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BACKGROUND

The concept of the Larimer Water Projects Working Group emerged from an August 1, 2018 County Commissioners meeting, during which the City of Thornton was presenting its application for a 1041 permit from the County siting and development of a water supply pipeline. At this meeting, the Commissioners indicated that they would like to see more community engagement related to the Thornton Water Project (TWP) 1041 Application. The Commissioners continued the hearing regarding the Thornton application until December 17, 2018, and directed County staff to work with Thornton and do more engagement to explore options, identify potential community benefits, and mitigate potential negative impacts of the proposed project. The vision of the process was that Thornton would learn from the community and subsequently submit a revised 1041 application to the County in advance of the Commissioners meeting on December 17, 2018.

In response to this direction from the Commissioners, Larimer County staff\(^1\) proposed a full engagement process including a Working Group, public events, a webpage, and coordination with Thornton as well as Northern Colorado Water Conservation District (Northern) to identify potential synergies of the conveyance of water projects. Based on the participation that had ensued over several months during the hearing process, staff developed a matrix of stakeholders and then invited 30 people to join the Working Group, of whom 28 accepted.\(^2\) With the list of stakeholders and invitations, the County had an eye toward establishing a group that reflected a diversity of geographic neighbors and perspectives.\(^3\)

Concurrent to this effort, the County also convened a discussion with the City of Thornton and staff from the Northern. Northern was already in discussions with the County regarding an intergovernmental agreement (IGA) to capture the negotiated conditions, analysis, and approach to Northern’s development of the Northern Integrated Supply Project (NISP), which is also a water supply project seeking pipeline access across Larimer County. The five “Project Coordination Team” meetings were intended to:

1) Encourage Thornton and Northern’s shared engagement in the Working Group process to listen and learn about the members’ perspectives and to answer questions at specific times in the process

DIFFERENT VIEWS ON PURPOSE:

Several members of the group interpreted the purpose of the Working Group differently than what is described here. These members understood that the goal of the LWPWG was to develop *alternatives to* the TWP rather than to provide ideas for maximizing community benefits and mitigating or minimizing community impacts. These LWPWG members were understandably frustrated when the process did not unfold as they expected or produce the outcome they had anticipated.

\(^1\) For the purposes of this report, “Larimer County staff” refers to staff from the Public Works and Community Development departments.

\(^2\) The invitation for membership on the LWPWG is included in this report as Attachment A.

\(^3\) The membership list of the LWPWG is included in this report as Attachment B.
2) Encourage Thornton and Northern to discuss and consider ideas that emerged from Working Group discussions
3) Solicit information from them as needed to support the Working Group’s discussions, and
4) Encourage them to discuss options for creating efficiencies between TWP and NISP.

Both Thornton and Northern had key project staff at each of the five Larimer Water Projects Working Group (LWPWG) meetings, as well as at the two community meetings. While the goal of the LWPWG effort was to inform Thornton’s 1041 application (with possible implications for NISP’s pipeline alignments), Thornton and Northern may not agree with comments made during meetings or with the final outcome of the process.

In support of both of these efforts, the County hired four consultants as well. For facilitation of the Working Group, two community meetings, and the Project Coordination Team, the County reached out to three facilitation firms with past experience with the County, County staff, and/or water projects. The County interviewed all three firms and selected Peak Facilitation Group to support the engagement effort. Additionally, the County hired three engineering firms to provide independent technical analysis regarding constructability (Bambei Engineering Services), geotechnical considerations (Lithos Engineering), and for traffic impacts (FHU). For complex projects or technical expertise beyond that of the County Staff, such as this, the Land Use Code allows the County to determine that additional expertise is necessary and hire that expertise. When the County hires expert consultants, the applicant reimburses the County for the costs.

**ENGAGEMENT PROCESS SUMMARY**

As noted above, the engagement process consisted of several activities including the Working Group, project webpage, and other events.

**Working Group**
The Working Group met for 3 hours a total of five times in September, October, and November 2018, with an average of two weeks between meetings which are described below. Although it may have been beneficial for the Working Group to meet more times in order to work through additional issues, questions, and ideas, this was the maximum amount of meeting time possible in the available timeframe between September and December 17. It was an aggressive meeting schedule, with many LWPWG members doing additional work in between meetings. It is a testament to the commitment of the members of the Working Group that participation in meetings never wavered or lagged, even when members were frustrated by the process.

**Community Meetings and Webinars**
In addition to these five meetings, the County also hosted two community meetings (on October 8 and November 15) to solicit a broader range of feedback from the larger community, as well as three technical webinars (on November 5 and 6) to allow for deeper dives into some of the technical issues and challenges of the TWP and NISP. Each of the meetings is summarized below.
Webpage / Press Releases
Each LWPWG meeting was publicly noticed on the Larimer County website and on a new website created for the LWPWG. Facilitation team staff posted information to the website, which is available at www.larimerwaterprojects.org. The website includes the following information:

- Meeting agendas, presentations, and summaries.
- Additional information submitted by Working Group members (Note: No attempt was made to verify the accuracy of information provided by Thornton, Northern, Working Group members, or presenters. LWPWG members used their own discretion about which information on the website to review.)
- Background and technical information on the TWP and NISP provided by Thornton and Northern, respectively and in some cases the County.

