



## Board Minutes – August 16, 2022

### **Attendees**

1. Jessie Olson
2. Deborah Hummel
3. Maria Pezza
4. Chris Smith (with proxy for Sue Schaffler)
5. Barbara Luneau
6. Jenny McCarty
7. Ken Lenarcic
8. Joseph Ryan
9. Monica Bortolini (with proxy for Kathy Peterson)
10. Darren Beck (left at 3:05 PM)
11. Julie Trumper
12. Erica Crosby
13. Eric Smith
14. Scott Griebing (left at 2:42 PM)
15. Jen Charles (arrived at 3 PM, left at 4:06 PM)
16. Joy Jenkins (arrived at 3 PM, left at 4:06 PM)
17. Mary Boardman (arrived 3:57 PM)

### **Welcome and Introductions**

- (Jessie started meeting at 2pm and went through introductions.) Chris called the meeting to order at 2:08 PM and went through introductions.

### **Weather Modification Pilot Program**

- Scott Griebing provided update on weather modification pilot program (see presentation).
  - Jessie asked where the generators are located and how big they are; Scott clarified that locations are still being determined and that they require roughly 30'x30' for operation.
  - Eric asked what measures are taken to monitor results of weather modification; Scott stated that you can quantify how much cloud seeding occurred in certain basins and then measure how much snowfall occurred. LIDAR snow measurements can also help.

- Darren noted that CWCB could use radar to show increased precipitation following a plane as it seeded.
- Scott clarified that among the main goals for this program are drought resilience and increased snowpack and runoff, and this is one of the most cost effective ways of achieving those goals.
- Monica asked if SVLHWCD wanted to work in the entire basin; Scott clarified that they intended to focus mostly in St. Vrain and Left Hand basins, but that depending on the storm, there could be benefits to neighboring basins as well.
- Jenny asked about the cost difference between the generators and alternative water storage in the basin; Scott clarified that weather modification is the most cost-effective method.
- Barbara asked about the timing of increased runoff and how to make sure water is available when it's actually needed; Scott explained that the operation will target any storms that come through with the right conditions with the intention of increasing snow pack across the whole basin. What happens to the runoff as a result of the snow pack is less in our control.
- Chris clarified that having more runoff in general may aid ditch companies regardless of timing of runoff.
- Darren noted that CWCB does seed as much as they can in any storm they can identify as favorable, except when increasing snowpack in an area will increase avalanche risk. CWCB also mentions flooding as a risk that's monitored.
- Darren noted that other land managers are already getting into weather modification projects, so we don't want to sit and wait on this.
- Barbara noted that BOD members would like to help out during the public comment period.
- No board action was taken.

### **Approval of Minutes**

- **Motion:** Ken moved, Barbara seconded, to approve minutes from the June 20, 2022 Board Meeting; the motion carried unanimously.
- 

### **Q2 2022 Financial Report**

- Jessie reviewed financial report summary.
- **Motion:** Barbara moved, Monica seconded, to accept the second quarter 2022 financial report; the motion carried unanimously.

### **COVID Memo**

- Jessie reviewed new COVID memo.
  - Monica asked if a state of emergency is still in place; Chris clarified that it would be in place until the end of 2022.

### **Captain Jack Update**

- Deb, Jen, and Joy provided update on Captain Jack (see presentation sent via email). Key things to note: they are moving forward with the ex-situ treatment system and improving their in-situ treatment (of the mine pool) by broadening the treatment area. Both measures will improve confidence in long term treatability.
  - Eric asked about state of funding sources for both in-situ and ex-situ treatments. Jen clarified that the funding has come through for continuing the treatability study for the in-situ treatment and that MineWater's contract has been renewed for the following year to continue with their feasibility study. There is a separate funding source for the ex-situ treatment process, which has also gone through. The contractor for ex-situ will be procured through open competition. In terms of in-tunnel treatment, the pairing of the in-situ and ex-situ processes were meant to be a long-term pairing.
  - Eric asked what length of time MineWater is contracted for (how long will they be managing the in-situ treatment) and will the ex-situ treatment process continue indefinitely? Jen clarified that in-situ contract has been extended through July of 2023. Ex-situ is intended to be long term.
  - Joe asked if they had a good understanding of the ratio of metal removal occurring in the mine pool versus in the external treatment system. Joy clarified that that data exists (although not on hand at the moment), and they have concentration comparisons they can look at and point out in their reporting. Joe clarified that he was wanting to understand if MineWater's progress in removing these metals was sufficient enough to have them continue their treatment into the future, and that he hoped MineWater would move towards a more process-based approach rather than a trial-and-error strategy.
  - Joe asked what would be looked for in the new contractor for the ex-situ treatment, and could this be something that MineWater might end up doing? Joy clarified that it would be open competition, but that it would be beneficial to have a contractor with knowledge of these treatment systems. It will be a qualifications-based solicitation from the state.
  - Ken asked if board members could get a copy of Jen's presentation. Jen said she would send out slides.
  - Deb noted that Watershed Center staff is encouraged by next steps as well as plans to expand treatment zone, move forward with ex-situ treatment plans, etc. Deb noted some things to consider:
    - It's important to have clear performance measures and consistency in the data, as well as having monitoring in place to measure performance.
    - Modeling the efficacy of treatment would help our understanding of things.
    - There's also interest in the active treatment facility that was put up at the mine; is there any sort of emergency backup plan for unforeseen water level rises? Jen clarified that eventually the idea is for that interim treatment plan to go away, but that would only be after the ex-situ treatment process is set up.

### **Partner updates & other project updates**

- Jessie reviewed project updates (see packet).
- Jessie and Monica updated on Montgomery Farms office space
  - City of Longmont will be performing renovations on the property, so Watershed Center staff will move forward with office space at Lefthand Fire facilities in the meantime, but the City is supportive of this being a future site of the Watershed Center.
- Erica updated on mine closure projects near Jamestown.
  - BEC (Balarat Education Center) Closure project
  - Jamestown Project includes about 35 dangerous openings
  - Any questions about these projects can be directed to Erica.
- Erica updated on water quality sampling occurring near Ward and Jamestown.
- Jenny updated on PL566 district NRCS funding
  - SVLHWCD recently posted an informational webinar about NRCS's Watershed Protection (PL566) funding opportunity, which will allow organizations to leverage NRCS funding for projects basin-wide. This can fund projects under 30 million without going to Congress. The goal of funded projects should be to improve water conservation, water resources, agriculture, etc.; almost anything aside from land/water acquisition. Project ideas can be emailed to Jenny.

### **ADM Funding**

- Jessie asked board members if they were interested in offering an ex-officio position to a City of Boulder staff member (Cat McIntyre was suggested). Jessie also proposed offering to Kevin Peterson with Boulder County's Sustainability Office, and proposed inviting them both ahead of the strategic planning meeting as this will be a great introduction to our organization.
  - Chris noted that we've often had two seats from the same organization, so there would be no issue bringing in an additional person from Boulder County.
  - Chris also noted that it makes sense to include City of Boulder as they own several properties in our watershed.
  - Ken noted that it would be great to formalize City of Boulder's participation.
  - Barbara and Jenny agreed with others' comments.
  - Monica noted that it would be great to see City of Boulder involved.

### **Adjournment**

The meeting was adjourned at 4:13 PM.