

Barr Lake/Milton Reservoir Watershed Association

2007 Board Meeting Minutes

#1	January 23, 2007	pp.2 - 5
#2	February 27, 2007	pp.6 - 7
#3	May 22, 2007	pp.8 - 11
#4	June 14, 2007	pp.12 - 18
#5	July 5, 2007	p.19
#6	September 5, 2007	pp.20 - 24
#7	September 25, 2007	pp.25 - 27

Barr Lake/Milton Reservoir Watershed Association

BMW Board Meeting
January 23, 2007 - 9:00am – 12:00pm
Metro Wastewater Reclamation District, Technical Service Building

Final MINUTES

Board Attendance:

Kipp Scott – ECCV
Steve Lundt – Metro Wastewater
Laurie Rink - FRICO
Vic Lucero – City of Thornton
Jill Piatt Kemper – City of Aurora
Darcie Garland-Renn – Integral Consulting

Sarah Reeves – SPCURE
Terry Baus – City and County of Denver
Chris Piper – Denver Water
Kelly DiNatale – United Water & San. District
Christine Hethcock – Beebe Draw Farms Metro Dist.
Blair Corning – S. Adams

Public Attendance:

Meeting Objectives

- Committee Updates and Action Items
- Plan for February Stakeholder Meeting
- Agree on ENSR Contract and Scope
- Agree on Hydrosphere contracts
- Hand out Watershed Plan
- Decide on Integral's Coordinator Contract for 2007

1. Updates and Action Items

Minutes from the 11/28/06 board meeting were reviewed. After a few minor spelling errors were discovered, the minutes were approved.

Treasurer report: Updated Balance Sheet, Profit & Loss Detail, Budget Plan Spreadsheet were passed around. BMW has submitted to the state \$48,600 for reimbursement. Alice Wood will now submit reimbursement claims to the state on a monthly basis. The plan is to have all in-kind invoices in to Integral by the 25th of each month so that the in-kind contributions can be included in the monthly reimbursement claims to the state. Laurie Rink then questioned the likelihood of the monthly invoice schedule for monitoring costs and asked if it can be done on a 6-month schedule. Sarah Reeves stated that a 6-month invoice for monitoring might not agree with how the state keeps track of in-kind contributions and that we need to check with them about reporting the in-kind monitoring costs that way. Also, all financial information is now in QuickBooks, which will provide better summary reports and streamline financial bookkeeping for 2007.

Watershed Coordinator Update: Laurie Rink approved and passed around 2 Integral invoices, one for December and one for January. March 20 is the closing of the one-year contract with Integral and that there is not much money left in the coordinator budget. Alice Wood told Laurie Rink that everything is fine though.

Approval of ENSR Contract(s): The board discussed the three ENSR contracts (1. short-term agreement to move forward, 2. the phased contract approach, and 3. the general Professional Services Agreement). Laurie Rink stated that these contracts have been looked at by Steven Janssen. Steven Janssen said that short-term agreement is okay but that the full term contract and general contract need to have some of the 319-grant language in it. The idea for the phased contract is that the 21 tasks would be grouped into 4 phases and that the contract would allow for refinement of each phase as the project progressed. Sarah Reeves and others mentioned that this might significantly slow down the project if there is an approval and renegotiation of the contract between each phase. Dennis Stowe suggested that the stakeholders approve of the entire contract for the modeling project and that the board has the authority to manage the contract in phases and approve/evaluation as the project moves along. Board liked this idea. Then Kelly DiNatale stated that the board should go ahead and approve phases 1 and 2 and then approve phase 3 and 4 later. Kipp Scott then summarized what the board was voting on and that was to have the stakeholders in February do a consensus vote for the entire project and to give the board authority to manage the contract and phases. The Board gave a unanimous vote for this. Then the board unanimously voted to approve phase 1 and 2. If something major does happen to come up during these phases, then it will be discussed with the stakeholders but for the most part the BMW board will manage how this modeling contract/project goes.

For the short-term agreement to begin the necessary ENSR work to start up this project with their company, the BMW board unanimously voted to have Laurie Rink write the authorization letter to give approval to ENSR to begin the billing process and allow up to \$10,000 to be spent on modeling. Laurie Rink will write this letter and send it to Ken Wagner.

For the general Professional Service Agreement, Laurie Rink will work with ENSR to include Steve Janssen's suggestions.

Draft Reservoir Assessment Report Update: To complete the two reservoir assessments, Hydrosphere has been asked to finalize the flow data from FRICO and to include a flow/nutrient budget for the Burlington ditch. Hydrosphere contract is for \$7,000. It will start as soon as they get the data from FRICO and will take 6 weeks to produce the final reports. The \$7,000 includes the one meeting with FRICO already, no additional meetings or presentation, and two final reports covering our comments. Kipp Scott asked if the contract price had an expiration date. Would the contract price still be valid if FRICO took a year to get the data to Hydrosphere? The contract does not have any expiring dates. Then the timeframe of when FRICO will provide the data was discussed. Due to other priorities, this data request update should be available for Hydrosphere by early summer. The board unanimously approved the contract, and Vic Lucero will speak with Manual (FRICO) about getting the data as soon as possible.

BMW Water Quality Database Update: Another contract from Hydrosphere is to update the water quality database so that it can be used this spring for the modeling project. The contract is for \$9,000 to update 15 different entities. The new data (2002-2006) will be collected by Integral and then given to Hydrosphere. The deadline for the new data is February 2nd, 2007. The contract was passed around. Dennis Stowe suggested having the last paragraph on the first page deleted from both contracts. Laurie Rink agreed to take care of this with Hydrosphere and to have the contracts include 319-grant language also.

2. Committee Updates

Information/Education: Jill Piatt Kemper gave the update. Ballots to vote on the newsletter name were handed out. Board members voted on their top two preferred names. The I/E committee will go over the results at their Feb. 8th committee meeting. Dennis Stowe requested articles from anyone for the next newsletter.

Watershed Plan Writing: Steve Lundt handed out to each board member a hard copy of the plan, copies of the executive summary, and copies of the newsletter and brochure. Darcie Garland-Renn handed out a commitment pledge that included a commitment follow-up form and an attendance sheet for presentations. Then Steve Lundt went through the watershed plan presentation that will be given to all stakeholders. The goal of the presentation is to have anyone give it to their board or employer in order to pass on the information about this new watershed plan. As Steve Lundt went through the 23 slides, the board gave suggestions and feedback on the material. It was also requested that the 20-minute presentation also be summarized into a 5-minute presentation. Terry Baus also said that the 20-minute talk would be great for a DRCOG update. The presentation can also be used for the update to the WQCC. Laurie Rink needs to send in a request to the WQCC to get on their agenda. Chris Piper also suggested adding a slide about why groups need to participate in this watershed group. The reason is that it will save money.