Summaries and Attendance
The facilitation team took detailed notes at each meeting and prepared draft summaries for review by LWPWG members. Several Working Group members provided feedback on each summary, and the facilitation team integrated these comments into final summaries.

There were members of the community in attendance at each LWPWG meeting in numbers ranging from 20 to 60, depending on the day. Comment/question cards were available at each meeting, and several community members completed them. Comments and questions (with associated answers) are included at the end of each meeting summary.

Setting the Stage for Collaboration (LWPWG Meeting #1): September 18, 2018
This was the first meeting of the Working Group, and the purpose of the meeting was to create a foundation for the collaborative work that lay ahead. Agenda items and discussions at this meeting included:

- Participant welcome and introductions.
- Review and approval of purpose and protocols to guide the Working Group process.
- County staff summary of the Thornton Water Project, its intersection with NISP, and the desire to maximize community benefits, minimize or mitigation negative impacts, and create efficiencies as much as possible if both water projects move forward and are approved.
- Identification of Working Group member interests in the TWP (interests are the underlying motivations or “why” upon which their positions or preferred solutions are based).
- Review of public comment to date (via a written summary prepared by the facilitation team following a review of all the written public comment received by the County and the recorded public comment from the Commissioners meeting).
- Identification of Working Group information needs, questions, and other concerns.

---

4 The summary of the September 18 LWPWG meeting is included in this report as Attachment C.
5 The LWPWG Protocols are included in this report as Attachment D.
6 The summary of public comment is included in this report as Attachment E.
Concerns about Inclusion of NISP

Several members of the LWPWG expressed surprise and/or frustration that NISP was included in their work. Some stated that they did not know enough about NISP to have an informed opinion about it, while others shared their opposition to NISP and thought that the County should not be combining, conflating, or otherwise integrating consideration of these two projects. County staff clarified that their reasons for this were to recognize that two applications were coming before the County and this process was a chance to explore additional ways to minimize impacts to Larimer County residents (such as through possible co-location of the two pipelines). The facilitator encouraged Working Group members to include or exclude NISP in their individual considerations of Thornton’s application.

- Clarification Thornton and Northern would not be Working Group members, but they would attend the meetings to listen and so that Working Group members could ask them questions, request documents or presentations about technical subjects or the project process, or provide them with suggestions.

Community Open House #1: October 8, 2018

The first community meeting was intended to provide an opportunity to learn about the existing TWP and NISP concepts to allow for more information engagement in the later community meetings. This event was an open house, with stations for Thornton, Northern, and the County. Some participants noted on their way out that the meeting was helpful and increased their understanding, but some indicated that they were hoping to see new information and new ideas from either Thornton or the Working Group. Several community members left comment cards with questions and suggestions. These were included in a summary of the open house, and all questions were carried over to the Question/Answer document for the Working Group (more on this below).

Digging Deeper to Understanding the Issue (LWPWG Meeting #2): October 9, 2018

The second meeting of the LWPWG focused on group learning, as the Working Group heard presentations on a variety of topics identified as information needs at the end of the first meeting. These presentations were:

- The meaning of and difference between a 1041 permit and an IGA (presented by Lesli Ellis, County staff).
- A brief overview of the Thornton Water Project (presented by Mark Koleber, Thornton staff).
- A brief overview of NISP (presented by Stephanie Cecil, Northern staff).
- An overview of how the Water Supply and Storage (WSSC) system operates and relates to the TWP (presented by WSSC General Manager and Working Member Dennis Harmon).
- Perspectives on the River I (presented by Save the Poudre Director and Working Group member Gary Wockner).
- Perspectives on the River II (presented by Colorado Water Trust staff Zach Smith).

7 The summary of the first community open house is included in this report at Attachment F.
8 The summary of the October 9 LWPWG meeting is included in this summary as Attachment G.
In addition to these presentations, the facilitation team began a Questions and Information Needs document to gather and record additional questions from LWPWG members and the associated responses. After each meeting, the facilitation team would email new questions out to (as appropriate) Thornton staff, Northern staff, and County staff. A small number of additional questions were answered by Working Group members with unique roles or expertise. Questions regarding water quality and flows, constructability, and traffic impacts were aggregated and answered during informational webinars at the beginning of November (more on this below).

**Different Perspectives on Thornton’s Involvement:** Working Group members expressed different perceptions and expectations of Thornton’s interactions with the LWPWG. Some were suspicious of Thornton based on previous interactions with them and/or negative assessments of the TWP. These members did not want Thornton involved in the LWPWG at all and expressed frustration that Thornton was allowed to provide information and maps to the group. These members were generally not satisfied with the written and verbal responses that Thornton provided to the LWPWG. Other Working Group members indicated that they wanted more time to ask questions, discuss ideas, and explore options with Thornton and thought that the process would have been more productive if Thornton (and possibly Northern) had been invited to directly participate. Some members of the community and the Working Group expressed interest in seeing what revisions Thornton would be making to their 1041 application and had hoped to see those by the time of the last meeting.

