting your ideas or what would they like to be seen along the corridor incorporated into the code and amend the county code. He stated the streamside overlays get captured by city zoning. He stated they don't have an IGA with the district. Mr. Small stated their authority is established through the statutes. Mr. Shea stated the county and the city have authority as home rule entities and they execute that through their agreement with regional building. Mr. Small stated he doesn't see a conflict with regional building over the floodplain. Mr. Shea asked if he saw opportunities to improve the community rating system scores. Mr. Curtis replied there is a new manual out in 2016, which is a five-year cycle. He stated he didn't know how things were going to shake out exactly. Mr. Miner

asked if the incorporated communities have to apply to get it. Mr. Curtis replied it is online on FEMA's website.

Mr. Chavez asked about the community rating system. Mr. Curtis replied water quality and land preservation are big. Unfortunately, in El Paso County, land preservation is a function of floodplain acreage total divided by the amount preserved. What is preserved in parks in the city and county is a small fraction of the total floodplain. There is a section of water quality and stormwater regulations. Regional building does a lot of credible activities with respect to outreach. Mr. Miner asked how FEMA interfaces with communities to help reconcile highways and roads and access to drainage. Mr. Small replied they do the maps. Mr. Curtis replied they issue the maps and let you know where the risk areas are and let you know where you can build. The regional building code lets you know about building in a floodplain and the rules you need to follow. Ms. Cobau stated the maps designed by FEMA identify those areas. Mr. Miner stated if he would like to build something inside a floodplain, but he is denied flood insurance because of it, there has to be some relief.

5. Reports:

- a. Governing Board – Mr. Small reported the board met on September 25th. The board elevated Jeff Besse from alternate to a regular member for the City of Colorado Springs and appointed Tim Mitros as the alternate.

Mr. Small stated he presented the proposed 2016 budget to the board, and there were two alternatives in the budget. Option 1 was for a full up district operation, which includes hiring staff and opening an office. Option 2 was to continue as is, except for the Fountain Creek Watershed Water Quality Activity Enterprise, which they will budget for next year. This will be funded by the Monetary Mitigation Funds under the 1041 Permit for \$9.7 million. He stated the district component has to be self-supporting, noting it can't use Monetary Mitigation Funds to operate the district. The full up district operation budget, at the end of the day, had a deficit of \$130,000. Option 2 had a \$24,000 deficit. He stated the board decided to go with Option 2.

Mr. Small stated the board asked for permission to resubmit the Fountain Creek Corridor Watershed Assessment of Rivers Stability and Sediments grant application. The grant was for \$30,000 from CWCB, the district will provide a \$30,000 match, and there will be \$32,000 in in-kind. The money went to fund the Upper Fountain Creek/Cheyenne Creek restoration master plan, as well as other activities throughout the State. This grant is to look at the corridor from Colorado Springs to the confluence with the Arkansas and do a Phase I waters assessment. The CWCB board meets in December when it should be awarded; noting it probably won't go under contract until April next year.

- b. Citizens Advisory Group - Ms. Kornelly reported the Citizen's Advisory Group (CAG) met on September 11th. She stated Mr. Small gave a presentation on the Upper Fountain Creek/Cheyenne Creek restoration master plan. CAG discussed the FEMA floodplain meeting and encouraged people to attend. CAG talked about Creek Week, noting she didn't have any numbers on the people who attended or participated or how much trash was picked up. She stated it will be summarized and available for people to use. She stated CAG will be taking on the acronym issue and there will be an acronym list placed

on the website on floodwater, stormwater, etc. It will be posted as a .pdf on the website. She stated when the list is first put together it will probably not be inclusive of everything and, as it is gone through, things will be added. She stated the next CAG meeting is October 9th.

- c. Monetary Mitigation Fund Committee - Mr. Small reported the committee met on September 17th. The budget options were reviewed, noting Ms. Kornelly made the presentation. Also at the meeting, Mr. Shea was elected secretary and Ms. Kornelly vice chair. The next meeting is October 15th at the Pueblo County Public Works Department, at 1:00 p.m. Discussion will occur on the floodplain administration and the regional wide amendments to the DCM.