Technical: Steve Lundt said that their will be Technical Committee meeting after the board meeting to discuss in more detail the modeling contract, reservoir assessment reports, and the updating of the water quality database.

3. Finalize Stakeholder Meeting Agenda

Agenda items will be:

1. Consensus voting on the Modeling contract/ Integral renewal contract
2. Kick off party for the watershed plan and giving the presentation
3. Guest speaker (Casey Davenhill from Cherry Creek Stewardship Partners) to talk about implementation of a watershed plan for Cherry Creek Reservoir

Other ideas for speakers/topics include: Bio-fuels generated from algae, Chatfield re-allocation, water rights/process, Restoration efforts on the S. Platte River, and a summary of water quality initiatives going on in the watershed.

4. New Business/Topics

Darcie Garland-Renn passed around the poster for the Colorado Watershed Protection Fund Tax Check-off Program. Darcie encouraged others to pass the word about this funding program and how BMW could actually be eligible to get a grand from this program.

Darcie Garland-Renn also passed around an announcement for a 3-day training course on watershed approach to land use planning. The training is done by the Sonoran Institute in Montana. Date of the training is March 26-28, 2007.

5. Watershed Coordinator Contract

Darcie Garland-Renn then left the meeting so that the board could discuss how to proceed with a watershed coordinator for 2007. The Integral contract ends on March 20th and the stakeholders will need to approve a board recommendation at the February stakeholder meeting. The Board unanimously voted yes to extend the Integral contract for another year, making sure that Alice Wood will be the coordinator. Laurie Rink did say that Alice will be getting a promotion at Integral and may affect the budget. Even if there was an increase in money, the board still agreed that Alice Wood needs to be our coordinator. The board will recommend to the stakeholders to update the contract with Integral and ask for a new scope of work for the next 12 months.

6. Next Meeting

Next Stakeholder meeting will be February 27th, 2007 in Brighton 9:00am – 12:00pm

Next Board meeting will be March 27, 2007 at Metro Wastewater, 9:00am – 12:00am

Barr Lake/Milton Reservoir Watershed Association

BMW Special Board Meeting
February 27, 2007 - 12:00pm – 12:30pm
Brighton Recreation Center

Final MINUTES

Board Attendance:

Kipp Scott – ECCV

Steve Lundt – Metro Wastewater

Laurie Rink - FRICO

Vic Lucero – City of Thornton

Jill Piatt Kemper – City of Aurora

Christine Hethcock – Beebe Draw Farms Metro Dist.

Blair Corning – S. Adams

Dennis Stowe – Littleton/Englewood

Public Attendance:

Meeting Objectives

- Discuss the 2007-08 Integral statement of work

1. Integral Statement of Work

Laurie Rink e-mailed out earlier the scope of work and handed out a few copies at the meeting. Laurie Rink said that the new contract is about \$20,000 more than last year, but that the BMW association has lots of flexibility with money and that shortage of money is not a concern at this point. The other topic to decide on was how to handle the \$1,500 over run of the current watershed coordinator contract. There are three possible ways to handle this: a) just don't pay it and have Integral take on the cost, b) vote to allow Integral another \$1,500 with this contract, or c) carry over the over budgeted \$1,500 onto the next contract for 2007-08.

Kipp Scott stated that he liked option b and Dennis Stowe agreed. It keeps the bookkeeper much cleaner and will avoid any confusion if and when the group gets audited.

Laurie Rink said that overall, the BMW association is under budget. Vic Lucero stated that he would rather spend or expect to spend more money upfront with this kind of big project and that spending will slow down at the end. He has no problem with spending the extra \$20,000 on a watershed coordinator.

Dennis Stowe also speculated that more \$7,500 paying members will come to the table once the TMDL is developed so funding should not be an issue. We will need to decide what to do in about 5 years when the NPS grant runs out and how the group will fund a coordinator.

Christine Hethcock wanted to know how the long-term budget looked. And the response from the group was that the BMW association can handle the \$20,000 increase. Then Dennis Stowe suggested that we look closely over what we spent last year and what we will spend this coming year with Integral so that we can then adjust and update the long-term budget to reflect better

what we actually spend. The BMW is a very big watershed and that it is important to keep the momentum going.

Alice Wood did step into the meeting and Christine Hethcock asked Alice if this large increase in the Scope would be a one time thing or would it jump up like this every year. Alice stated that this jump was due to taking on the updating of the database and the increase in the I/E activities for the year and that if nothing major comes along, this new amount of about \$58,000 should be the same each year.

Kipp Scott suggested that we approve the new scope of work and update the long-term budget. The board unanimously agreed.

For the cost overrun of \$1,500, the board unanimously agreed to amend the current Integral contract to add another \$1,500. Laurie Rink said that she would write the letter and take care of the amendment.

6. Next Meeting

Next Board meeting will be March 27, 2007 at Metro Wastewater, 9:00am – 12:00am

Barr Lake/Milton Reservoir Watershed Association

BMW Board Meeting
May 22, 2007 - 9:00am – 12:00pm
Metro Wastewater Reclamation District, Administration Building

Draft MINUTES

Board Attendance:

Kipp Scott – ECCV

Sharon Davis – Metro Wastewater

Randy Ristau - CDPHE

Sarah Reeves – SPCURE

Chris Piper – Denver Water

Blair Corning – S. Adams

Dennis Stowe – Littleton/Englewood

Steve Lundt – Metro

Terry Baus – City/County of Denver

Kent Minor – State Parks

Laurie Rink – FRICO

Christine Hethcock – Pelican Lake Ranch

Alice Wood – Integral Consulting, Inc.

Public Attendance:

Robin Reilley – DRCOG

Meeting Objectives

- Committee Updates and Action Items
- Plan for April Stakeholder Meeting
- Regulatory Procedures and Timing

1. Updates and Action Items

Minutes from the 03/27/07 board meeting were reviewed and approved to be finalized.