**Exploring Options and Ideas for Addressing Interests, Maximizing Benefits, and Mitigating/Minimizing Impacts (LWPWG Meeting #3): October 24, 2018**

At the third Working Group meeting, members offered their proposals for ways to maximize benefits and/or mitigate or minimize negative impacts of the TWP (and NISP, if they were inclined to do so). These ideas were phrased as “what if” ideas to stress the creative opportunities they were presenting for Thornton (and NISP in some cases). The 12 “what-if” idea proposals involved 17 Working Group members (some worked in teams; one was not feeling well and emailed his idea to the LWPWG after the meeting). Some Working Group members offered ways to refine or enhance pipeline alignments on Douglas Road or County Road 56. These “what-if” ideas included (some have been combined into single bullets below to reflect common themes):

Ideas relating to Pipelines or Improvements to Pipeline Proposals
- Co-location of the TWP with NISP
- Thornton funding water rights acquisition, engaging in water exchanges, and pursuing new scientific assessments to keep water in the Poudre River
- Protection of agricultural land and donation of farms owned by Thornton to Larimer County
- Annual payments to private property owners for use of their land
- Community support for an expedited permit from the US Army Corps of Engineers for Thornton to keep its water in the river through Fort Collins and divert it in Windsor

---

9 The complete and final Questions and Information Needs document is included in this report as Attachment H.
10 The summary of the October 24 LWPWG meeting is included in this summary as Attachment I.
Ideas relating to Alternatives to Pipelines

- Use of the Larimer Canal to convey water instead of building a pipeline to minimize pipeline length
- Keeping water in the Poudre River through Fort Collins and diverting it in Windsor (and associated benefits)

The summary from the October 24 meeting contains detailed accounts of each of the “what-if” ideas, as well as the improvements to community benefit and/or mitigation or minimization of negative impacts that the ideas’ authors envisioned.

**Informational Webinars to Answer Questions from the LWPWG**

On November 5 and 6, the County offered three online webinars as part of the engagement process to answer outstanding LWPWG questions regarding water quality and flows, constructability, and traffic impacts. The webinars involved online presentations of PowerPoint slides with a live presentation that could be heard over a computer or phone speaker. Working Group members had the option to either listen to the webinars live and email or text questions in real time or to view the recording after the fact or read written summaries and email or questions later. Some chose not to participate.

Two of the webinar presentations were delivered by independent third-party consultants hired by Larimer County. These webinars were:
- Constructability and Geotechnical Matters on November 5
- Traffic on November 6

The third webinar on water quality and flows was delivered by a combination of Thornton staff and water quality consultants and a water rights attorney hired by Thornton. This webinar occurred on November 5.

**Further Discussing and Refining “What-if” Ideas (LWPWG Meeting #4): November 13, 2018**

Part of the fourth Working Group meeting was dedicated to providing Working Group members an opportunity to ask follow-up questions of Thornton, Northern, County staff, and the Larimer County independent consultants following the webinars. Following this, members were invited to work at any of five stations on different alternative concepts for the TWP assembled by County staff for the purpose of discussion. The five concepts at the stations were based on two alternative pipeline routes in Thornton’s 1041 application to the County, two “what-if” ideas from the November 13 LWPWG meeting, and one additional concept proposed by a community

---

11 Written summaries of the three webinars are included in this report at Attachment J.
12 The summary of the November 13 LWPWG meeting is included in this report as Attachment K.
member with input from Thornton that was of interest to some Working Group members. County staff prepared summaries of these five concepts, incorporating additional what-if ideas from the Working Group presentations where possible. The five concepts synthesized and put forward for further discussion were:

A. Canal Conveyance (LWPWG member “what-if” idea)
B. Douglas Road (Thornton’s 1041 application)
C. County Road 56 (Thornton’s 1041 application)
D. Poudre River (LWPWG member “what-if” idea)
E. Shields Street and Poudre River (community member option, with Thornton input)

At each of the five stations were several materials:
- A map of the conveyance route,
- A list of the potential community benefits and potential negative impacts that County staff had heard prior to the meeting,
- Sticky notes and markers,
- Chart paper for notes,
- Lists of the interests identified by the LWPWG at the first meeting, and
- Lists of the “what-if” ideas proposed by LWPWG members at the third meeting.

The work product from this meeting included annotated maps and additions to the lists of potential community benefits and potential negative impacts for each option. These items became the framework for the community open house two days later.

**Community Open House #2: November 15, 2018**¹³

The goal of the community open house on November 15 was to get community input on the five concepts described above. The meeting room was set up with five stations like those at the LWPWG meeting on November 13, though now each included the additional potential benefits and impacts that were added by Working Group members on November 13. Approximately half of the Working Group attended the community open house, answering questions and engaging in discussion with community members.

---

¹³ The summary of the second community open house is included in this report as Attachment L.
In addition to the five stations:

- Thornton had a table to share information and answer questions; this included having the water quality consultant they hired available to answer questions.
- Northern had a table to share information and answer questions.
- The County’s traffic consultant had a station to share information and answer questions.
- The constructability consultant hired by the County did not have a station but did circulate throughout the room and answer questions.

