

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

Meeting Minutes

June 5, 2013

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

1. Call to Order and Introductions

Meeting was begun at 13:10. A quorum was not present, therefore this will be an informational meeting.

Additional member arrived at 14:45 to form a quorum and the meeting was called to order at 14:45.

In attendance were the following designated members of the Fountain Creek Watershed Technical Advisory Committee:

| <u>Name</u> | <u>Organization</u> |
|---------------------------|---|
| Joan Armstrong | Pueblo County, Planning and Development |
| Dan Bare, P.E., Secretary | City of Colorado Springs, Engineering |
| John Chavez, Chair | El Paso County, Stormwater |
| Pat Coffee | Pueblo County |
| Duane Greenwood | City of Fountain, Public Works |
| Nancy Keller, Vice-chair | City of Pueblo |
| Elaine Kleckner | El Paso County, Comm. Services/Planning |
| Irene Kornelly | CAG |
| Dave Lethbridge | El Paso County, Fire Recovery Coordinator |
| Rich Muzzy | PPACG |
| Larry Small | FCWD, Executive Director |

2. Approve Agenda June 5, 2013 Meeting

Without a quorum the Agenda was not approved, but was followed.

After quorum was present Agenda of June 5, 2013 was approved. The motion was made by R. Muzzy and seconded by I. Kornelly and unanimously carried.

3. Approve Minutes of May 1, 2013 Meeting

Minutes from the May 1 meeting were not available for approval. They will be available for the 3 July meeting. After quorum was present there was a Motion to table minutes for

May. D. Greenwood motioned and R. Muzzy seconded. Motion was approved by unanimous vote.

4. Reports/Presentations

a. Governing Board – no update was provided.

b. Citizens Advisory Group (CAG)

An update was provided by Irene Kornelly including the following items.

-The CAG will have a meeting on Friday (June 7) prior to the Board retreat to formulate the recommendations from CAG to the District Board (regarding funding options).

-It was decided that Oil and Gas Sub-committee will no longer need to discuss the topic since no sources worth pursuing have been found to-date even though there may be continuing efforts by the City or County to formulate legislation.

-Mary Barber will be updating the website for the District, but needs a computer. She will coordinate with Jeff Besse.

c. Updates from Members Regarding Waldo Canyon Flood Prevention Efforts

-The County is in the RFP process for seeding damaged areas from the Waldo Canyon fire. Deadline for getting the seed on the ground has been extended to the last day of June. NRCS money has not yet been provided and may be 3 more weeks, but the effort is moving forward. There is a window of opportunity in the fall for planting but it is hoped that seed will be on the ground earlier.

-Initial flood risk maps provided by Matrix were distributed for public review. D. Lethbridge reported that mapping shows that post-fire 10-year flows result in a floodplain roughly equal to a 100-year pre-fire floodplain using better topography. The floodplains estimated were based on all of the crossing structures being blocked showing worst case debris conditions. J. Chavez. noted that the flows used were from the BAER team post-fire assessment of hydrology with a 30% factor added for debris. The maps show three levels of risk based on estimated elevation flow for less than 1 foot, between 2 and 4 feet and greater than 4 feet. These provide people with an idea of whether they need to consider buying flood insurance based on post-fire conditions causing bigger flows and the potential for structures to be blocked. City is organizing community meetings to discuss flood risks in Camp Creek and Douglas Creek. D. Lethbridge stated that the County has had larger meetings and is now moving to organize neighborhood meetings like in the Williams Canyon. J. Chavez noted extent of flood study was from Chipeta Park through Manitou Springs to confluence with Monument Creek. Also includes other tributaries like on Camp Creek and Douglas. D. Greenwood is getting questions about the impact on Fountain Creek flood potential.

E. Kleckner stated that CDOT has hired Tezak to do 5 projects up Ute Pass including at Rainbow Falls recreation area to stabilize the slopes. D. Lethbridge noted that CDOT is doing work at the outfall from Waldo Canyon and Sand Creek since keeping Hwy 24 open is a high priority.

d. Southern Delivery System (SDS) Update: Allison Moser, CSU

A presentation was provided on the status of the SDS project. The presentation included progress on the jurisdictional wetlands, Williams Creek Pump Station Power Supply, the Fountain Creek Realignment project and the Raw Water Pipeline Segment S4AC.