Treasurer report: Thru April 2007, BMW has just over \$150,000 in the bank thanks to about \$62,000 in State grant reimbursements. Alice Wood passed out a new spreadsheet that summarized the grant reimbursements and match. BMW needs to start spending some of the cash match for the outlined tasks.

It was suggested that a budget committee needs to be formed to help keep track of the matches and to help build a long term budget plan. It is also good to have oversight over Integral. It is also good to re-evaluate the dues structure and might want to update them, along with the bylaws. Members of the new budget committee include: Christine Hethcock, Chris Piper, Dennis Stowe, and Laurie Rink. They will meet in the next month to report to the annual meeting in August.

Watershed Coordinator Update: BMW received the last invoice from the first contract with Integral. Laurie Rink did not sign it and wanted to have the board talk about it first since there was some run over issues. 1. \$1,500 reimbursements, this was pre-authorized, 2. \$2,226 for database task which was budgeted at \$0 for initial contract, and 3. \$1,300 over run additionally for other items. The Board, by consensus, agreed to pay the last invoice and actually thanked Alice for the increased effort that caused these over runs. The money to pay this over run will come only from the BMW funds in the bank.

Watershed Plan Talk Update: Laurie Rink gave the talk to the board of Henrylyn and the Burlington Irrigation company. Steve Lundt helped Christine Hethcock with her talk at the Pelican Lake Ranch. Randy Ristau suggested giving the talk to city councils such as Commerce City and Brighton. Alice Wood gave the talk to the Water Quality Control Commission as an informational item. Dennis Stowe gave the talk to a large district board, SPCURE in April, his staff and Board, and the national water resources association. Chris Piper will be giving the talk to Denver Water's planning forum.

2. Committee Updates

Information/Education: National River Clean up week is June 2-10 and the BMW association has signed up to clean a reach of the S. Platte River on June 9th from 10am to noon. Volunteers will clean up trash from the Burlington Headgate down to the Clear Creek confluence. Metro is donating 10 pizzas, work gloves, and all the disposal costs of the trash.

Lake Appreciation Month celebration at Barr Lake is getting planned. The main event will be cleaning up the 9 miles of shoreline. Over 80+ kids from Americorp will be showing up along with their family members. FRICO is donating and cooking a BBQ lunch for all the volunteers. The executive director for the CDPHE, Jim Martin, will be doing the Secchi Dip In. A t-shirt will be made for the volunteers and CLRMA has already donated \$500. The BMW Association then, by consensus, agreed to donate another \$500 for t-shirts. Sarah Reeves will check into getting plantable bookmarkers.

Watershed Plan: The committee met and talked about how to improve the figures and tables. Joni Nuttle also gave several comments about the plan. Sections have been assigned to committee members to update. Committee will also be looking into a new web service by EPA to help with watershed plan writing. Next committee meeting is June 7 at metro from 9am to noon.

Technical: The committee has been working closely with Ken Heim on the initial stages of modeling. Ken Heim has put together a schematic flow diagram for the purposes of setting of the model and getting a good feel for how the water flows through the watershed. Two major concerns are: 1. how detailed should the diagram be. Should it include all listed permit dischargers? and 2. How do the return flows work for the diversions?

Dennis Stowe suggested including everything in the initial framework so that it is there but model only the major flows and pollution sources. Dennis also suggested having a water rights person look over the diagram and Chris Piper agreed and offered to have someone from Denver Water look over it. Lot of terms need to be changed to avoid future confusion with other local water rights terms.

The contract with Hydrosphere to update the BMW WQ database has been put on hold due to a run over of about \$5,900. The current contract is a time and material type because of the big unknown on how much data and what kind of data was going to come in. To finish the update, Hydrosphere estimates it will cost \$5,900, which is about 66% more than the original \$8,900.

The Technical committee initially had issues with this over run and has concluded from communications with Jean Marie Boyer that the over run is legitimate and that the BMW board should approve this cost. Kipp Scott ask why did this happen and Steve Lundt summarized Jean Marie boyer's e-mail explanation. Dennis Stowe stated that organizing a water quality data base is complex and expensive and is actually surprised how quickly BMW has been in this effort. Laurie Rink suggested that we anticipate this kind of over runs with data management in next years contract with Integral. Then the board unanimously approved by consensus to pay the extra \$5,900, not to exceed.

Joni Nuttle and the State have sent a letter to the BMW Association stating some concerns about the modeling effort so far. They are concerned that too much effort is being put towards modeling nonpoint sources and that in-reservoir modeling is not being done first or concurrently with the watershed modeling. Steve Lundt passed around the letter and a draft response letter that will go to the state. Steve Lundt stated that he thinks this is just a lack of information since there was no one from the State at the initial meetings with ENSR in January of 2007. The response letter includes the modeling schedule and a new modeling diagram that clearly shows that BMW has committed to doing in-reservoir model by August of 2007. The reason for modeling NPS is because BMW wants to go the extra step to include NPS without jeopardizing any modeling efforts for point sources. Plus, NPS may become important in the future.

Kipp Scott liked the response letter and thinks that we are still doing the right thing. Randy Ristau said that we need to not throw any punches and respond with a letter stating clearly how we will model the reservoir. He suggested keeping it simple. Randy also said that the Division and BMW have a common goal, keep the Water Quality Control Commission happy.

3. Nutrient Criteria Development

Alice Wood set some ground rules with this facilitated agenda item. People can speak only if they hold the ball. The idea is to go around the room and listen to what everyone things about what we should do as a group. Laurie Rink then started off by summarizing the April 12 meeting with the Division about this topic. Then Laurie Rink went over the table of options and the pros/cons to each option.

Dennis Stowe went first and stated that the current grant is for pH TMDL development and it would be wrong to use that grant money to develop a nutrient standard. It would take a major change in the PIP to do that so any work will have to be paid for by the BMW Association. Dennis Stowe does not think that the BMW association should do it.

Blair Corning went next and stated that consensus is important to the group. It seems to him that there needs to be more time for any nutrient development and likes option B.

Then it was decided that this topic is so large and there was just not enough time. The next nutrient criteria workgroup meeting is June 14th so it was decided to have a special 3 hour board meeting on June 14 from 1pm to 4pm at Metro to talk just about nutrient criteria development.

4. New Business/Topics

5. Next Meeting

Next special board meeting will be June 14th, from 1pm to 4pm at Metro.

