



SP CURE Board Meeting
Tuesday, November 21, 2023 – 9:00 am
Meeting Location:
Virtual Meeting

Meeting Summary

High Level Take-Aways

- There will be no December Meeting.
- WaterSMART Grant application Scope of Work (SOW) is in progress, hoping to get for review by January meeting.
- MC is working on developing Arsenic Study.
- Want to continue collaborating with watershed groups for next year's Confluence.

Action Items

- Share WaterSMART grant proposal SOW with SP CURE when it is ready.
 - BC to develop outline on SP CURE's key ideas/concerns for the Feasibility Workgroup and set meeting with Dan D and Julie T to fully develop a white paper.
-

1. Discussion and Approval of November Meeting Minutes

Jim Dorsch made a motion to approve the November minutes. Sherry Scaggiari seconded the motion which passed unanimously.

2. Bureau of Reclamation – WaterSMART Grant / Project Opportunities

Dan DeLaughter summarized the grant opportunity for the group. The WaterSMART grant is a cooperative watershed management grant offered through the Bureau of Reclamation (BOR). Grants are \$300,000, but funds are disbursed out over 3 years at \$100,000 a year. There are two application deadlines: December 5th and sometime in September of 2024. The intent is for the grants to be used for efforts like temperature monitoring, biological monitoring, and other instream projects. There is no required match, but the application does require a sponsor organization. Ideally this would be SP CURE. GEI is in the process of preparing a proposal for the preparation of the application. This proposal has been estimated at \$10,800. It is envisioned to be a 50/50 split of monitoring the instream conditions of the river and biological work/instream improvements. Sarah suggested that the Scope of Work (SOW) should be sent out to the larger group for a better understanding of the budget and for a vote at the January meeting.

3. Confluence at the Confluence – debrief and next steps

Sarah asked the group how they thought the Confluence at the Confluence went.

Positive

- One of our more successful Confluences
- Many engaged in discussion

- Educational
- Good turnout
- Well planned, good food

For Improvement

- There were a lot of watershed group updates in a row - maybe we should have added something different in the middle. Could concentrate more on storytelling.
- Maybe more interactive things mixed in - such as what have you learned?
- Wish for more attendance from other departments of utilities

Membership agreed to continue to plan the Confluence with the watershed groups next year.

There were a number of follow up items out of the Confluence to address. Future SP CURE meetings will address:

- How SP CURE might collaborate with watershed groups to address education and communication (top priority identified in Confluence)
- Discuss how to address (or we are addressing) the Roadmap, climate resilience, and environmental justice/social justice

4. **Project Updates**

a. Colorado Monitoring Framework

Sarah reported that the group had finished work on PFAS biosolids data communication. The Division has decided to only post PFOS biosolids data on their website and not the other measured PFAS constituents or QC data. There was a draft write up on the plan for communicating the information on the Division's website that was shared with CMF members.

b. CWQMC/CDSN

No update

c. BMW TMDL

BMW is having their retreat in December. The group will be working on scenario planning.

Dan DeLaughter suggested an addition to the scenario list, adding another control regulation scenario and tying it to the VIP plan. What would it mean for BMW?

d. Monitoring Committee

Discussed Arsenic study. Jake is working to figure out timeline and presentation to the Division.

e. Partnership Opportunities

No update

f. Confluence at the Confluence

Discussed in body of meeting.

5. **Budget Update**

The November budget update was provided for review. No unexpected items.

6. **Other Topics and Announcements**

December SP CURE Meeting - The board moved to cancel the December meeting, but wanted to keep progress moving forward on having Juan Roberto speak at a future event.

Nutrients Feasibility Workgroup - Sarah met with Nathan Moore to discuss the concept of the Nutrients Feasibility Workgroup. The Division intends to focus mainly on trying to make current offramps more feasible for use by stakeholders. There are 7 meetings planned at this point and additional smaller group meetings may be planned to address specific issues. There are basically three areas of focus:

- What to do when we already have standards in place – using site-specific standards, discharger-specific variances, and alternative analyses. Looking for how we can improve the way we use these tools. Creating clarity for those applying to make sure they know what is needed. Is there a way to apply multiple DSVs to many at once vs one at a time?
- What to do when there is no standard in place – consider a Reg 85-type approach. Don't want to abandon the concept of feasibility. Consider the quickest/most efficient way to protect the uses.
- Site-specific standards – how can we make these better?

The first meeting is in February 2024. We will need to determine how to tackle this as we can't do everything at once. You can register to join the meetings here:

https://us02web.zoom.us/join/register/tZwtfuisqD8oGtAEnbR7het_elsf6SCFf2T

Julie noted that, in her opinion, Regulation 85 “2.0” is the best option so we can have tech-based standards that are actually feasible, we can actually meet them, and they can be planned for. At the Water Quality Forum retreat, Nicole Rowan felt like focusing on a control regulation would be a good approach.

Jim Dorsch and Eric Marler both provided feedback that there is a need to make Discharger Specific Variances (DSV) and Site-Specific Standards (SSS) more feasible.

The group agreed that there would need to be coordination with the permitting section for SSS to work. This cooperation is needed since the EPA is not the biggest fan of SSS. The group agreed that there also needs to be collaboration on appropriate compliance schedules. Eric Marler noted that the permits group tends to disregard SSS in permits, as they look to downstream uses as the controlling factors. SSS may be more suited for lakes. An example being that a non-critical nutrient could be removed from consideration of the lake.

Jim Dorsch noted that the EPA is starting to find that air deposition is the primary source of nutrients. Treatment is possible, but then non-point sources will become the driver of contamination.

Attendees started a list of thoughts to be shared regarding the feasibility workgroup:

- Permits implementation and associated processes
- Antidegradation is being applied to everything, even without data - resulting in very low new limits. Relax antidegradation limits to allow you to meet the standard that is based on meeting the use.
- Consider a broader spectrum of constituents - not just nutrients
- The concept of the number of safety factors that are applied to a standard creates extremely low, infeasible standards
- Consider trading to be an option
- Reg 22 workgroup conversation - It seems like a more positive and streamlined approach to construction feasibility – Would allow for the ability to build to current needs vs design capacity. Not building assets that are stranded.

SP CURE will put together a one-pager to help guide our input in the process. Sarah to draft outline and work with Dan DeLaughter and Julie Tinetti to develop the document.

7. **Next Meeting Dates**
January 16, 2024 – Virtual
February 20, 2024 – Virtual
March 19, 2024 – Virtual

SP CURE Board Meeting: November 21, 2023
Attendance Record

Present	Name	Organization
	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
	Brian Tracy	City of Golden
X*	Jim Dorsch	Metro Water Recovery
	Jordan Parman	Metro Water Recovery
X*	Mark Koch	Molson/Coors
X*	Gary Smith	South Adams County W&S
X*	Dan DeLaughter	South Platte Renew
	Nicole Laurita	South Platte Renew
	Tess Insalaco	South Platte Renew
X*	Eric Marler	Suncor Energy (U.S.A.)
	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*	Jake Kunugi	Brown and Caldwell

*Joined virtually/by phone