-Pipeline will terminate at Marksheffel and Powers. Connection to dam outlet is complete and water can be released through the cone valve. This allows the Bureau of Reclamation to better control smaller releases. Thirty-seven of fifty miles of pipe are in the ground. All of S1, S2 and S3 pipelines are completed and hydro-statically tested. Revegetation and irrigation is being done on Pueblo County projects. S4 is completed to I-25 but not tested. Grading for water treatment plant has begun. Contract for 3 pump stations has been awarded and are beginning permitting. The affect of the new 1041 process is being worked through for pending phases and Commissioners have committed to avoiding project delays. Component that connects dam to 90 inch pipeline and Juniper Pump Station will be under construction this Fall. The entire pipeline is encased in a flow-fill material. North combo segment is about half completed and is partly in the City and partly in the County. The Finish Water 3 segment is designed and going out to bid and is also an issue for the 1041 process. Last segment 2B will connect WTP to raw water pipeline.

-There has been good establishment of wetland mitigation area after first year which has benefited from irrigation of adjacent land. There has been a good diversity of plants with some mitigation of weeds required.

-A power pole for the Williams Creek Pump Station Power Supply was relocated to avoid floodplain and stability issues in response to TAC comments.

-Contractor has been selected based on 90% design of the creek realignment project and will coordinate with engineers to develop final design and evaluate constructability. Project is designed for about a 10-year event for stability. Rundowns will be used from the adjacent irrigated land to protect banks. Project is expected to be done under a USACE Nation-wide permit. Access to the site will be from a frontage road. Fountain Creek realignment application is expected to be submitted in July for an August Land Use request. Plans will be provided to the TAC 2 weeks prior to meeting. Expect Fall construction with wetlands planting in February or March, 2014.

S4A central segment is a challenging segment. Plan is to bore under I-25, railroad and floodplain about 40 feet deep with limited trenching. This will avoid most of the trees.

5. Unfinished Business

a. Redefine memberships on Sub-Committee to Review/Discussion on Chapters 1-5 of City of Colorado Springs Drainage Criteria Manual and Spin-off Projects (to prepare recommendation to the Board regarding District Adoption of DCM).

J. Chavez moved this item to after Item 5b to accommodate presenters.

After presence of quorum a Motion to table Item 5a until July meeting was made by D. Greenwood and seconded by R. Muzzy. Motion passed by a unanimous vote.

b. Update on USGS Fountain Creek Watershed Flood Control and Sedimentation Study (Dave Mau, Mike Kohn with John Fulton on conf. call)

Dave M. introduced project. Scenarios are completed except for main-stem reservoir. Thirteen scenarios are being evaluated. Draft report will be delivered to District about mid-July for review as co-sponsor. Then comments will be incorporated into a final report for distribution.

Mike K. summarized the project which was done to evaluate remediation scenarios for peak flows and sedimentation. Models based on 2006 URS/USACE model and updated and calibrated prior to evaluating scenarios. Hydrologic model was HMS with 72 subbasins applying the SCS CN method. The model was calibrated to 12 USGS stream flow gages and rain gages. Calibration was based on the 2011 storm and validated using the 1999 storm. Calibrated HEC-RAS 4.1 with about 2,000 cross-sections covering about 130 miles of model domain using the Mannings roughness coefficient and 15 USGS stream gages. Sediment transport model was done using a pre-release of HEC-RAS 4.2 based on critical Shields number in the Koplán-Larsen equation. Calibration was done by matching sediment rating curves from 6 USGS sampling sites. Design storm was same as that used for URS watershed study, SCS 24-hour Type IIa (with a PMP spatial distribution). HMS model results were entered in the RAS model as a basis for the scenarios.

The results from the scenarios (1 thru 13) were presented at the location of the gage station in Pueblo. Scenario 10 will involve placing a dam about 10 miles north of Pueblo on the main stem based on the USACE 2009 report recommendation and will be completed soon. Initial Scenario 11 represented a lined channel to eliminate sediment movement, but caused an increase in degradation downstream. Scenario 12 included 10 drop structures to control sediment, but did not seem to work. This will be verified. Scenario 13 evaluated a wide floodplain constructed above the 10-year level for a distance of 10 miles and showed a 5% reduction in peak flow and a 10% reduction in sediment transport. Sediment transport volumes based on single storm event. Downstream flooding problems will not be identified. Detention storage volumes entered in the model were based on 10-foot high embankment limit. Individual sites were not evaluated for feasibility of achieving storage. Hydrology is based on existing conditions without future growth. Hydraulic routing based on modified-puls, unsteady state within HEC-RAS 4.1. No assessment has been done to look at properties at risk, but could be evaluated based on model results and water surface elevations, but cross-sections are only about 500 to 2,000 feet apart to identify issues. Pueblo railroad bridge abutment issue was discussed as a potential area of concern. Providing inundation maps is not part of the project scope. It is feasible to create the

storage needed to get the results in the scenarios, but each site would need to be evaluated. Presentation is not available from the USGS as a policy.