Next Stakeholder meeting will be the watershed tour and workshop on June 21, 2007 at Metro 9:00am – 12:00pm

Next Board meeting will be July 24, 2007 at Metro Wastewater, 9:00am – 12:00am

Barr Lake/Milton Reservoir Watershed Association

BMW Board Meeting
 June 14, 2007 12:30pm – 4:00pm
 Metro Wastewater Reclamation District, Administration Building

Final MINUTES

Board Attendance:

Kipp Scott – ECCV

Sarah Reeves – SPCURE

Chris Piper – Denver Water

Blair Corning – S. Adams

Dennis Stowe – Littleton/Englewood

Steve Lundt – Metro

Laurie Rink – FRICO

Christine Hethcock – Pelican Lake Ranch

Vic Lucero – City of Thornton

Jill Piatt Kemper – City of Aurora

Kelly DiNatale – United Water and San. District

Alice Wood – Integral Consulting, Inc.

Public Attendance:

Meeting Objectives

- Discuss the Nutrient Criteria meeting
- Determine next steps with Nutrient Criteria Development

1. Opening Comments

Alice Wood stated that the BMW Board members met with the CDPHE's water quality division in April to check in on their status of developing nutrient standards for Barr and Milton. At that meeting, the Division suggested that the BMW association take on the task of nutrient development. Alice Wood then reminded people that only pH TMDL development was in our original grant schedule and this was a major change if the BMW Association was to take on the nutrient development.

The goals of this meeting are to give everyone an opportunity to speak their minds about this topic and to come to a consensus or other final decision on what to do next.

2. Overview

Laurie Rink gave a summarization of the State's Nutrient Criteria Development meeting that occurred in the morning of June 14, 2007. Several Board members attended this meeting. The first item that was discussed was the Wastewater Utility Council's letter and presentation. The WWUC stated that POTW's are not a major source of phosphorus, there is no clear correlation between nutrients and chl-a and so it is best to focus on chl-a. The WWUC favors narrative instead of numeric standards, and favor doing a site-specific approach since each reservoir and lake behaves differently. WWUC also stated that they think the state should do this incrementally by focusing on lakes and reservoirs first and then deal with rivers and streams later.

EPA then talked about the recent encouragement letter from headquarters. This letter was requested by some states and EPA thinks that the states need to speed up the process since it has been since 1998 that the nutrient criteria development was started. The initial goal was to have the standards done by 2001 but in 2007 only 4 states/territories have all four parameters in their standards. EPA stated in the letter that incremental steps are fine, numeric is preferred and if you must do a narrative that there needs to be a numeric translator, suggested doing standards for TP, TN, chl-a, and transparency, and that Colorado is lucky to have progressed along so far and have so many site-specific tools at hand.

City of Westminster presented their proposal to establish a sub-category for lake use. Direct use terminal drinking water reservoir should have stricter nutrient standards to protect the most sensitive use. There are about 100 reservoirs in the state that would be in this new sub-category.

Jim Saunders presented his rationale for defining the growing season or chl-a averaging period for the state. After graphing chl-a for several Colorado lakes that have been extensively monitored, the suggested average period for chl-a is July to the end of September. Jim did state that site-specific situations can define their averaging period as they see fit with the data.

Finally, the State will begin to have monthly meetings to talk about the various standards that will be addressed for the 2010 basic standards rulemaking hearing.

Then Laurie Rink gave a quick summary of the Barr/Milton nutrient criteria options summary chart that outlines the 3 possible options:

- Option A is to have the BMW Association do a site-specific standard by 2009;
- Option B is to have the BMW Association do a site-specific standard sometime after 2009; and
- Option C is to have the state do the nutrient standard by 2010.

3. Opinions

Each person had 3-5 minutes to give their opinion on which option to go with. Ground rules were explained by Alice Wood.

Kipp Scott – Option B, likes the idea of being in charge of the process and being the driver on how the standards will look for Barr and Milton. Kipp felt that we would get a better product, we have a current methodology that is good, it will mean more work for BMW, and thought that 2009 was just too soon to get it done. Stick with it and just do it.

Kelly DiNatale – Option B, as soon as practical. Agrees with what Kipp stated and option C means there is no stakeholder necessary to do the process. 2009 is tight but might work. Thinks Option A could be possible since data collection and modeling are underway.

Christine Hethcock – did not really favor an option but did have questions. Questions: Do we need a control regulation if we have a site specific standard in place? She pointed out that, according to the morning Nutrient Meeting, if 90% of the problem is from POTWs then they should be the focus and responsible for fixing the reservoirs. She asked why wait until later for something to be forced on the group if the group can start now?

Laurie Rink – Option C, Our job is hard enough to hit the current pH TMDL. With pH, BMW had a starting point of 9.0 but with nutrient standards there is no starting point. The fear is that the group might not come to consensus on such an undertaking. With the state defining the numbers first, then the BMW group can address the situation. The problem with C is that it does take longer. The main concern is that the whole process just might fall apart and not come to consensus. But, the group might be able to come to consensus on a counter-proposal to the WQCD. Question: Will the WQCD recommend statewide or site specific standards?

Sarah Reeves – Since she represents SPCURE, she did not want to voice one option. She did state that there seems to be not enough time for Option A, Option B seems feasible timing-wise, and for Option C her professional experience is that the State might not come up with a good nutrient criteria (e.g. e.coli). Question: what happens if we figure out nutrient levels for pH and the state comes back with stricter numbers with the criteria in 2010? Question: If we do pH TMDL now and later nutrients, how does it affect stakeholders to do the work twice?

Jill Piatt Kemper – Hybrid of Options B and C. Neither the State nor BMW can do it alone, need both to work together on the standards development. The urgency is not important for City of Aurora but it might be for permit holders and having them comply with a tight schedule with permits. Question: If criteria are set in 2010, when would discharge permits change?

Chris Piper – Leaning towards Option B. Chris had several questions about all this. Questions: What is the reason for nutrient standards in the first place, is it possible for a BMW site-specific to be more lenient than the state's standards, How much phosphorus reduction is needed to meet the pH of 9.0, How much additional cost will it take to do option B, and are there other grants out there for this.

Blair Corning – Option C, Timing is tight for Option A and the BMW Association can't even do Option B because of timing. Blair doesn't think State will do site-specific for Barr and Milton.

Vic Lucero – Option C. Vic stated that the amount of effort it would take to take on nutrient standards by 2009 would be too great for the group and beyond the budget. Vic stated that a nutrient reduction to get the pH below 9.0 is possible but an even bigger reduction to meet some nutrient standard (say 50 ug/L) is most likely not attainable. The group can keep Option B in mind while utilizing the model. Vic also agreed that the group is not yet ready to come to consensus on nutrient criteria.