6. Business:

- a. Finalize DCM Scope - Mr. Muzzy distributed a draft of the DCM. This revision reflects the discussion at the last TAC meeting where suggestions were made regarding community participation, and the update of the DCM is a collaborative effort between all the entities. The site planning and design standards were changed to tighten the scope of work. The floodplain administration needs to be tweaked with respect to the regional floodplain administration and Pueblo County. He stated monetary mitigation needs to be refined. He stated there is a potential of getting money from DOLA. Mr. Shea asked the timeline on the DOLA funding, noting the monetary mitigation won't probably be ready until the first quarter of 2016. Mr. Muzzy replied the deadline to use the money is the end of June 2016, but there may be a possibility of getting a two-month extension. There is no deadline to apply for the funding. There are other competing interests within PPACG that could put that money to use. If there was a letter submitted on behalf of the district providing a match towards the project, then it would probably be sufficient to secure the funding. Mr. Small stated he needs to receive a copy of this because it was left at the board meeting that it is interested in having the member governments participate in funding this. He stated he needs to get quotes on what it takes to complete these tasks. As soon as he gets it, he can get the quotes and then it has to go to the board to determine how much they want to ask the governments for and how much the district wants to fund. If it is going to be funded with monetary mitigation funds, then it has to go to the Monetary Mitigation Advisory Committee to recommend it to the board. He stated he didn't think there was anything available to make those decisions until January, based on how long it will take to go to the private sector and get quotes. If you look at the 1041 permit, the monetary mitigation funds are payable to the district on January 15, 2016. According to the permit, they are payable the 15th of January following the year the SDS pipeline is complete and water is moved from Pueblo Reservoir to Colorado Springs. The pipeline is complete and water has been moved, so the money is due January 15, 2016. Mr. Chavez stated there has been discussion about looking at the criteria document to determine how it is applicable and how it is to be used by other member organizations. He asked if the monetary mitigation funds are available to do the work where it would be basically evaluating criteria for adoption by Pueblo or El Paso counties. Mr. Small replied it would be outside the scope if the district paid for 100% of the cost. If the district is paying for its portion they are going to use for their criteria to apply their projects, then he can see how that is applicable. It is up to the committee to make a recommendation to the board and for the board to agree with it. In his opinion, if the funds were going to be used to pay 100% of

the costs, then it is questionable. Mr. Shea asked how we can get to that cost allocation and how much should be funded through the Monetary Mitigation Funds. Mr. Small replied he has three sources in mind to go to get quotes. It is up to the board to decide how much they want to pay. Before the board makes the decision, the Monetary Mitigation Advisory Committee has to look at it and determine what it is worth to the application of those funds and figure out the percentage. Chairwoman Keller stated when she mentioned it the board she didn't get any percentage, noting they seemed receptive to this type of concept. Mr. Chavez questioned how you could get a quote from someone when the level of effort to do it from all members requires varying degrees. Mr. Muzzy replied this is the type of feedback needed. Mr. Shea stated the objective was to develop a general criteria manual much like urban drainage has that could be taken by the various jurisdictions and they could adapt it, adopt it, or whatever to make it useful to them. Mr. Chavez felt if the scope could be written to allow that "wiggle" to have members tie in and do a contract amendment specific to them, then that makes the funding clean. Mr. Small replied whatever the statement of work is the board wanted the district to pay for part and the member governments to pay for part--up front not later. The statement of work has to permit enough commission for the consultant to be able to do it. The drainage criteria manual was built on the very same premise. Mr. Shea stated the City of Colorado Springs has its own DCM and doesn't have to do anything, and El Paso County is in the process of adopting its own adaptation of the City's DCM and has spent resources to do this. Mr. Small stated these were never incorporated. Mr. Shea stated the DCM has criteria that is applicable with the city so all references to land use, landscaping, etc. are there. This task is how do you take that and make it more general so that the criteria are not all hard wired into the City of Colorado Springs. Mr. Small stated it should be watershed-wide. Mr. Miner stated when the district was established it included Pueblo and El Paso counties, noting it wasn't just within the drainage area of the watershed. He felt the DCM has to be generalized to where the City of Colorado Springs, Manitou Springs, or Green Mountain Falls can use it and then be able to modify it to their geological/physical location. Mr. Shea stated El Paso County's DCM will be applicable for other unincorporated areas in the county. They are taking the City of Colorado Springs' DCM and making it applicable to them. Mr. Muzzy stated the criteria for Woodland Park, El Paso County, Colorado Springs, and Pueblo are all different, noting this is based upon hydrology, location, land use, etc. It needs to be tailored specifically to the unique factors of each of the jurisdictions and the Fountain Creek watershed. Mr. Miner asked what level it was going to be written at. Mr. Small felt the purpose was to create a set of core criteria that can be tailored by each of the jurisdictions to their unique requirements. Mr. Miner stated if and when the RFP goes out that whoever the engineering firm that is hired that there be something in their scope of work that when they come up with a preliminary draft that it be submitted to each entity within the watershed for feedback. Mr. Muzzy stated the criteria are just for the district. Mr. Miner stated the reason he suggested this is because they would have preliminary input from all communities. Chairwoman Keller stated there was a significant amount of that done when Colorado Springs did its DCM. She stated Page 1, Paragraph 3, is the concern of going to the entities. She stated it needs to be tailored specifically to the district and take out everything that refers to the other entities and then leaving that up to them. Mr. Chavez stated he is on board with that, but he would still want a little wiggle room that in the event one of the member organizations wants to hire the contractor to do the tailoring so it applies to them. Chairwoman Keller asked if this would be done as an individual contract and it wouldn't be a part of this. The answer