After a brief presentation on each of the options by County staff, community members were invited to provide feedback in the following ways:

- Using provided dots, indicate which of the potential community benefits was most important to them for each option.
- Using provided dots, indicate which of the potential negative impacts was of most concern to them for each option.
- Rate how well they thought each option addressed the interests identified by the Working Group (1 = not well / 5 = very well).
- Indicate whether they thought it was important for Thornton and Northern to co-locate their pipelines if both are permitted.
- Provide additional ideas for improving options by writing on sticky notes or maps.
- Provide any additional comments for the LWPWG.

More than 100 members of the public attended the meeting, with most participating in the dot preferencing of the potential community benefits and impacts and about 2/3 responding in whole or in part to the interest evaluation worksheet and the co-location question. While there were some challenges related to the community open house (see below), the community provided useful information to inform County staff, the County Commissioners, and Thornton as the 1041 process proceeds. A complete summary of the results of the community open house is attached; below are some high-level outcomes.

**Potential Community Benefits (Common Themes between Options Combined)**

Across all options, community members indicated that the benefits most important to them related to:

- Minimizing pipeline construction and associated disruption to private property, roads, and traffic;
- Protecting trees and other environmental features in construction corridors;
- Protecting private property from having pipelines or pumphouses constructed on them;
- Potentially improving infrastructure after construction;
• Enhancing flows in the Poudre River through use of the Poudre River option and/or through Thornton’s participation in the Poudre River instream flow concept;
• Eliminate or minimize pipeline miles;
• Potentially providing increases to base and peak flows in the Poudre River;
• Conserving land or dedicating Thornton-owned properties to Larimer County for open space;
• Feasibility of co-location of TWP and NISP pipelines if both are approved

Potential Community Impacts (Common Themes between Options Combined)
Across all options, community members indicated the greatest concern over the following types of potential impacts:
• Traffic impacts from construction (duration and size of impacted area, as well as whether/how these would change if one or two pipelines are built);
• Wetlands impacts from construction;
• Utility shut-offs (water, sewer, power, cable);
• Impacts to private properties in any alignments and how private property might be used (e.g., fee simple acquisition, easement, or eminent domain);
• Impacts to flows in the Poudre River; variation in flows in the River;
• Treatment requirements and associated waste disposal to treat lower-quality water to Thornton’s drinking water requirements; and
• Construction of additional storage vessels, pumphouses, and pipes (depending on the option).

Interest Evaluation
• Of the options that included alternative conveyance methods and no pipelines, community members indicated that the Poudre River option met the variety of interests better than the Canal Conveyance option.
• Of the options that included pipelines, community members indicated that the County Road 56 option met the variety of interests better than the Douglas Road option or the Shields option.

Co-location of Pipelines
Two-thirds of those community members who answered this question indicated that if the TWP and NISP are both approved, the two pipelines should be co-located and construction should be coordinated.

Community Open House Challenges:
• Parking at the venue was extremely limited. Some LWPWG members indicated their neighbors tried to attend and gave up when they could not find parking.
• The interest evaluation worksheet was confusing, especially because multiple and sometimes competing interests were combined under the same category heading.
• The lists of potential community benefits and potential impacts were confusing because the additions from the LWPWG meeting did not always make sense and/or were not clearly written as benefits or impacts. Staff and the facilitation team did not edit, refine, or vet these additions.
• The options stations were in order along back walls while the stations with Thornton and Northern at them were at the front of the room. Some LWPWG members indicated that they thought this might have biased the community’s input.


**A Really Big Bump in the Road Near the End of the Process:** At the November 15 community open house, some Working Group members began discussions with Thornton about ways to mitigate impacts to their neighborhood if a pipeline were to be sited there. Thornton agreed to meet with these neighbors to further explore options and notified the County and the facilitator of these meetings. Northern was also invited to these meetings and also planned to attend. Word of these meetings got out to other Working Group members, some of whom perceived them as secret, thought that they were intended for the neighborhood to encourage Thornton not to put a pipeline there, and found them reminiscent of meetings two years ago that sparked concern among some Douglas Road residents. Many emails and calls between Working Group members, staff, and the facilitator ensued in the week after the public meeting before the last Working Group meeting. Thornton clarified that the meetings were not intended to be secret and were exploratory in nature, but ultimately decided to reschedule the meetings until after the last Working Group meeting out of respect for the process.

---

**Evaluating the Options (LWPWG Meeting #5): November 27, 2018**

At the fifth and final Working Group meeting, the facilitator reviewed the outcomes from the community open house on November 15, and then Working Group members had an opportunity to ask any remaining questions they had of Thornton, Northern, or County staff and consultants. After this, Working Group members were invited to provide the same input as the community did at the November 15 open house, with some variations:

- The Working Group used electronic polling devices (“clickers”) instead of dots and worksheets for their feedback and prioritization.
- Working Group members were invited to critique or discuss the options, interests, benefits, and impacts prior to indicating their preference with their clickers.
- Several Working Group members expressed confusion or frustration over weighing the five options against the interests, noting the same concern that emerged on some of the community worksheets about the categorization of competing interests under a single heading. This made it difficult to evaluate options against the interests, so after trying it on one concept, the group agreed not to do it on future options.
- The polling slides on the potential benefits and potential impacts for each option included only the 5 or 6 (if tied) from the community open house based on dot preferences. Some Working Group members expressed confusion or frustration about the items on these lists, stating that some of the items were written as benefits or impacts, some were not accurate in their understanding of the option, some did not occur in Larimer County, and some were contradictory. As with the benefits and impacts listed at the community open house, County staff and the facilitation did not revise, edit, or vet these lists after the November 13 LWPWG meeting or after the November 15 community open house.
- Working Group members were invited to abstain from participating in any evaluation slide that troubled or concerned them. Response numbers on some polling slides were as low as 9, with as many 19 Working Group members abstaining.