Dennis Stowe – Option C and possibly still do Option B. Right now BMW has a specific goal for pH and it would be difficult to start from scratch with nutrients. We have no funding to take on nutrient criteria development; current grant can't go towards it. It would take 1.5 years to redo the current grant schedule. Have to complete the first contract project first. Option A is shooting in the dark. No matter what Option C will happen.

Steve Lundt – Option C, kind of seriously stated to also secretly do Option B and attend the October, 2007 issues scoping meeting. It will take Metro many years to actual begin treatment for phosphorus because of how large of a project that is. The longer we push off the nutrients

standards the better for Metro's construction/planning schedule for tertiary treatment. Option C, but at the same time, the BMW group can be working on a site-specific standard using the modeling that we will use in the coming year. Don't really need to publicize it, but BMW can do modeling runs specifically for nutrient criteria development. The reservoirs are so overly loaded with phosphorus that a feasibility standard needs to be set. What is technologically and economically feasible for Barr and Milton. State did a test of their methodology and the phosphorus level for warmer water for Barr would be 131 ug/L while the average is over 500 ug/L. It is also important to communicate with the commission all these issues and it would be a good idea to state something to the commission in October.

The group opened up to more general discussion. Kipp then changed his answer to Option C after hearing everyone else. He was comfortable with the idea of Option C, if the POTWs accept it, and possibly also following with Option B.

The group then summarized all the questions that came up.

List of Questions:

1. Do we need a control regulation if we have a site specific standard in place?
 - a. Answer: This is a question for the WQCD. No, but would need to implement a site specific TMDL
2. Why wait until later for something to be forced on the group if the group can start now?
 - a. Answer: n/a
3. Do reservoirs have protection during the nutrient criteria development process? (e.g. interim standard)
 - a. Answer: unknown. This is a question for the WQCD.
4. Assuming Option C will happen no matter what, will the WQCD recommend statewide or site specific standards in 2010?
 - a. Answer: unknown. This is a question for the WQCD.
5. Assuming Option C will happen no matter what, will the WQCD recommend site specific or numeric standards in 2010?
 - a. Answer: unknown. This is a question for the WQCD.
6. Is the nutrient criteria issue too contentious for a consensus organization?
 - a. Answer: unknown. Note that "if we don't fight here, we fight in front of the WQCD. We are stronger working together as a group.
7. If pH TMDL is done, then nutrient criteria, how do we implement actions?
 - a. Answer: unknown. This is a question for the WQCD. Note that under current timing it would be hard to implement pH actions before nutrient criteria analysis, but if the nutrient criteria are delayed pH implementation could move forward.
8. When do the implications (permits, 303(d) listing) hit?
 - a. Answer: unknown. This is a question for the WQCD.
9. What happens if we figure out nutrient levels for pH now and the state comes back with stricter numbers with the criteria in 2010?
 - a. Answer: We would need to meet the more strict criteria.

10. If we do pH TMDL now and later nutrients, how does it affect stakeholders to do the work twice?
 - a. Answer: more cost and time expensive, but the process would already be in place from doing the pH TMDL.
11. If criteria are set in 2010, when would discharge permits change?
 - a. Answer: unknown. This is a question for the WQCD.
12. Are Barr and Milton going to fail nutrient criteria once adopted?
 - a. Answer: Yes.
13. How do nutrient criteria fit into the pH TMDL, 319 grant Project Implementation Plan, and funds?
 - a. Answer: The PIP schedule was based on the assumption that the State nutrient criteria process would be moving forward on schedule concurrent with our pH TMDL process.
14. Does our model have capacity to model both point and non-point sources?
 - a. Answer: Yes.
15. Can the BMW group determine what good nutrient criteria are? Can the WQCD?
 - a. Answer: Yes, but...need consensus, time, ...
16. What is the reason for nutrient criteria?
 - a. Answer: Nutrients are the cause of many other symptoms (e.g. algae growth, low DO)
17. Are there other grant funds available that could fund nutrient criteria work?
 - a. Answer: unknown, needs research.
18. How much phosphorus reduction is needed to meet the pH of 9.0?
 - a. Answer: Modeling will help to answer this.
19. If we develop our own nutrient criteria, can we be more lenient?
 - a. Answer: Yes, but still need to be protective of water quality and meet pH and other standards
20. What would be the additional cost to the BMW Association of Option B?
 - a. Answer: One estimate is that it would consume about one additional year for meetings just to address the policy side of the issue.
21. Is addressing pH going to address nutrients?
 - a. Answer: Yes, but not necessarily down to levels as protective as potential nutrient standards.
22. If Option C is adopted, can the BMW Association submit a less strict counter-proposal?
 - a. Answer: Perhaps. As long as you can prove that the less strict option is still protective (e.g. manganese)
23. What is a feasible goal for water quality? How do we determine feasibility?
 - a. Answer: unknown
24. Will pH TMDL modeling give enough information to come up with numbers for nutrient criteria?
 - a. Answer: pH modeling will give more information related to nutrients, but may not give enough info to develop criteria.
25. Can we just ban phosphorus in the watershed?

- a. Answer: No, the problem needs multiple solutions. Steve Lundt mentioned that Ken Wagner (ENSR) did a nationwide study that showed that banning P would not lead to enough reductions.
- 26. Can we give the Division guidance while they develop criteria?
 - a. Answer: unknown. This is a question for the WQCD.
- 27. How do we present this information/decision to the BMW stakeholders? To the WQCD?
 - a. Answer: Stakeholders – will discuss at next meeting, no need for a stakeholder vote. Will want to reference EPA 1998 memorandum. WQCD – Alice and Laurie will talk to people at the Division.
- 28. Should the BMW Association make a statement of intention at the October WQCC nutrient pre-hearing?
 - a. Answer: The BMW Association might suggest that the WQCD make the statement in our behalf.
- 29. Would the BMW Association like to stay together following pH TMDL development to work on the nutrient issue?
 - a. Answer: The BMW Association will be staying together as a group anyways to implement/monitor the pH TMDL.

