

Draft Meeting Minutes Wednesday, August 9th, 2023

Attendees: See the table at the end of the minutes.

John got the meeting going and Amy recorded it <u>here</u>. John welcomed everyone and went over the agenda.

Nathan Moore, CDPHE staff – Nathan reported that there were work groups being formed regarding the fee setting effort. There will be two hearings, one in 2024 and one in 2025. Here is a link to where people can sign up for the work groups - https://cdphe.colorado.gov/water-quality/water-quality-engagement/water-quality-fee-setting-rule. There's a Water Quality Control Commission (WQCC) meeting on Monday that is mostly focused on drinking water. Reg. 61 will be up for an informational hearing in October. He encouraged people to contact them if they wanted to suggest changes to the regulation. The quarterly webinar is next week and **Andrew** will be sending out an agenda soon. Also, there will be some openings at the state. People were encouraged to help recruit good candidates.

John asked about PFAS monitoring. Some permits include a Practical Quantitation Limit (PQL), some don't, because the method kept changing. Nathan suggested that people reach out to Water Quality Control Division (WQCD) staff if they have a table with PQLs in their permits.

Alex Johnson, Virridy –The slides from the presentation can be found here. Alex provided background information about his company. He used to work with the Fresh Water Trust. He's been working around the county doing watershed restoration work. It's not applicable in every watershed and most applicable in watersheds with more nonpoint sources of pollution than point sources. Virridy is located in Boulder and was started by a professor at the University of Colorado (UC) – Boulder.

Virridy is a project developer that creates carbon credits through their projects. Companies that are interested in reducing their greenhouse gas emissions are looking to buy carbon credits. They already have Memorandums of Understanding with some dischargers to explore the options to tap into the carbon offset market. The amount of carbon offsets generated and amount of carbon avoidance through the use of alternative technologies is measured. The methods are currently out for review.

A lot of money has been spent on water treatment since the 1960s and there's still lots of impairments. Green infrastructure may provide better solutions than grey infrastructure in terms of carbon emissions. Water quality trading has been accepted in Colorado since 2003, beginning in the Cherry Creek Watershed. EPA has a lot of guidance on water quality trading.

Alex went through how a project would be implemented. In watersheds where nonpoint sources are dominant, green infrastructure options may be particularly appealing, especially from a holistic perspective. For watersheds where point sources are dominant, green infrastructure may not be as practical. Green infrastructure implementation would require documentation and maintenance, just like the grey infrastructure. There is an emerging market for carbon credits created by things like green infrastructure. Carbon credits do not yet have a high enough value to offset the entire cost of grey infrastructure, but they may reduce the costs of implementing green infrastructure projects by significant amounts and the price of carbon credits are expected to rise dramatically.

He shared references to policy documents around water quality trading. Virridy is confident that watershed projects would qualify for many sources of water quality funding. CU– Boulder is working to propose legislation for studies around green infrastructure project implementation specific to Colorado. Some states offer incentives for green infrastructure. Monitoring is part of the projects. Baseline data will be important in the green infrastructure implementation. They are looking into attracting venture capital into the project options. There are time constraints because of climate change. We need to be working now on solutions`.

John thanked them for the presentation.

Discussion Items

Regulatory Updates – Justine reported on the fee setting work groups. There is a very aggressive meeting schedule. They have draft regulation language but there isn't a lot of content yet. The air quality sector has a fee setting model that might be appropriate. Metro is worried about the bifurcation of the rule making. The WQCD was given a healthy budget from the legislature to have a robust work group process. During the legislation there were a lot of discussions that now seem to be being ignored. The concern is about how the money is being spent. Metro is preparing a memo requesting clarification of how the money is being spent. Anyone who shares the concerns about the bifurcation of the process should reach out to Katie. There are 3 other rule-making hearings scheduled for May and June of 2024. The time frame is likely to be compressed given the aggressive schedule the WQCD has set. The concern is about the transparency of how the funds are being spent. It's critical to understand and get the process as transparent as possible now. Other states have been through similar

processes so there are models to follow. Blair created a form to poll the members about

CWWUC Fee Setting Poll

how they want to participate. Responses to the poll are shown to the right. Several members are interested in the topic and will reach out to Metro directly.