As with the community open house, there were concerns about the information provided, the information requested, and the methods for getting input at the Working Group meeting. However, there were some clear indications in the results that could inform County staff, the

---

14 The summary of the November 27 LWPWG meeting is included in this report as Attachment M.
County Commissioners, and Thornton as the 1041 process continues. The summary of the November 15 meeting has the complete polling results and additional information about comments and concerns from Working Group members. Some overview results are listed below.

**Potential Community Benefits (Common Themes between Options Combined)**

Similar to the results from the community open house, LWPWG members indicated that they are most interested in community benefits that:

- Minimize pipeline construction in Larimer County and use routes that are less disruptive to residences,
- Minimize disruptions to private property,
- Facilitate co-location of the TWP and NISP pipelines if both are constructed,
- Eliminate pipeline miles, and
- Keep or put water in the Poudre River.

**Potential Negative Impacts (Common Themes between Options Combined)**

Working Group input on negative impacts is quite different from that received at the community open house, likely due to different perspectives and knowledge of the options. Working Group members abstained from participating in polling on slides related to impacts at a higher rate than on slides related to benefits. Impacts of greatest concern to those participating were:

- Pipeline construction and associated impacts,
- Impacts to private property, and
- Construction of new storage vessels.

**Concerns about Two Options**

- Description of benefits and impacts of the Canal Conveyance option was not consistent with how the LWPWG member who proposed it envisioned it. This was because, at the request of the County, Thornton evaluated the idea and provided the map based on how they would/could implement the idea based on their understanding of it and how it could work. County staff and the facilitation team did not convey this to the Working Group or to the community.

- The Shields option was substantially different than how it was characterized by the community member who initially developed it. The version discussed by the LWPWG and at the community open house included a pipeline along either Douglas Road or Country County Road 56. As above with the Canal Conveyance option, this was because, at the request of the County, Thornton evaluated the idea and provided the map based on how they would/could implement the idea based on their understanding of it. County staff and the facilitation team did not convey this to the Working Group or to the community. The idea also did not include some of the improvements to wastewater treatment facilities as initially proposed by a member of the community. This was also not conveyed to the community or to the LWPWG. When the LWPWG discussed the divergence from the original intent at the meeting, they agreed that their polling on this option should be on the original version, not the version with the a pipeline on County Road 56 or Douglas Road. This increased confusion and frustration for some members of the Working Group.
Concerns about the LWPWG Interest Evaluation Process

Working Group members expressed concerns as follows:

- Benefits and impacts were not consistent, did not all occur in Larimer County, and in some cases were not consistent with members’ understanding of the option.
- Interest list was confusing and not useful as an evaluation tool because competing interests were included under a single heading.
- The fact that Thornton provided the maps for the options was a source of anger and suspicion for some Working Group members. It was not conveyed to the Working Group that this was at the request of the County.
- Clerical errors by the facilitation team on an earlier version of the community open house summary and some of the slides at the LWPWG meeting caused some confusion.

Additional Perspectives from LWPWG Members

Due to the confusion and frustration at the final Working Group meeting, the facilitator invited LWPWG members to submit any final or additional thoughts via email. Nine Working Group members submitted comments this way. Many of the comments from these emails are included in the text above and will not be repeated here. Some additional perspectives that were repeated in multiple emails but were not mentioned above are listed below. Several emails included a stated preference for one of the five options; a few of them have very detailed analyses of one or more options. All of the emails are appended to this summary with permission from the authors; more information and detail is included in each.\(^{15}\)

- Gratitude for the process and for being included in it.
- Hope that the time and effort invested by LWPWG members and the community have a meaningful impact on Thornton’s revised application to the County.
- Appreciation for the relationships that emerged between Working Group members as they worked through this challenging process.
- Concerns about the makeup of the Working Group including:
  - Few women
  - Perception that east Douglas Road residents were not represented
  - Perception that Save the Poudre did not have enough representation
  - Perceptions that the group was dominated by supporters of the Poudre River option and No Pipe Dream
- Frustration that Planning Commission would not have a new hearing on the TWP; confusion when staff and facilitator unintentionally said that it would (but were referring to NISP, not the TWP).
- Concerns that Thornton, Northern, and the Water Supply and Storage Company had undue influence on the process.
- Inconsistencies in presentation of information from Thornton and Northern versus information from the County’s consultants.
- Questions and confusion about whether and when Thornton will build a second pipeline in Larimer County.
- Frustration that Working Group members cannot speak at the December 17 County Commissioners meeting.

