

MINUTES
NFRWQPA
March 23, 2006

1. Roll Call

The meeting was called to order at 3:00 p.m. by Chair Ed Schemm at the offices of the Northern Colorado Water Conservancy District. Roll was called and the following members were in attendance:

Tony Huerta – Berthoud	Mike Friesen – Mead
Randy Siddons – Boxelder S.D.	Ester Vincent - NCWCD
Ken Rutt – Broomfield	Karl Heil – Northglenn
Les Morgan – Dacono S.D.	Terry Farrill – South Ft. Collins S.D.
Earl Smith – Evans	Eric Doering – St. Vrain S.D.
Carol Webb- Ft. Collins	David Brand – Upper Thompson S.D.
Jim Sidebottom – Ft. Lupton	Jeff Hodge – Upper Thompson S.D.
Sam Boone – Greeley	Mike Geile – Weld County
Jim Landeck – Hudson	Wayne Ramey – Weld County Tri-Area S.D.
Trudy Peterson – Kersey	Dennis Wagner – Windsor
Dave Pusey – Kodak	
Ed Schemm – Larimer County	
Larry Wyeno – Longmont	
Rod Hamilton – Loveland	

Also present were Connie O’Neill, Brad Simons, Trisha Culp, John Koenig, Wayne Lorenz, Mike Todd, and Ken Hamilton.

2. Minutes

Minutes of the February 23, 2006 meeting were considered. Mr. Farrill made a motion to approve the minutes. Mr. Smith seconded the motion and it passed.

3. Financial Report

Ms. O’Neill summarized the February 2006 financial reports. Mr. Ramey made a motion to accept the financial reports. Mr. Farrill seconded the motion and it passed.

4. Site Application – Centerra Interchange Lift Station

Ms. O’Neill presented the application and indicated that it was for a lift station and force main that would be located at Highway 34 and I-25 to serve a portion of the Centerra development. The lift station and main would be built by the developers and turned over to the City of Loveland once complete. Ms. O’Neill indicated that due to the size of the lift station, she had placed it on the agenda for consideration. Mr. Nickel, engineer for the project, presented a map of the area and described the flows. Mr. Geile asked why the station had not been put in earlier. Mr. Nickel indicated that other development in the area is being served by gravity flow. Mr. Hamilton explained the long range plan for the area. Mr. Ramey made a motion to recommend for approval of the application. Mr. Rutt seconded the motion and it passed.

5. Site Application – Rivers Edge Lift Station

Ms. O’Neill presented the application which was for a lift station located outside of Estes Park in the Upper Thompson Sanitation District area. The proposed facility will serve 12 condo units and would be owned and operated by a homeowners association. She also indicated that this application was similar to one considered by the Association a couple of months ago. Mr. Hodge questioned whether the operator was certified. He also questioned the other gravity options for the area. Mr. Todd, engineer for the project,

indicated that the excavation needed to tie into the main on the roadway did not seem feasible. He also indicated that it would be cost prohibitive to pipe to the north side of the river as that would require the replacement of approximately 1,000 feet of main. Mr. Todd indicated that Sullivan Septic is in the process of becoming certified.

Mr. Hodge then questioned the power supply to the station and stated that he felt back up power would be appropriate. Mr. Todd explained the power supply for the station from the City of Estes Park. Mr. Geile stated that the set up as described should be acceptable without a back up. There was additional discussion of the power supply from the City. Mr. Geile then made a motion to recommend for approval of the application. Mr. Wagner seconded the motion and it passed.

6. **Request for Comment – Ben Delatour Scout Ranch**

Ms. O’Neill stated that Ben Delatour Scout Ranch was requesting comments regarding a change to the site application that the Association had considered in April 2005. The changes were related to flow rate and the type of treatment being proposed. The state was requesting that the Ranch calculate the flow rate based on the population. The original application had based the flows on water usage records. This change would result in an increase to the flow rate. In addition, the Ranch was proposing a change to the treatment method using the Microbics FAST system. Mr. Ken Hamilton, engineer for the project, explained the change to flows and gave an overview of the reasons for switching treatment methods. He indicated that with either method a new technology review would be required by the state.