4. Discussion

The next step was to come to a decision and to figure out how to present this to the stakeholders and to the State. The following ideas were discussed:

1. Use the nutrient criteria numbers that the WQCD comes up with late next year and run these scenarios in the Barr/Milton watershed and in-reservoir models.
 - a. Would probably need extra funding for this.
2. Support simultaneous occurrence of Option B and Option C.
3. If not all stakeholders are at the table during the stakeholder process, a control regulation would still capture all contributors.
4. The BMW Association should push for time to respond to State nutrient standards (e.g. ammonia standards)

5. Decision

The group decided to follow the approach of:

- Follow the original work plan outlined in the current 319 Project Implementation Plan to complete a pH TMDL by 2010
- Wait for the State to develop the nutrient standard by 2010
- BMW will review the nutrient standard as it affects BMW Association and see if a counter-proposal is necessary using the tools developed for the pH TMDL
- Stay together as a group to work on the nutrient issue

It was decided that the BMW Association Board will update the stakeholders at the October stakeholder meeting. The Board will inform the stakeholders that the priority is to develop a pH TMDL by 2010 while the state continues to develop nutrient standards for the state by 2010. Once the pH TMDL has been developed and the BMW Association has seen the proposed nutrient

standards for Barr and Milton, the BMW Association may provide a site-specific counter-proposal for nutrients based on the tools used in developing the pH TMDL.

For the State, the Board will tell them that the BMW group is fully committed to completing the pH TMDL work and will wait to see how the nutrient criteria development unfolds for 2010.

6. Next Meetings

Next Stakeholder meeting will be the watershed tour and workshop on June 21, 2007 at Metro 9:00am – 12:00pm

Next Board meeting will be July 24, 2007 at Metro Wastewater, 9:00am – 12:00am

AGENDA
BMW Board of Directors Meeting
July 24, 2007

Metro Wastewater Reclamation District, Administration Building
9:00am – 12:00pm

I. Opening

- Approval of 05/22/07 & 06/14/07 minutes

II. Updates/Action Items

- Treasurer Update
- Watershed Coordinator Update
- Workshop and Tour Feedback
- Action Item Follow-up:
 - TMDL Conference Report



III. Committee Updates

- Budget Committee
- Information/Education Committee (Jill Piatt Kemper)
 - Lakes Appreciation Month Summary (Steve Lundt)
- Watershed Plan Update (Alice Wood)
- Technical Committee (Steve Lundt)
 - Modeling Update

IV. Annual Review of Mission, Vision, Values, and Goals

- Start reviewing and Update if necessary

V. Nutrient Criteria (Alice Wood)

- Summarize Special Meeting and Overall Board Conclusion
- Next steps

VI. Annual Meeting (08/28/07)

- Pelican Lake Ranch Community Pool
 - At-Large Board Director Candidates
 - Any Bylaw Updates
 - Dues Summary for Director Seats
 - Planning Assignments (food, drinks, cooking, certificates, Van, activities)
 - Speakers – Septic systems and Oil/Gas industry

VII. New Business/Open Topics from Membership

- Annual Re-evaluation of Mission, Vision, Goals at next Board meeting

VIII. Next Meeting

- Annual BMW General Membership Meeting (August 28, 2007, 9:00am)
- BMW Board Meeting (September 25, 2007, 9:00am – 12:00pm)

Barr Lake/Milton Reservoir Watershed Association

BMW – Water Quality Control Division Meeting
September 5, 2007 2:00pm – 3:30pm
Colorado Department of Public Health and Environment
Water Quality Control Division offices

Draft MINUTES

Attendance:

Chris Piper – Denver Water
Blair Corning – S. Adams Co. Water and Sanitation
Steve Lundt – Metro
Laurie Rink – FRICO
Kelly DiNatale – United Water and San. District

Alice Wood – Integral Consulting
Joni Nuttle – CDPHE-WQCD
Randal Ristau – CDPHE-WQCD
Jim Saunders – CDPHE-WQCD

Meeting Objectives

- Review the WQCD and BMW modeling approach letters
- Discuss the Nutrient Criteria meeting
- Determine next steps for pH TMDL and Nutrient Criteria

1. Opening Comments

Randy opened the meeting and Alice pointed out the three primary topics that BMW wanted to discuss:

- Modeling memo & response
- Nutrient Criteria
- Next Steps
 - Ph TMDC
 - Nutrient Criteria

2. Modeling Approach Letters

Alice gave a brief overview of the three memos/letters which present information and opinions on the BMW Association (and subconsultant ENSR) modeling approach.

- WQCD memo (May 2)
- BMW response (May 29)
- ENSR Memo (May 31)

Randy pointed out that “no news is good news” and that the BMW Association should proceed since there has been no counter-response to their letter.

3. Nutrient Criteria

Laurie reviewed “the decision” on page 6 of final minutes from the 6/14/2007 Special Board Meeting:

“The group decided to follow the approach of:

- Follow the original work plan outlined in the current 319 Project Implementation Plan to complete a pH TMDL by 2010
- Wait for the State to develop the nutrient standard by 2010
- BMW will review the nutrient standard as it affects BMW Association and see if a counter-proposal is necessary using the tools developed for the pH TMDL
- Stay together as a group to work on the nutrient issue”

Laurie requested feedback from the WQCD, and the following conversation ensued:

- Laurie: Have we made correct assumptions regarding schedules, etc.?
- Joni: The State’s assumption is that the pH TMDL will address nutrients, which then creates a site-specific standard.
- Jim: Would your pH TMDL address nutrients?
- Steve, Kelly, Laurie: Yes.
- Laurie: Our questions relate to the fact that the nutrient reductions to meet pH criteria will likely still lead to higher nutrient concentrations than the State’s nutrient criteria.
- Jim: The site-specific standard we [Barr/Milton] develop for nutrients related to pH would probably not be superseded by State standards. This could be to our advantage.
- Steve: Would addressing pH be enough?
- Jim: That’s a first step. May have to tighten to meet chlorophyll a levels.
- Randy: Looking at overall WQ, not individual constituents.
- Jim: Stepwise is one possible approach. Immediate problem is pH. This is unlikely to bring Chl a down.
- Randy: The “high road” (i.e., Chl a standards) will be very hard.
- Kelly: Do we want to accept the statewide nutrient criteria, or does BMW want to come up with their own?
- Jim: A possible statewide criteria value would be 25 mg/L growing season average for phosphorus, could Barr ever meet that?
- Steve: What if BMW proposed, for example, 100 mg/L?
- Jim: With a good rationale and everyone (WQCD & WQCC) on board, this could go into the control reg.
- Jim: Safe to assume that we’re not ever going to hit a value that the WQCD proposes.
- Laurie: Need a numeric target to start with. Shooting in the dark without references will make it very difficult for our organization to come to consensus.
- Kelly: The model and appropriate BMPs can guide the group decisions.
- Randy: That would be failing using the tool.
- Jim: Why not be expected to meet the same standards as Cherry Creek? The Commission would certainly ask this.