\(^{15}\) These emails are included in this report as Attachment N.
Final Facilitator Impressions

• A better process with clearer outcomes might have emerged with more time. Five meetings compressed into 3 months (with a holiday!) was not enough time for Working Group members to understand the options, issues, and ideas at play in a complicated project such as this. It was not enough time for them to build relationships and want to help each other succeed. It was not enough time for staff and the facilitation team to do our finest work in process design and document preparation. But everyone did their best to complete the work in the time available, and the facilitation team hopes the Commissioners appreciate the substantial time and effort the community invested in this process. However, the rushed process resulted in communication between County staff, the facilitation team, and the Working Group being inconsistent and incomplete, increasing distrust among some LWPWG members.

• Some participants entered and left the process in support of or against one alternative. Some participants came with a preference but dug in to learn and try to find new ideas and approaches outside of or in addition to their original inclination. However, everyone did what they felt was right and came to each meeting with a commitment to protecting their community, however they understood that.

• Some Working Group members really wanted this process to end in a vote for the “best” project. Some expressed frustration that the process was not set up them to work through options to get to a single, recommended option to submit to the Commissioners. Staff and the facilitation team resisted voting for three reasons.
  o First, the Working Group was not an elected, representative body that could speak for the rest of the community. They were an appointed body of interested and invested people who were as balanced and representative as possible.
  o Second, we understood that the Working Group needed to expand Thornton’s thinking about community benefits and impacts and to help them better understand what really matters to the people in this area. At the end of the day, what to submit to the County in a revised application is Thornton’s to decide and the Commissioners to approve or deny.
  o Third, the amount of time in the process allowed for some preliminary analysis of new ideas but not a full technical analysis that would lead to an informed decision.

• A rough start to Thornton’s previous engagement with certain segments of the Larimer County community going back for several years has made for a difficult process characterized by a lack of trust. While some Working Group members reported that they learned from Thornton and appreciated their participation, others indicated that it did not improve their view of or relationship with Thornton.

• Committed people having a hard discussion on a tough issue in a challenging process is still a great way to inform public policy. Even when it’s messy.
Aug. 24, 2018

Via email

Re: Invitation to Participate in Larimer County Water Projects Working Group

To (HOA or neighborhood organization) -

Larimer County would like to invite an official representative of your Homeowner Association (HOA) or neighborhood to participate in a Working Group of approximately 25 interested stakeholders to work with the County, City of Thornton, and Northern Water through an independent facilitator to review and give feedback on proposed water conveyance alternatives associated with the City of Thornton Water Project 1041 permit application.

At a hearing on August 1, 2018, the Board of County Commissioners tabled the Thornton pipeline 1041 application decision until December 17, 2018 to allow the County and City of Thornton to work with the public to better define and analyze issues, alternatives, and solutions related to the pipeline proposal. At the end of the Working Group process, the facilitator will share a summary of the deliberations and conclusions of the Working Group and other public input with the Commissioners to assist with decision making related to the Thornton 1041 application in December.

Larimer County values the diverse perspectives regarding the water and pipeline conveyance issues and aims for the Working Group membership to reflect that diversity of interests. Members are asked to perform the following primary functions:

1. Attend all or most of five scheduled evening meetings including the Sept. 18 kick off (see next page).
2. Review materials in advance and/or between meetings.
3. Represent your organization’s interests to the Working Group and relay information from the group’s dialogue to your organization’s membership regarding other points of view, possible alternatives and mitigation, and evolving solutions.
4. Work constructively to understand the concerns of others in the group and help find ways to address them while treating other members, staff, and applicants with civility and respect.

Larimer County has limited HOA and neighborhood contact information, so if you are not the official representative, we ask that you please find out if your organization is interested in participating and willing to nominate you or another representative. If so, please email or mail the enclosed contact information to me by September 7. If you know other people who would like to participate in future events, we encourage them to monitor a project webpage (to be established by September 10) and sign up for notifications. In the meantime, please let me know if you have any questions.

Kind regards,

Lesli Ellis, AICP CEP
Larimer County Working Group Membership Information

Name: _______________________________

Organization: _______________________

Physical Address: ______________________________

Email Address: ____________________________

Phone: ________________________________

The schedule is not yet fixed, but the list below includes all possible meeting dates. Please indicate the meetings you can commit to attend. Meetings will generally be held the evenings of the following dates (bold face are most likely dates):

- Tuesday, Sept. 18 (kick off)
- Tuesday, Oct. 9
- Wednesday, Oct. 24
- Tuesday, Oct. 30 (alternate date)
- Tuesday, Nov. 13
- Tuesday, Nov. 27 (alternate date, if needed)
- Wednesday, Nov. 28 (if needed)

(optional information) What is your primary interest or concern related to the project:
Via email

Aug. 24, 2018

Re: Invitation to Participate in Larimer County Water Projects Working Group

To ___,

Larimer County would like to invite you to participate in a Working Group of approximately 25 interested stakeholders to work with the County, City of Thornton, and Northern Water through an independent facilitator to review and give feedback on proposed water conveyance alternatives associated with the City of Thornton Water Project 1041 permit application.

At a hearing on August 1, 2018, the Board of County Commissioners tabled the Thornton pipeline 1041 application decision until December 17, 2018 to allow the County and City of Thornton to work with the public to better define and analyze issues, alternatives, and solutions related to the pipeline proposal. At the end of the Working Group process, the facilitator will share a summary of the deliberations and conclusions of the Working Group and other public input with the Commissioners to assist with decision making related to the Thornton 1041 application in December.

