

**Chatfield Reallocation FR/EIS Study Meeting
Tetra Tech Conference Room, Lakewood, Colorado
Thursday, December 11th, 2008: 9:00 am — 10:30 am**

1) Introductions

- Tom Browning (Colorado Water Conservation Board (CWCB)) welcomed attendees and announced that EDAW would be giving a presentation on the Recreation Study at approximately 10:45.

**2) Study Logistics: Budget, Study Schedule (including ITR and AFB),
Cost of Storage Policy Exception**

- Eric Laux (U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (COE)) said that the budget for the external peer review and model certification is approximately \$60,000 and Kayla Eckert Uptmor (COE) has drafts of both. The three issues he wants to focus on in the external peer review are: NEPA concerns, recreation, and water issues in the West. The funding for the external peer review will be 100% federal (\$43,000 for a three expert panel); the model certification will be a 50/50 cost share (approximately \$16,000).
- Eric is uncertain on how the external peer review is going to work. The panel has to be made up of experts outside of the COE; an example would be the National Academy of Sciences. He added that it has to be a non-profit agency that puts together the review panel and could easily take two months. The COE is now requiring this on all existing projects. He is looking into whether or not the external peer review can go on at the same time as the public review. Kayla is willing to work with Eric on making that happen.
- The COE will have a Preble's meadow jumping mouse expert review the Preble's portion of the functional units model. Eric will have to fund the review through a separate contract. The rest of the Internal Technical Review (ITR) (now called the Agency Technical Review) will be handled in-house with the technical review panel.
- As of today, there is a need for about \$20,000 in funds. The cost share agreement after the Schedule and Cost Change Report (SACER), an amendment to the original contract agreement, if approved would make more funds available. Eric is not sure what is going to go on with the federal administration change in terms of the Continuing Resolution and new funding for fiscal year 2009.
- Question from Rick McCloud (Centennial Water and Sanitation District) to Eric: Is the ITR different for the external peer review? Eric answered that yes, it is a different review and it (the ITR) is going on now. There are currently 44 comments back from the review team and he feels like there is nothing major that will hold up progress. Eric added that they can conduct an Alternative Formulation Board (AFB) and still have some gaps in the ITR.

- Katie Fendel (Leonard Rice Engineers for City of Brighton) suggested that once the Draft FR/EIS has gone through the internal and external reviews they should announce it on the Chatfield webpage so the public can be informed about the rigorous review process.
- Question from John Hendrick (South Metro Water Supply Authority (SMWSA)) to Eric: Where is the traditional COE cost/benefit analysis going to be presented in the Draft FR/EIS? Eric answered that it's going to be included in Chapter 5 which Eric is going to distribute to the Cooperators next Monday. It is his plan for the Cooperators to have it reviewed before Christmas so that the COE can review it and pass it on to the AFB as soon as possible. All supporting appendices for Chapter 5 will be posted on Tetra Tech's FTP site.
- Dave Giger (Colorado State Parks Department) announced that his agency is going to meet after the first of the year to determine if they can release their FR/EIS comments to the Corps. The comments will be approved by the Colorado Department of Natural Resources before they are released.
- Question from Rick to Eric: When will the Cooperators see Chapter 7? Eric said that they are waiting on finalization of cost elements before it can be released.
- Question from Rick to Eric: Is the ITR team looking only at Chapters that have been changed based on Cooperator comments? Eric answered that Chapters 1, 2, and 3 have incorporated comments. Chapter 4 does not have comments incorporated yet but he gave them the comment spreadsheet so they can see what was commented on. The ITR team will review all of the chapters.
- Eric said that a question came up about the cost of water treatment for the alternatives—are there costs associated with that that haven't been included yet? Rick and Katie said that they will take a look at their estimates.
- Question from Tom to Eric: Have you heard of any need for a 30-day notice for a change to the federal register related to the cost of storage? Eric heard from Steve Cone (COE) that the 30-day notice will not be necessary.
- Question from Tom to Eric: Is there any way that the AFB can happen in March while they are in Washington D.C.? Eric answered that the date will be nailed down sometime in January because COE headquarters needs 45 days notice to schedule an AFB. They would like to have it take place in-district but headquarters personnel generally do not travel.
- Question from Rick to Eric: Can the Cooperators be involved in the AFB? Eric answered that yes, they can be involved. Tom added that now that they know the AFB is not a closed-door meeting it would be nice to have it locally so that the Cooperators can be involved. Eric is not sure what kind of crowd control they are going to want and he will find out and get back to the Cooperators.