- Joni: Questions such as these speak to the need for an in-lake model to identify the lake water quality responses.
- Randy: Modeling in-reservoir will happen soon, right?
- Steve: Yes
- Joni: Remember that you don't want to get bogged down (example, our flow diagram)
- Kelly: Will ENSR start the in-lake model in December regardless of the status of the watershed model?
- Laurie: The watershed and in-lake model are very intertwined.

- Chris: One more part of the Board's nutrient criteria decision: the 319 grant is tied to what we are going to do (i.e. pH). How will we come up with funding to also address nutrient criteria?
- Alice: An example of how nutrient criteria could cost more would be hiring a consultant to determine what truly is a "reasonable" management practice for each contributor of nutrients in the watershed.
- Kelly: The model will already do this. What might cost more is negotiations, but we will have to do that for pH anyway.

- Jim: Is standard setting beyond the grant?
- Randy: [reading from the Project Implementation Plan]: We can use the grant for "assisting the State" with nutrient criteria.
- Laurie: "Assisting" is different from "doing".

- Kelly: What is the best approach? Should we do it all [pH and nutrient criteria] at once, or stepwise [pH then nutrient criteria]?
- Steve: Our group might have a hard time with nutrient criteria since there isn't a clear numeric target.
- Blair: People come into the BMW to solve the pH problem. It's hard to get people on board, spending money without a nutrient criteria target.
- Randy: But there can be a cost savings if we work on both at once.

- Laurie: How is this a departure from what the group originally decided? On developing lake standards for 2010, is there going to be a regional approach for plains/off channel/reservoirs?
- Jim: We're planning on a warm water category, but probably not subclasses. Would have to justify subclasses. Criteria will be based on aquatic life use.
- Laurie: Will we know by 2009 what the nutrient criteria numbers will be?
- Jim: December 2009/January 2010 (after WQCC Issues Formulation Hearing).
- Laurie: Timing-wise, it might work out to get these numbers and then run them in the model.

- Jim: BMW's current decision [as presented in the 6/14/2006 Special Board Meeting Minutes] would be reacting rather than acting in a proactive manner. This will be perceived differently by the WQCC.
- Joni: 2010 Regulation 31, 2014 Regulation 38. Site-specific standard could come at any point. There are many possibilities for how to move forward. If you don't think you could have a NC number for 2009, then your proposed approach makes sense.

- Randy: Isn't site-specific logical?
- Jim: It will end up that no matter what because of economic feasibility.
- Joni: Due to consideration of aquatic life use (driver for both pH and nutrients) the results for pH and nutrient criteria might not be so different.

- Randy: We're hoping that BMW will be involved at the WQCC Issues Scoping Hearings (Reg 31& 38). Show you're trying to be involved in the process.
- Joni: Can make a statement of intent at the hearing as a placeholder to get us on the schedule. Not binding at this point.
- Joni: For stakeholders, show them what the Chl a numbers mean
 - E.g. photo of lake color at different Chl a levels.
- Laurie: What would you envision BMW saying to the WQCC as part of the Scoping Hearing?
- Randy/Joni: You want to be part of the process. Tell them where we're at with modeling and that we may go toward site-specific standards.
- Kelly: BMW will be back if we can come to consensus.
- Joni: You can back out any point, but harder to get in faster if you don't go to Issues Scoping Hearing.

- Steve: If we share model/database, could Jim or WQCD use this for Barr/Milton to come up with site-specific standards instead of the translator approach?
- Joni: Can't sign off on any model until it's complete.

- Blair: The group has always expected a long time frame. This is related to the organization's comfort level and reality of how long things take.
- Randy: May want to revisit the ENSR scope of work to see if we need any adjustments to meet nutrient criteria needs.

4. Next Steps

Alice attempted to reiterate the appropriate next steps based on the preceding conversation:

- pH modeling → continue in current direction; make sure that Chl a is a part of the model
- Nutrient criteria → talk over with the BMW Board. Develop a draft Statement of Intent for the Board to review in case they decide to participate in the Issues Scoping Hearing.
 - Determine deadlines for submission of materials to WQCC for Issues Scoping Hearing.
 - Hearing is on October 17; WQCD documents due by September 26.

- Laurie and Alice will touch base with Board members who were not at this meeting to review the major meeting points.
- Move next Board meeting to September 19 (formerly scheduled for September 25)

5. Discussion

Jim, Joni, and Randy left the meeting. The BMW participants stayed to discuss general ideas for what might be said in a Statement of Intent at the WQCC Issues Scoping Hearing:

1. Be brief, ~ 5 minutes
2. Be non-committal, “wish-washy”
3. State that we are working on a pH TMDL which will address nutrients
4. We will evaluate WQCD actions for nutrient criteria by 2010
5. State where we’re at right now/what progress has been made
6. Point out that we’re dependent on group consensus, modeling/data progress
7. If everything comes together and is ahead of schedule, our group might be ready for site-specific standards at the 2009 hearing

The meeting ended at approximately 4:00 p.m.

Barr Lake/Milton Reservoir Watershed Association

BMW Board Meeting
September 25 2007 - 9:00am – 12:00pm
Metro Wastewater Reclamation District, Administration Building

Draft MINUTES

Board Attendance:

Sarah Reeves – SPCURE
Chris Piper – Denver Water
Kipp Scott – E. Cherry Cr. Valley
Steve Lundt – Metro

Dennis Stowe – L/E
Laurie Rink – FRICO
Vic Lucero – Thornton
Jill Piatt Kemper - Aurora
Alice Wood – Integral Consulting, Inc.

Public Attendance:

Randy Ristau – CDPHE
Steven Janssen - Henrylyn

Joni Nuttle – CDPHE

Meeting Objectives

- Committee Updates and Action Items
- Finalize Board Decision about Scoping
- Update mission and vision
- Select 2007/08 officers

1. Updates and Action Items

Minutes from the 07/24/07 board meeting and the 09/05/07 meeting with the CDPHE were both approved with some minor spelling errors.

Treasurer report: nothing new was reported with the overall finances.