Larimer County values the diverse perspectives regarding the water and pipeline conveyance issues and aims for the Working Group membership to reflect that diversity of interests. Members are asked to perform the following primary functions:

1. Attend all or most of five scheduled evening meetings including the kick off on Sept. 18 (see the next page for the other dates).
2. Review materials in advance and/or between meetings.
3. Represent your organization’s interests to the Working Group and relay information from the Working Group’s dialogue to your organization’s membership regarding other points of view, possible alternatives and mitigation, and evolving solutions.
4. Work constructively to understand the concerns of others in the group and help find ways to address them while treating other members, staff, and applicants with civility and respect.

If you are willing to participate in the Working Group process, please email or mail the enclosed contact information to me by September 7. If you know other people who are interested in this project, we encourage them to attend upcoming public events and monitor a process webpage (available by September 10) and sign up for notifications. In the meantime, please let me know if you have questions.

Sincerely,

Lesli Ellis, AICP CEP
Larimer County Working Group Membership Information

Name: ______________________________

Organization: ____________________

Physical Address: ______________________________

Email Address: _________________________

Phone: _______________________

The schedule is not yet fixed, but the list below includes all possible meeting dates. Please indicate the meetings you can commit to attend. Meetings will generally be held the evenings of the following dates (bold face are most likely dates):

- Tuesday, Sept. 18 (kick off)
- Tuesday, Oct. 9
- Wednesday, Oct. 24
- Tuesday, Oct. 30 (alternate date)
- Tuesday, Nov. 13
- Tuesday, Nov. 27 (alternate date, if needed)
- Wednesday, Nov. 28 (if needed)

(optional information) What is your primary interest or concern related to the project:
Aug. 24, 2018

Re: Invitation to Participate in Larimer County Water Projects Working Group

To (Organization)

Larimer County would like to invite you or a representative of your organization to participate in a Working Group of approximately 25 interested stakeholders to work with the County, City of Thornton, and Northern Water through an independent facilitator to review and give feedback on proposed water conveyance alternatives associated with the City of Thornton Water Project 1041 permit application.

At a hearing on August 1, 2018, the Board of County Commissioners tabled the Thornton pipeline 1041 application decision until December 17, 2018 to allow the County and City of Thornton to work with the public to better define and analyze issues, alternatives, and solutions related to the pipeline proposal. At the end of the Working Group process, the facilitator will share a summary of the deliberations and conclusions of the Working Group and other public input with the Commissioners to assist with decision making related to the Thornton 1041 application in December.

Larimer County values the diverse perspectives regarding the water and pipeline conveyance issues and aims for the Working Group membership to reflect that diversity of interests. Members are asked to perform the following primary functions:

1. Attend all or most of five scheduled evening meetings including the kick off on Sept. 18 (see the next page for the other dates).
2. Review materials in advance and/or between meetings.
3. Represent your organization’s interests to the Working Group and relay information from the Working Group’s dialogue to your organization’s membership regarding other points of view, possible alternatives and mitigation, and evolving solutions.
4. Work constructively to understand the concerns of others in the group and help find ways to address them while treating other members, staff, and applicants with civility and respect.

If your organization is interested and willing to send a representative to participate in the Working Group process, please email or mail the enclosed contact information to me by September 7. If you know other people who are interested in this project, we encourage them to attend upcoming public events and monitor a process webpage that also will be available by September 10. In the meantime, please let me know if you have questions.

Sincerely,

Lesli Ellis, AICP CEP
Larimer County Working Group Membership Information

Name: ________________________________

Organization: _______________________

Physical Address: ______________________________

Email Address: ___________________________

Phone: _______________________

The schedule is not yet fixed, but the list below includes all possible meeting dates. Please indicate the meetings you can commit to attend. Meetings will generally be held the evenings of the following dates (bold face are most likely dates):

- **Tuesday, Sept. 18** (kick off)
- **Tuesday, Oct. 9**
- **Wednesday, Oct. 24**
- **Tuesday, Oct. 30** (alternate date)
- **Tuesday, Nov. 13**
- **Tuesday, Nov. 27** (alternate date, if needed)
- **Wednesday, Nov. 28** (if needed)