Justine Beckstrom, Vranesh and Raisch and Stephan Wilson, Town of Eagle, reported on a change to the temperature standard methodology. Justine shared slides regarding the issue. Regulation 31 was revised in 2016 to define warming events that included days where temperature exceedances would be allowed. The methodology was incorporated into the 303d methodology in 2017. GEI used a biological basis that considered actual temperature impacts to fish, for the methodology. In 2023 Regulation 93 had a rulemaking

Active
Responses

Average time to complete

Status

View results

1. As a Utility are you concerned about the Division's methodology for bifurcating the Fee setting rule-making process?

More Details

2. Would your utility be interested in joining with Metro in its efforts to discuss this with the Division further?

More Details

Ves

2

No

2

Take on as a Council

8

hearing. It included Segment 9c of the Eagle River which had some exceedances of temperature but they were in the allowable total number of days of allowable exceedances (as interpreted by Eagle WWTF staff?). The Water Quality Control Commission (WQCC) sided with WQCD staff and put the segment on the 303d list as impaired. The WQCD was given much more time to present than the Town of Eagle staff (Eagle WWTF staff?). Eagle was not given an opportunity to respond to questions, WQCD was. This change to the interpretation of the methodology, doesn't include any allowable exceedances and doesn't consider the impacts of climate change. Eagle did calculations that showed that the wastewater treatment wastewater flows were relatively small so even extensive effluent cooling couldn't meet the temperature standard. There is a conflict about the frequency of the exceedance allowed. During the hearing no one could answer the questions about the exceedance conflict. That issue could be included in letters of support. Blair prepared a poll for the council. The vote was unanimous in favor of supporting the request for reconsideration. For most other water quality parameters some sort of exceedance is allowed. The warming event was based on biological data and intended to protect aquatic ecosystems. The justification for the change in the methodology doesn't seem to exist. During the hearing, it was clear that the WQCC didn't understand the methodology. They adopted language that codified the change statewide. Eagle is likely to get more stringent permit limits.

The Town of Eagle is asking for the CWWUC support in their request for reconsideration. Specifically, they are requesting comments in support of the reconsideration and being a proponent. The best course of action is requesting a reconsideration rather than a judicial review. They are also asking for funding. The support of CWWUC is be

important. Eagle will send out templates for letters of support. Reconsideration can't be requested until September 14th. **Amy** will share the slides with the minutes.

Blair made a motion for the CWWUC to support the Town of Eagle's request for reconsideration and commit to submitting a letter of support. Jim Heckman seconded the motion. There was discussion about committing funds to the effort. The vote was unanimous. Funding for the request can come from the legal services line item. The WQCC may not grant a request for reconsideration. In that case, the Town of Eagle could request a judicial review.

Budget – Last month information was presented on how to raise funds for upcoming Regulatory actions. This month proposed fee increases to membership dues to raise the \$100,000 we think we'll need to participate in the 2027 hearing are presented for consideration. Roy Heald moved, and Jim Heckman seconded a motion to approve the proposed membership dues increases. The motion passed unanimously.

Roy Heald moved, and Jim Heckman seconded a motion to approve the budget with a change to move half the funds in the Education/Lobbying line item to the Legal Services Line item. The vote was unanimous to approve.

The membership also approved spending \$1,500 for Gabe and his staff to draft a letter of support for the Town of Eagle's Request for Reconsideration. They also voted for the organization not to become a member of the Water Quality Forum.

	Budgeted 10,000	2023 Actuals Actual	Totals (Under) / Over	
\$	•	Actual	, ,	
\$	•	Actual		I
	10.000		Budget	Comments
	10 000			
•	10,000			estimated
l C				
Ψ.	87,333			
\$	97,333			
Total			(Under) / Over	
Un	restricted		Budget	
<u> </u>				
 			(0.00)	
_			/	
	1,000		(1,000)	
-	660		(660)	
\$	1,200		(1,200)	
\$	24,200		(24,200)	
\$	25,000		(25,000)	?
\$	3,900		(3,900)	
			-	
\$	3,559		3,559	Temperature
\$	92,394		(92,394)	
		(
1				
	\$ \$	\$ 500 \$ 31,500 \$ 400 \$ 175 \$ 1,000 \$ 660 \$ 1,200 \$ 24,200 \$ 25,000 \$ 3,900	\$ 500 \$ 31,500 \$ 400 \$ 175 \$ 1,000 \$ 660 \$ 1,200 \$ 24,200 \$ 25,000 \$ 3,900	\$ 500 (500) \$ 31,500 (31,500) \$ 400 (400) \$ 175 (175) \$ 1,000 (1,000) \$ 660 (660) \$ 1,200 (24,200) \$ 24,200 (224,200) \$ 25,000 (25,000) \$ 3,900 (3,900)

Chemical Form Evaluation Subcommittee – John had no report.