3a) Discussion Item: Water Quality Analysis

- Gary Drendel (Tetra Tech) told attendees that Tetra Tech's Water Quality Analysis internal draft is complete and is currently being reviewed. He is going to have a draft to the COE by Christmas for review. The new portion of the analysis does not indicate that there are any worsening water quality conditions. Eric will have Tetra Tech incorporate any COE comments and then the analysis will be distributed to the Cooperators. The timing will depend on when the COE water quality expert completes his review. Gary thanked the Chatfield Watershed Authority for providing data in a timely manner.

3b) Discussion Item: Environmental Mitigation Plan

- Mary Powell (ERO Resources) announced that their model will go in for COE review on January 2nd. The Draft Conceptual Environmental Mitigation Plan will be ready for COE review by the end of January. Eric added that this will not hold up the schedule on the AFB. Mary said they have made a lot of good progress since the last meeting and the functional assessment for the wetlands has been completed and it looks good.
- Question from John to Eric: Will the Cooperators be able to see the different costs for each alternative associated with mitigation? Eric said that is the plan and that the different mitigation costs for the alternatives will be added to the Draft FR/EIS as they come in.
- Question from John to Eric: Some of the proposed mitigation has a lifetime beyond 50 years—how do you account for that? Eric responded that the analysis is required to look at a 50 year lifespan so that is what they are looking at. Question from John to Eric: How do you address lifetimes and impacts that go beyond 50 years—there are terminal values that need to be assessed. Eric responded that looking at that would require another model that would have to go through the model review process and added that the new model review process is causing people to use models that have already been reviewed.
- Rick stated that the model will be ready January 2nd but the Plan is not going to be done until the end of January. Mary clarified that they want to get the model out as soon as possible but they will have January to work on the text. There is no way to release the Draft Plan without the completed model certification. Eric reminded Rick that this is accounted for in the schedule.

3c) Discussion Item: FR/EIS Chapters and Appendices

- Eric said that ITR comments on Chapters 1 through 4 will go to Tetra Tech for incorporation hopefully before Christmas.
- Tom confirmed with Gary that Tetra Tech has received comments from The Audubon Society on all the released chapters.

- Gary said that he will post all the updated appendices on the FTP site and will resend the email to all Cooperators (through Tom Browning) on how to access the site.

3d) Discussion Item: Dam Safety and Seismic Review

- Eric informed attendees that the model on the impacts of liquefaction (location and lateral extent) is essentially complete. He will share the model results with one of the COE experts in Portland to see if there are any concerns. There will be answers from that consultation in a week or two. If there is nothing major he will be able to finish the structural study possibly by February. The ITR on liquefaction should be done in March.
- There is a memo being put together on how the COE is going to evaluate the dam at Chatfield if it is classified as a critical structure. Eric said that they want to check details on everything before they actually release any information. The COE dam safety officials will include all aspects of their evaluation in the memo they are creating. Eric is not sure when the memo will be released and added that the classification of the dam at Chatfield as a critical structure can have the potential to stop a reallocation but he feels like the COE would finish the study anyway.

3e) Discussion Item: Coordination with the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA)

- Tom said that the State is coordinating with EPA scientists Brent Straskowski and Jody Ostendorf. They will be looking at NEPA, wetlands, and water quality issues.
- Eric added that they have been invited to the Cooperator meetings in the past and have never attended. Rick said that he knows them and will encourage them to come.

3f) Discussion Item: UDV Analysis and BBC Study

- Eric informed attendees that Betty Peake (COE) is aware that the EDAW study will be finished soon and after it is complete she can finish her Unit Daily Value (UDV) analysis. The BBC study can be completed after the EDAW study as well.

4) Public Involvement

- Brooke Fox (Chatfield Basin Conservation Network (CBCN)) announced that the Coordination and Subcommittee meetings are being combined on January 6th so it will be a longer meeting. It will take place at the Metro Wastewater office on York Street in Denver.
- Haley McKean (Webb PR) said that she is hoping to have the flyer and website content reviewed by Eric, Tom, and Gary by the end of the week so that the flyers could be printed before the January 6th meeting. Eight signs about the FR/EIS are being printed and will be posted at Chatfield State Park soon.

- Haley informed attendees that a media request has been made by the local CBS affiliate for any materials that they can use. She reminded attendees that the COE wants any Cooperators that are contacted to comment on the FR/EIS to direct the request to the COE public information officer (Monique Farmer) in Omaha. Also, if they are a special technical advisor they cannot comment on the confidential information discussed in meetings.
- Eric clarified that anything to do with the impact analysis or preliminary findings is confidential—basically what is printed on the flyer or on the website is what is available to the public.

6) Wrap-up: Next Meeting Date

- Next meeting date: Thursday, February 6th, 9:00 am — 11:30 am. Gary will check on the Tetra Tech conference room schedule.