was yes. Mr. Bailey stated it could be kept as district only and if the other entities want to take it on their own there could be an agreement that the firm could work with them separate.

- b. Mr. Muzzy stated a meeting could be held with the proposed consultants. Mr. Small stated when it is sent out to them, a pre-bid meeting could be made available to them to come and answer questions. Chairwoman Keller stated in order to keep this moving if a revision could be done and sent out for everyone to submit their comments before the next meeting. Mr. Shea stated he heard we need to get this to the contractors and that we need quotes and there has to be discussion about cost allocation. If this is district only, then it is going to be funded strictly through them as opposed to the different jurisdictions. He asked if it could be taken to the Monetary Mitigation Advisory Committee for discussion and then figure out what recommendation can be made to the board, as opposed to taking it to the board and then the Monetary Mitigation Advisory Committee. Mr. Small replied yes. Mr. Miner asked what would be term of the contract. Mr. Small guessed it would be six months. He stated they need to hear from the contractor how much it costs and how long it would take.

Mr. Chavez stated he saw a conflict on how Page 2, last paragraph, Flow Profile, is written. He stated the evaluation of the benefit of providing profiles is one thing, but the in the end it says it will be done. Are we going to have them evaluate it or are we going to profile along the creek? He felt the evaluation piece is more useful. After discussion, it was decided to be left as is.

Mr. Chavez stated on Page 3 there is a section of hydrology which talks about streets and storm sewers. He wondered what the likelihood of building roads within the floodplain in the district's jurisdiction is, noting it is something we don't need and is highly unlikely. Mr. Shea stated maybe these are cost questions which they need to have for the consultants. Mr. Small stated the criteria is going to be used to guide the approval of our own land use applications, but also the advisory comments to those which are submitted to them. Mr. Muzzy stated it probably needs to be reworded so instead of providing guidance that it should provide specifications. The DCM could be evaluated by the consultant and see what sections could be changed. Mr. Shea asked if we need to redo the scope of work. It would be to evaluate and make recommendations on changes that would be appropriate, and make modifications to the DCM.