6. Other Business –

a. Mill Levy (storm water funding): Discussion was held regarding recommendations on (storm water) funding from TAC to the District Board for the June 13 District Board meeting.

Larry Small gave an update of the Task Force meeting he attend Monday and interacted with TAC on the issues.

Reports were provided to the Task Force by three sub-committees; Governance, Emergency and Engineering. Engineering sub-committee is waiting for CH2MHill contract to determine process for Stormwater Management Assessment project to reconcile/validate the project list and costs for the city.

Emergency sub-committee has looked at the Moors (sp?) assessment report and looked at the inundation maps showing potential flooding from a 10-year storm of 1.75 inches per hour which results in flood limits approximately equal to current 100-year limits. Also discussed the need of funding for forest thinning. Desirable density is 75 trees per acre and there are currently about 300 trees/acre for fire mitigation.

Most of the conversation was related to the Governance sub-committee. Discussed four alternatives for organizing a regional storm water entity: the Urban Drainage District; the Southeast Metro-Stormwater Authority (SEMSWA); the PPRTA and a fifth utility at CSU option. The preferred approach is to follow the SEMSWA model and creating an El Paso County Authority through IGAs. The IGAs would include the City of Colorado Springs, El Paso County, Fountain and others and Pueblo was not specifically included or excluded but focused on El Paso County. A property tax was ruled out. Could be funded through a sales tax or a fee based on impervious surface. A vote is preferred to approve funding, but fees do not require a vote and could set a president. Need to decide what a ballot question would look like. Voting on a sale tax is common. Discussed a possible 0.5% sales tax which could generate about \$35M annually based on what the PPRTA tax generates. The technical approach and the period of the program needs to be resolved which will determine the revenue needed. The Authority would have bonding authority. General revenue bonds require a vote, but revenue from a fee would not require a vote for bonding. The disadvantage of the RTA model was that priorities were set by the Board, but individual projects are handled by separate parties. It is believed that a systems approach is needed to mitigate upstream and downstream impacts. The SEMSWA model would do everything, collect funds, doing projects and handle MS4 permit. The Urban Drainage District is different and the FCWD can only be funded by fees or a mill levy and would have to be applied equally to El Paso and Pueblo Counties. District could do projects in conjunction with an authority. Authority would be made up of a Board of government officials appointed from members. Decisions should be finalized at the June 24th meeting of the Task Force. El Paso County is providing legal support to evaluate options. City and County staff have not yet been involved in the meetings. A sales tax may be put to a vote in 2014 at the earliest. There is expected to have capital and maintenance fund with

possibly and emergency fund also. No provision is being made for other expenditures such as trails. Funding should continue indefinitely.

Two major questions are the amount of funding and the nature of the ballot issue. It is unclear how the FCWD would relate to the Authority. Adding to sales tax has a practical limit and creating the Authority could be perceived as another layer of government. Special Districts within the FCWD are possible but difficult and must be resident initiated. A presentation of the FCWD characteristics, revenue sources and uses of revenues will be provided to the Board in order to assist in their decisions making. It was noted that everyone benefits from storm water improvements outside of their immediate area and should be reminded of this. One approach may be for the FCWD to wait to complete projects with the funds coming in 2016 and by showing the benefits support the need for funding. Other options for organizing funding were discussed. Governance committee suggested that the obligations of the City/County Drainage Basin Fee program could be taken over by the new Authority, but this could jeopardize the proposed funding approval.

CAG may be preparing to recommend that the FCWD focus on the Fountain Creek corridor and avoid the process related to wider issues and do what the FCWD is designed to do. May want to create a 3D model to show the plan for Fountain Creek. The FCWD has been supported by advances against the CSU obligation and will need to continue to find sources of funding until that full obligation is due. The 1041 Permit obligations include an assessment of payments of a percentage of the annual payment due after 2016 beginning 42 months after the execution of the permit. These assessments may be able to be used in advance payments to complete projects. Also need to consider cooperative efforts throughout the FCWD. Grants are not a good option for continued operating funds because of the need to providing matching funds. Issues with using the fifth utility could be the affect on bonding capacity, bills could be sent outside of the service area of the other utilities and enforcement could be an issue.

TAC was requested to send any comments on funding options to John C. by June 10th. John will compile any comments and distribute them to the TAC for further input on talking points for June 13th Board meeting.

7. **Public Comment** – no public comment was provided.
8. **Executive Session (If Required)** – no executive session was convened.
9. **Setting Date, Time, and Location of Next Meeting:**
July 3, 2013, 13:00 hours, City of Fountain, 116 S. Main Street, Fountain CO 80817.
10. **Adjournment** - Meeting was adjourned at 15:49 by consensus without a quorum.