Coordinator Report: The updated summary of the budget tracking. There were issues.

Annual Meeting Feedback: Everyone enjoyed the annual meeting and thought that it was an appropriate location for it. People enjoyed the speakers, liked that there was no powerpoint shows, and thought it was great to see new faces there. Dennis Stowe suggested that we try for a bigger audience for next year to talk about the modeling and upcoming TMDL and nutrient work. Alice Wood did the “thank yous” already, and Christine Hethcock did a great job organizing the event.

Review Mission, Vision, Goals, and Values: It was decided that there were no major changes necessary. Most likely the water quality goals will change soon and that the list goals will be achieved and can be checked off. Randy Ristau emphasized making the goals measurable and achievable. It was suggested to list annually the goals and what was accomplished in the previous year. This would be a way to keep track of goals and when they were achieved. All the goals need to tie back to the watershed plan and be in the plan. The current list of goals needs to be checked to see if they are all in the Plan. Dennis Stowe stated that there are three areas of every project that need to be equally addressed: financial, technical, and political. Dennis stated

that we are doing well for financial and technical, and that it is time to spend more effort on political. Steve Lundt stated that we should communicate to the stakeholders how we are accomplishing our goals with an article in the next newsletter. Also, this can be communicated by publishing a State of the Watershed report at the end of this year.

2. Select Officers

Nobody else on the board wanted to an officer and all the current officers agreed to continue with their officer role. Christine Hethcock was not at the meeting and Alice Wood said that she would speak with Christine to confirm that she wanted to still be the Treasurer. Steve Lundt stated that he would be the Secretary again but felt that it is good to have turnover of officers. The board voted unanimously to keep the current officers.

3. Committee Updates

Budget Committee: Kipp Scott agreed to chair this committee. They met in August for the first time to cover how to track contracts and projects. The plan is to update the operating budget, submit taxes in November, and to work with Randy Ristau about in-kind match issues and how to better track it. Randy is concerned about the large sum of in-kind match and feels that it will be heavily scrutinized at some point.

Information/Education: Jill Piatt Kemper said that BMW will have a poster ready for the South Platte Forum, Cherry Basin annual meeting, and for the upcoming watershed conference in Breckenridge. There was a grant available to help with marketing but BMW was not eligible because of the c(6) nonprofit status. If this becomes an issue, BMW may have to consider becoming a c(3) instead. Newsletter has a new editor, Mary Dodson with Aurora. Steven Janssen will contact a Weld County commissioner to join the stakeholders.

Watershed Plan Committee: Slight change of plan and schedule with the update to the plan due to the delay with the reservoir assessments and modeling efforts. Sections of the plan will most likely be updated and provided on line at the end of this year. Instead of an executive summary, a state of the watershed will be produced. Steve Lundt will be giving the watershed plan talk at this year's NALMS symposium in Orland, Florida. WEF Tech and WESCAS will also hear the talk later this year.

Technical Committee: Steve Lundt stated that Hydrosphere has requested \$5,400 more to finalize the two reservoir assessments. It was agreed by the board to approve this amount but to amend the current contract make it a fixed sum not to exceed to finish out this project. The board approved up to \$6,500 for this. This amount will include a final review/check of the assessment reports. Vic Lucero and Steve Lundt will speak with Jean Marie Boyer at the watershed conference to talk about this amendment. Steve also updated the board on the modeling progress. The next workshop will be in early December to show the model to the stakeholders and to present what in-lake models will be used.

4. Nutrient Criteria Update

Laurie Rink summarized the most recent meeting that BMW had with the CDPHE on 09-05-07. At that meeting, the State strongly encouraged the BMW association to submit a letter of intent

for the upcoming scoping hearing in early October for the S. Platte basin annual review in 2009. It would provide a place holder for now if the BMW association does go ahead with any nutrient criteria development. Randy Ristau and Joni Nuttle both stated that it is a positive thing to do, that it would keep BMW on the commission's mind, and that BMW can back out in 2008 when they have the issue formulation hearing. A draft letter was passed around and most thought it was vague and did not commit to much. Jill Piatt Kemper felt strongly that it was not necessary for BMW to send a letter and that the BMW association could come in at anytime with a site specific or update the water quality control commission at anytime on what is going on. This hearing was in preparation for a basin-wide hearing for the S. Platte and the BMW Association is going to have to do a site-specific anyways. Jill did not see any need to be apart of the scoping hearing. Then the board voted on whether or not to submit a statement of intent, and it was unanimous except for one no vote. Kipp Scott did not feel either way on the issue. So Chris Piper saw no penalty if it was submitted but did see a penalty if it was not submitted. Steve Lundt asked Randy Ristau if it is common for groups to drop out later and if not would it be a penalty if BMW dropped out next year. Randy said that it is not too common to drop out but it is common to be contentious.

Alice Wood agreed to finalize the letter as is with a couple of minor changes and deliver to CDPHE on 09/26/07. Alice will then paraphrase the letter at the scoping hearing on 10/09/07.

5. Plan Stakeholder Meeting

Alice Wood has already spoken with Tim Grotheer and Marth Hahn from Plum Creek WWTF to talk about wastewater phosphorus removal. Alice will put a draft agenda together.

6. New Business/Topics

Steve Lundt presented his idea to propose to FRICO to not pump effluent to Barr Lake for the upcoming fill season since Barr Lake is so full. Steve concluded from the data that Barr Lake is approximately 10,500 acre-feet from full pool and that could easily come from 10.5 days of diverting 500 cfs of spring runoff from the River. Metro effluent TP concentration is about 2 mg/L, the S. Platte River during the winter is about 1 mg/L, and the best low nutrient water is at 0.3 mg/L from the River when the river is diluted with spring runoff. So Steve stated that this is a great opportunity to fill Barr Lake without Metro effluent and see how the water quality is for the summer of 2008. This will most likely be a scenario for the model and a great way to test the model. If effluent has to be pumped because of water rights, then the other idea is to pump minimally and have it not go into Barr Lake.

Steve Janssen then explained the history of the Burlington, FRICO, and Henrylyn system and how water rights work among all the different partners. Overall, the idea is a great one but water rights might not allow for it. Laurie Rink then suggested setting up a meeting to talk with Manual Montoya with FRICO to get his understanding and see if this idea is possible.

4. Next Meeting

Next board meeting will be November 27th, from 9am to noon at Metro.

Next Stakeholder meeting will be October 23, from 9am to noon.