Mr. Ramey asked if they were still planning to use UV disinfection. Mr. Hamilton indicated they were as their permit limits are set at the end of the pipe prior to discharge into the leach field. He also indicated that they would be required to provide the state with a back up plan. Mr. Ramey then made a motion to submit comments to the state that indicated the Association had no concerns with the proposed modifications. Mr. Wyeno seconded the motion and it passed.

7. **Public Hearing (Continued) – 2005 Update – Areawide Water Quality Management Plan**

Ms. O’Neill summarized how the public hearing process would work. She indicated there were five unresolved items for consideration, four of which she felt were uncontested. She presented the first item which was an update to the previously approve language for the City and County of Broomfield.

The second and third items were the service area boundaries for Dacono Sanitation District and Weld County Tri-Area Sanitation District. Ms. O’Neill reminded the group that these items were tabled at the last meeting. She presented a new map outlining the boundaries that both Districts had agreed to. The new map reflects an area between the two districts along Highway 52 that would remain undesignated. There was then discussion from the members regarding additional changes to Dacono Sanitation District and a possible merger with St. Vrain Sanitation District. Ms. O’Neill pointed out that a request for that had not been received by the Association. At this time the only item for consideration was the revised boundary as indicated by the map.

Ms. O’Neill indicated the fourth item was the service area boundary for the City of Greeley. At the last meeting the City was still considering the addition of some area to the west in their service area. The City has since decided it would not be feasible to include

that property so the map presented represents the proposed Greeley service area. The map also included a change from the map that was posted on the website in the W ½ of the SW ¼ of Section 25 T6N, R67W. A joint request from Windsor and Greeley had been received to move that area into Windsor's boundary.

Mr. Schemm then asked for public comment on these items. Seeing none, he asked for questions from the members. Mr. Ramey then questioned the process for amending the proposed boundaries in the future should the Districts develop service agreements with each other. Ms. O'Neill reviewed the plan amendment process. Mr. Ramey then made a motion to accept these four items presented for the 2005 Update. Mr. Doering seconded the motion and it passed.

Ms. O'Neill then presented the fifth item which was the service area for Windsor, along with a map. She indicated that the map reflected an area between the Windsor and Greeley boundary that Windsor has indicated is outside their growth management boundary and does not plan to serve and therefore should not be included in the service area. She indicated that a portion of the property that would be left undesignated is owned by the Andersons and they have started the development process with Weld County. The representatives of that property have also requested that their property be removed from the Town's designated area and left undesignated temporarily. They have indicated that they are in the process of forming a Title 32 District and may request designation of that property to that District once it has formed.

Ms. O'Neill then stated that at the February meeting there was no action taken on this item as Greeley was considering including this property in their boundary however, they were not able to do that. She indicated that at this point the Association has a joint request to exclude the property however, there were questions raised at the last meeting about whether this was the appropriate decision from a water quality planning perspective. Ms. O'Neill indicated that in her discussion with both parties she has stated that she felt if the Anderson property were to develop, it would be in the best interest of the region for wastewater service to be provided by Windsor given the proximity of the property to the Windsor WWTP and the lack of an engineering reason for not serving the property. She also pointed out that with Windsor's latest request, the property where the WWTP is located would be removed from their service area. She stated that her recommendation would be to include the WWTP within the area that is designated as Windsor's service area.

Mr. Schemm then moved to public comments on this issue. Mr. Lorenz and Mr. Koenig, representatives of the Anderson property, presented a map of the property. Mr. Lorenz indicated that the property is currently split by the existing Windsor service area boundary. He indicated that the map also outlined the gravity sub-basin and felt the property could be served by gravity to Windsor however they are not willing to serve it. He indicated that the property owner does not want to be included in Windsor's area and be denied service. Mr. Siddons asked if the Town would need to run lines through the Anderson property to provide service to the south. Mr. Lorenz indicated they would. Mr. Wagner indicated they could either go around or through the property. Mr. Friesen asked what the opinion of Windsor was. Mr. Koenig indicated the correspondence they have received from Windsor indicates they do not plan to serve the area. Ms. O'Neill stated that Windsor requested not to include the area in their boundary.