Mr. Chavez stated on Page 4, under the Floodplain Administration, one of the prohibitions that was listed on Page 5 under the Streamside Overlay Zone was detention facilities. He stated he didn't know how much we want to get into streamside overlay zones. Mr. Shea stated maybe the consultant could identify these things and break it down for us and then we can have a discussion on whether this is the appropriate ordinance to refer to or should there be a streamside guidance document. Chairwoman Keller felt it needs to go back to the committee. Mr. Shea asked if there is some way to mitigate discussion with the subcommittee. Mr. Small stated he is not going to ask the consultants for any proposals because there is no funding for it. What he will be asking for is budgetary estimates for the statement of work in order to see if it is affordable to begin with. He asked the TAC what they are trying to achieve--are they trying to have the Colorado Springs' DCM tailored to the district or are you trying to develop the floodplain administration and the watershed-wide criteria. Mr. Muzzy stated the hope

was to develop a Fountain Creek Watershed District DCM. There were add-ons like the site planning and design standards. The community participation was an issue that came up at the last meeting. Mr. Small stated when you expand the statement of work to include this, it is very expensive, especially to include developers, etc., and they can't afford to do all of this.

Discussion occurred on presenting it to the Monetary Mitigation Advisory Committee. Chairwoman Keller stated they could present this effort. Mr. Small stated there are two different issues: (1) is this something consistent with the purpose of the funds, and (2) is the amount of money would provide a reasonable value to the use of those funds. At the October meeting, we have to find out if it is consistent with the purpose of the funds and, if it is, then we get a quote and present it to them so they can make a valued determination on it. Mr. Shea stated the purpose of the funds is for a project or projects within the Fountain Creek Watershed between Colorado Springs and confluence that provide a significant not just incidental benefit to Pueblo County. Mr. Small stated there is a determination for what the projects are (i.e., water quality, sedimentation, and flood control). Mr. Shea stated the question will be tying this policy to meet that objective. He felt this policy will provide that type of benefit to the Fountain Creek in Pueblo County. Chairwoman Keller stated there needs to be design criteria to use for the projects. Mr. Small agreed, noting part of the purpose of this is to provide us the criteria so when we go to a contractor. Mr. Shea felt most folks are going to be open to the benefit and there will be general support from the Monetary Mitigation Advisory Committee, but we need to be prepared with the cost estimate for this project and tying it back to the benefit of Fountain Creek in Pueblo County. If there are deliverables which are going to be outside of that, then we are going to have to identify the funding.

Mr. Muzzy stated he would like to schedule a meeting of the TAC committee next week to go over the changes.

c. Contact List – Chairwoman Keller handed out the updated TAC member list.

7. Other Business: No discussion.

8. Public Comment: Mr. Gary Rapp from the Recycling Coalition of Colorado Springs stated in July he brought TAC information about two watersheds that are under development. He provided a handout showing Sand Creek and Jimmy Camp Creek. Because of the record rainfall in May, it was felt this was a good opportunity to look at these as a paired watershed and do a runoff analysis. They looked at the stream flows of both watersheds over the entire month of May. This time they want to look at the daily precipitation both in Colorado Springs and Pueblo. They said they want to look at the rainfall runoff from these two watersheds, which are adjacent to the Colorado Springs airport weather station. The USGS information was taken on stream flows and did a paired watershed storm runoff hydrograph. Sand Creek has 40% development, as compared to Jimmy Camp Creek which has 10% development. One is an urbanized watershed and the other is just beginning. What they are pushing for in the DCM is to utilize a full spectrum detention, which relies on determining the excess urban runoff volume or the extra runoff which is generated when a watershed is paved. Jimmy Camp Creek is a pre-development hydrograph, and Sand Creek is post-development hydrograph. The volumes under each hydrograph are significant because in full spectrum detention you expect it to take the pre-development stream flow and keep it at

that level. The pre-development stream flow volume has to be run out so it won't be a problem to Fountain Creek. In a technical paper, it states that full spectrum development should be viewed as an add-on to runoff volume reduction practices that are implemented during urbanization or retrofitted into existing urban areas. He stated he wanted to show today the impact of urbanization Sand Creek has and how difficult that is going to be to make that volume control and rate control work together.

9. Set Date, Time, and Location of Next Meeting: The next meeting will be held on November 4, 2015, at 1:00 p.m., at Fountain City Hall.

10. Adjourn: There being no further business; the meeting was adjourned at 3:38 p.m.

LRS