



**SP CURE Board Meeting**  
**Tuesday, July 18, 2023 – 9:00 am**

Meeting Location:  
Virtual Meeting

## Meeting Summary

---

### High Level Take-Aways

- Meeting attendees discussed this year's Water Quality Forum Retreat and agreed that the venue and topics were good.
- SP CURE kicked off a review of their strategic planning and will continue the discussion at the August meeting.
- SP CURE requests sponsors for this year's Confluence at the Confluence.

---

### Action Items

- Sarah and Christine to participate in WQF Steering Committee review & next steps of table discussion talking points regarding hearing improvements from WQF retreat.
- Erin to share email from USGS seeking participants in the Lagrangian Study.
- Beth to send email requesting Confluence at the Confluence sponsors.

---

### 1. Discussion and Approval of June Meeting Summary

Curt Bauers made a motion to approve the June meeting minutes. Julie Tinetti seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

### 2. Water Quality Forum – Debrief on event

Dan DeLaughter, Julie Tinetti, Jim Dorsch, and Erin Donnelly attended the WQF Retreat and provided some insight during the debrief.

#### Workgroup Update

Erin provided an overview of the workgroups and outcomes. The Aluminum, 10-year Roadmap, MS4, and Permits Webinar were returning groups. The Regulation 22, Permittee Communication and Engagement, Regulation 82, Regulation 21, and 303(d) Listing Methodology were the new work groups. All workgroups will move forward in some form.

#### Permits Webinar workgroup

- Proposed longer webinar and focus on permittee issues. This is an ongoing conversation, and Andrew Neuhart is communicating with former PIF group.
- The Permittee Communication and Engagement workgroup will roll up under this workgroup.
- Nicole Rowan (Division) mentioned that we can also discuss permits under Fee Bill, and there will be permit process and LEAN work as a part of this stakeholder process.
- SP CURE discussion:

- The conversation about communication and process should be open to outside stakeholders rather than internal conversation at the Division.
- The conversation around level of effort was lacking.
- There was little discussion around number of meetings and resources needed.

#### Feasibility workgroup

- Will be a subgroup of the 10-year Roadmap workgroup. Overall, there was not much discussion on the details of this effort.
- The intention is to put more effort into this process next year, not this year.

#### Regulation 22 workgroup

- Raised concerns with not moving the work forward that was mostly complete regarding construction flexibility. Apparently, the Division was not aware of the well-developed approach that Bret Icenaugle had worked on with the group.
- Dan DeLaughter plans to present on this to Permits soon, and Nathan Moore seemed interested and open.

#### Dredge and Fill

- There is an effort underway by the Division to address “gap” waters. This is a dedicated effort for it this year, but it will not fall under the workgroups but will have a Division-led workgroup.

WQF retreat attendees requested a deeper and more complete discussion of Division initiatives.

### **Nutrients Hearing**

Lisa Carlson gave a summary input she had received from interviews of various stakeholders on the topic of how the June 2023 nutrient hearing went. Tables had discussions to brainstorm how it could improve in the future.

- TAC
  - Lack of transparency in general about what was happening. TAC members even saw communication breakdowns. Jim Dorsch mentioned that TAC members should be responsible for briefing others at meetings.
  - There were ideas about how to improve communications, particularly around how the TAC shares their recommendations with the group. The TAC recommendations need to be simple enough for non-technical members to understand them.
  - They needed more time to review materials and what an appropriate timeline would be (6 months – 1 year prior to hearing).
  - Could record the meetings.
  - Potential for hiring a neutral specialist to participate in the TAC. This person would only represent science and not stakeholders involved in the hearing. There would need to be planning and anticipation of these costs. This is a barrier because the Division would not pay for this.
- Proposal
  - Concern with late delivery of the proposal. Stakeholders need more time to review the information and comment.
  - Dan DeLaughter proposed that there could be a proponent’s proposal from the Division and then allow folks 3 months to generate alternative proposals. In this case, the numbers weren’t finalized in a timely manner which made it difficult to counter-propose.
- Communication

- Communication changes at the Division are a cause of some of the issues since they mostly communicate in the “informed phase” and are not communicating outside of the Division.