There was then discussion from the group regarding the IGA between Greeley and Windsor in the general area. Mr. Wagner described the growth management area (GMA) for Windsor. He indicated the property had been removed from the GMA by the Planning Board and the Water and Sewer Board had made a decision not to serve it. Mr. Koenig summarized the annexation processes that have been explored. Mr. Hodge stated that we should be considering who can best serve the area. Ms. O'Neill restated the area being requested by Windsor as their service area. Mr. Landeck questioned the options. Mr. Schemm added that if another treatment plant is built in the area it may be premature to approve an expansion of Windsor's service area until we know which plant could best serve the area. Mr. Lorenz requested that the Association consider the entire Anderson property in their decision and not leave it split between boundaries. Mr. Schemm stated that it is not clear why Windsor does not want to serve the area. Mr. Wagner stated there are land use issues. Mr. Koenig presented a packet to the Association outlining the issues including CDOT issues and proximity to the WWTP.

There was then discussion about water supply for the property. Mr. Farrill pointed out that if we simply deny Windsor's expansion request we will not resolve the issue. Ms. O'Neill then questioned whether a district would form if they do not need to build a WWTP. Mr. Koenig indicated they probably would not. Mr. Schemm outlined 3 issues:

- Do we take existing area out of Windsor's service area?
- How do we deal with the rest of the Anderson property not in Windsor's area?
- How do we deal with the rest of the requested expansion to the south?

Mr. Landeck stated he felt we were obligated to promote cooperation and not change the boundary at this time. Mr. Schemm also mentioned some precedent for regional service in Boulder County. Mr. Pusey questioned the existing Windsor lines in the area. Mr. Wagner indicated Windsor currently has a sewer line up WCR 17 that is outside their service area. Mr. Doering then made a motion not to change the existing boundary for Windsor. Mr. Siddons seconded the motion. Mr. Wagner then questioned the other changes that Windsor had requested separate from the southern boundary. Ms. O'Neill indicated that the map reflects other changes besides the southern boundary. Mr. Doering amended his motion to state that the southern boundary of Windsor remain at WCR 62 and the other requested expansions to the east, west, and north be accepted. Mr. Siddons agreed with the amendment. Mr. Ramey questioned whether the annexed area to the south should also be included in the boundary. Mr. Wagner stated he felt this motion seemed vindictive. Mr. Schemm stated he felt that we were trying to encourage Windsor to reconsider their decision and hopefully encourage a resolution. Mr. Schemm called for a vote and the motion passed with a vote of 16 in favor and 2 opposed. Mr. Ramey made a motion to encourage Windsor and the other parties to try to resolve the issue. This motion died for a lack of second.

Ms. O'Neill stated that there had now been a decision made on all items that were proposed for change to the 2005 Update. Mr. Farrill made a motion to move forward with the amendments for approval from the Water Quality Control Commission. Mr. Smith seconded the motion and it passed.

8. Board Position

Mr. Schemm stated that there were two people who volunteered to run for the open Board position. He stated that the ballots will be counted after the meeting. Ballots were then

handed out. Ms. O'Neill announced that Bob Alberts and Jeff Hodge were the two nominees.

NOTE: Following the meeting the ballots were counted and Mr. Hodge was elected to the Board position.

9. **Other Business**

a. **Water Quality Control Commission:** Ms. O'Neill stated that at the March Commission meeting there was an update from the Division of Wildlife regarding their involvement with water quality issues. There was also an Administrative Action Hearing to approve the 305(b) report.

b. **Selenium Update:** Ms. O'Neill gave a brief update on selenium activity in the state. Most agencies have put this on the back burner because of its low priority and lack of funding. She also indicated that the watershed groups in the area have begun to monitor.

10. **Adjournment**

There being no further business the meeting was adjourned at 4:55 p.m.