Nominating Committee for October Board Officer election— Katie Koplitz volunteered to be the Nominating Committee.

Water Quality Forum Updates – **Meghan Wilson** –A number of members attended the Water Quality Forum retreat. Via chat, Mehan reported that she couldn't go to the retreat this year so she didn't have a report. There's a steering committee meeting this Friday and after that the work plan should be posted to the website.

Drinking Water Council Updates – Cynthia Lane – Cynthia was not available to report.

Board Action Items – Approval of invoices for

August checks for approval		
2367- Alliance Member Service	\$ 265.30	insurance, last payment was late
2368 - Amy Conklin	\$ 1,837.50	July Coordinator services
2369 - Vranesh and Raisch	\$ 646.00	legal services, Inv. 44979

payment – Jim Heckman moved, Jesse Schlam seconded approval for payment of all invoices. The vote was unanimous.

Approval of July 12th, 2023 minutes. Jim Heckman moved; Julie Tinetti seconded a motion to approve the minutes. The motion passed unanimously.

Next Meeting – Wednesday, October 11th at 1:00 pm NO MEETING IN SEPTEMBER

Attendance Amy Conklin, Coordinator Nathan Moore Andrew Sayers-Fay 7193225511 Justine Beckstrom Alex Johnson

Member	Last	First	email	
Colorado Springs	Berleman	Annie		х
City of Longmont	Noble	Anne	Annie.Noble@longmontcolorado.gov	х
Security	Mills	Anthony		Х
City of Grand Junction	Firl	Ashley	ashleyfi@gjcity.org	х
Longmont	Bilgin	Azra		х
Roxborough	Biggs	Barb	barbara@roxwater.org	х
Greeley	Johnson	Ben		х
South Platte Renew	Corning	Blair		х

Security	Bernard	Brandon		х
Mount Crested Butte	Burks	Bryan		x
Pinyon Environmental	Byus	Carolyn	byus@pinyon-env.com	х
Upper Thompson	Bieker	Chris		х
Boulder	Sigmon	Cole		х
City of Lafayette	Jackson	David	david.jackson@lafayetteco.gov	х
City of Broomfield	Cowell	Dawn	dcowell@broomfield.org	х
SACWSD	Smith	Gary		Х
City of Montrose	Webb	Hyran		х
Silverthorne	Kruckeberg	Jason		Х
WHMD	Shivers	JD		Х
Black Hawk	DiToro	Jessica	jessica.ditoro@lrewater.com	Х
Fountain	Heckman	Jim		Х
Monument	Kendrick	Jim	jfkendrick@q.com	Х
Greeley	Kunovic	Joe	·	х
Metro Water Recover	Dorsch	Jim	jdorsch@mwrd.dst.co.us	Х
City of Longmont	Gage	John	John.Gage@LongmontColorado.gov	Х
Aurora Dominion Cherokee Centennail	Handzo Baile Watkins Tinetti	John Josh Joshua Julie	_iwatkins@cherokeemetro.org	X X X
Metro	Koplitz	Katie		Х
Northglenn	Freyre	Manuel		Х
Pueblo	Vanderloop	Maria	MVanderloop@pueblo.us	Х
Monument Sanitation	Parker	Mark	parker@msan.co	х
	Uhland	Mark		Х
NFRWQPA	Thomas	Mark	mthomas@nfrwqpa.org	Х
Boulder	Paternini Wilson	Mary Meghan	wilsonm@bouldercolorado.gov	X X
City of Boulder	Mimna	Melissa		х
Centennial	George	Nic		Х

City of Aurora	Harmon	Nick	nharmon@auroragov.org	х
C. Springs Utility	Zeitlow	Patti	pzietlow@csu.org	х
St. Vrain	Fleck	Rob	Rob@stsan.com	Х
Security	Heald	Roy	r.heald@securitywsd.com	Х
Centennial	Calkins	Samuel	SCalkins@cwsdhrmd.org	Х
Northglenn	Stanley	Shelley	sstanley@northglenn.org	Х
Town of Eagle	Wilson	Stephan	stephan.wilson@townofeagle.org	x
City of Westminster	Wilson	Tara		х
Fremont	Ormandy	Toby	tormandy@fsd.co	Х
City of Greeley	Eldrige	Tyler	Tyler.eldridge@greeleygov.com	х
Woodmen Hills	Eaves	Wally		х
Plum Creek	Martin	Wes	wesmartin@pcwra.org	Х