Jim Dorsch described how the Temperature rulemaking went in the past. The Commission asked participants to go back and find more agreement/solution before submitting a proposal. Now, the Commission doesn’t do that and rather leans on the Division. And there isn’t a good means/ability to have conversations and come to an agreement. The Division feels that there is a lot of pressure from EPA. Also, we need to prioritize our focus and spend and the focus at hand is Nutrients.

Table discussions were noted by a scribe and turned in. The WQF steering committee can review the documentation. Sarah and Christine will look at table discussion notes and continue to drive forward the topics of concern.

Julie shared the experience of Centennial going to the Legislature, which was an area of concern for the Division. Centennial informed the Division and were openly communicating with them prior to going. After, the Division seems to “talk down” on that even though they did not collaborate and work towards a solution.

Christine asked about the venue and turnout. There were about 60 people there, and folks agreed that they liked the facility and would go there again next year. The presentations from the EPA and PFAS presentations were well done with good information. Other than that, it was similar to previous forums. The location was close to downtown, and the light rail drops off. There were various folks along the front range that traveled to/from each day.

There was discussion about forum meetings and whether those should be virtual or hybrid. They settled on 2-3 being hybrid and rest virtual.

### **3. Coordination Contract – Discuss 2023-2024 coordination contract and budget**

Sarah provided the Brown and Caldwell task order for SP CURE board to review. The contract amount and details are the same as last year. Meeting participants stayed on the call after completion to discuss. The Board will vote at the next meeting.

### **4. Strategic Planning – Review of strategic planning and scorecard update**

Sarah provided an overview of the SWOT Analysis and Summary of Actions from 2021. The board met over a few meetings to deep dive into strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and threats. The outcome was a list of six tactics. The review of tactics and scorecard will continue at the August meeting.

### **5. Discuss Project Updates**

- Colorado Monitoring Framework** – CMF is focusing for the remainder of the year on PFAS data and biosolids communication, and developing a strategy amongst water quality groups to collaborate.
- CWQMC/CDSN** – No update.
- BMW Watershed** – Recently held their annual meeting with a report out and tour of the Waterway Resiliency Project.
- Monitoring Committee** – Committee is confirming round robin for this year. The USGS reached out and is looking for partners to sponsor their Lagrangian Sampling Proposal. Erin will circulate the email.
- Partnership Opportunities** – No update.

- f. **Confluence at the Confluence** – October 17, 2023. OneWater(sheds): We're all in one South Platte Boat. We are looking for sponsorships this year (\$250), and the sponsors are recognized on the invitation and agenda.

## **6. Budget Update**

The budget is up to date and there are no unplanned expenses.

## **7. Other Topics and Announcements**

None.

## **8. Next Meeting Dates**

August 15, 2023 – Virtual

September 19, 2023 – Virtual

October 17, 2023 – Confluence at the Confluence

**SP CURE Board Meeting: July 18, 2023**  
**Attendance Record**

<b>Present</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Organization</b>
	Juliana Archuleta	Adams County
X*	Sherry Scaggiari	Aurora Water
	Zachary Trabold	Aurora Water
X*	Julie Tinetti	Centennial W&S
	Alan Polonsky	City and County of Denver
	Jon Novick	City and County of Denver
	Michael Probasco	East Cherry Creek Valley W&S
	Sara Brewer	East Cherry Creek Valley W&S
X*	Curt Bauers	FRICO
X*	Brian Tracy	City of Golden
X*	Jim Dorsch	Metro Water Recovery
	Jordan Parman	Metro Water Recovery
	Mark Koch	Molson/Coors
X*	Gary Smith	South Adams County W&S
X*	Dan DeLaughter	South Platte Renew
	Nicole Laurita	South Platte Renew
X*	Tess Insalaco	South Platte Renew
X*	Eric Marler	Suncor Energy (U.S.A.)
X*	Caleb Owen	Thornton
	Shay Shih	Thornton
	Steve Materkowski	Mile High Flood District
X*	Christine Johnston	Xcel Energy
X*	Sarah Reeves	Coordinator, Brown and Caldwell
X*	Beth Albrecht	Brown and Caldwell
X*	Erin Donnelly	Brown and Caldwell

\*Joined virtually/by phone