(optional information) What is your primary interest or concern related to the project:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First Name</th>
<th>Last Name</th>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Alternate (if any)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Scott</td>
<td>Ballstadt</td>
<td>Town of Windsor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dick</td>
<td>Brauch</td>
<td>At Large Property Owner</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Janet</td>
<td>Carabello</td>
<td>Hearthfire</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pat</td>
<td>Crotzer</td>
<td>County Road 56 Area</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ryan</td>
<td>Donovan</td>
<td>At Large</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donnie</td>
<td>Dustin</td>
<td>City of Fort Collins</td>
<td>John Stokes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clint</td>
<td>Hanna</td>
<td>North Shields Area</td>
<td>Michael Birchette</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dennis</td>
<td>Harmon</td>
<td>Ditch Company, Water Supply and Storage</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark</td>
<td>Heiden</td>
<td>Eagle Lake HOA</td>
<td>Jim Rios</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Penny</td>
<td>Hillman</td>
<td>At Large</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chuck</td>
<td>Hull</td>
<td>Terry Point Townhomes HOA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bob</td>
<td>Kitchell</td>
<td>Hwy. 1 Area / Douglas Road</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christine</td>
<td>Kratt</td>
<td>S Bar G Representation</td>
<td>Scott Glick</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warren</td>
<td>Lemerich</td>
<td>Starlite Drive</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ron</td>
<td>Linkenheil</td>
<td>Lochland Park</td>
<td>Priscilla Siano</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jim</td>
<td>McCauley</td>
<td>Terry Shores</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bobbi</td>
<td>Norman</td>
<td>Woody Creek HOA</td>
<td>Isaac Lewis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jerry</td>
<td>Pault</td>
<td>The Hill Community and Cobb Lake Preservation and Recreation Association</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jason</td>
<td>Roudebush</td>
<td>Braidwood</td>
<td>Erik Nelson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mike</td>
<td>Scheid</td>
<td>East Larimer County (ELCO) Water District</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greg</td>
<td>Schreiner</td>
<td>Agricultural Advisory Board</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bill</td>
<td>Spencer</td>
<td>Terry Acres HOA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charmaine</td>
<td>Stavedahl</td>
<td>No Pipe Dream</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don</td>
<td>Taranto</td>
<td>Town of Timnath</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Devin</td>
<td>Traff</td>
<td>Weld County Government</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ed</td>
<td>Vojensky</td>
<td>Terry Cove HOA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karen</td>
<td>Wagner</td>
<td>At Large</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gary</td>
<td>Wockner</td>
<td>Save the Poudre</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Invited organizations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country Club Road</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coalition for the Poudre River Watershed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Notes about this document:

- This is a summary of the meeting only. It is not a comprehensive list of all of the statements made during the meeting.
- Inclusion in this document is not an endorsement of the truth or accuracy of the statements made during this meeting.
- In the interest of brevity, some statements have been combined into one or two sentences. Some nuance may have been lost in the process. This was unintentional.
- Any mistakes in summarizing the meeting were unintentional and do not negate the value or impact of the statements made during the meeting.

ATTENDANCE


Larimer County staff: Todd Blomstrom, Lesli Ellis, Rob Helmick, Linda Hoffman, Mark Peterson

Facilitation: Heather Bergman, Dan Myers

Observers:
City of Thornton: Joanne Herlihy, Emily Hunt, Mark Koleber, Gerald Simpson

Northern Water: Stephanie Cecil, Christie Coleman

Public Observers: 14 members of the public observed the meeting.

ACTION ITEMS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lesli Ellis</th>
<th>Post a link to Section 14 of the Larimer County Land Use Code on the project website.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Peak Facilitation</td>
<td>- Send Peak Facilitation contact information to Working Group members.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Finalize the Working Group Protocols and post them on the project website.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Provide a list of group interests for the next meeting.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

AGREEING ON THE RULES OF ENGAGEMENT

Heather Bergman of Peak Facilitation Group led the group in a discussion on the “rules of engagement” that will govern the Larimer County Water Projects Working Group during its deliberations. The Working Group discussed several components of the Protocols; those
discussions are summarized below. (Note: The “Protocols” document is attached to this summary for reference and complete details.)

**Working Group Purpose**
The Working Group will focus on two water supply conveyance projects, the Thornton Water Project and the Northern Integrated Supply Project (NISP), both of which are proposed in Larimer County. The Working Group will develop shared understanding, identify interests, identify ways to maximize community and minimize or mitigate negative impacts, evaluate ideas against the interests, and submit a report to the County Commissioners in December. The report will summarize the group’s thoughts on the ideas and issues related to these two water projects and tell the Commissioners what the group’s best ideas to maximize community benefits and minimize or mitigate negative impacts are (without voting on them). The group does not have to agree on all these ideas; the report can explain that some group members think in one way and others in another about a given topic. Peak Facilitation Group will write the report and share it with the Working Group for editing and review. The group will submit the report with one voice (although that one voice may say that the group disagrees).

**Clarifying Questions and Answers**
*How can the Working Group accomplish all its tasks in time for the Thornton Water Project’s 1041 permit application hearing on December 17? Group members spent a year trying to understand the Thornton Water Project and are now being asked to consider the hugely complex NISP. What is the connection between NISP and the Thornton Water Project?*

The facilitator shares these concerns. The project team aims to keep the project’s scope as manageable as possible, which should help with time constraint issues. The Working Group will work hard to finish its work by December 17, but if it needs more time, the group may be able to ask the County to give the group an extension if the work is almost complete. However, the Working Group should proceed with the intention of completing its work by December.

*This Working Group was convened to discuss the Thornton Water Project. Why is NISP included? (Note: Discussion on the inclusion of NISP in the Working Group’s purview is captured below.)*

**Working Group Membership and Substitutes**
The Working Group benefits from the diversity of its members and represents key perspectives on the water projects. However, the Working Group is discouraged from "counting heads" of the precise number of representatives from each interest group, as no voting will occur. Rather, the important issue is to determine if there are other interests or perspectives that are not captured by or included in the current membership.

Each group member is responsible for attending at least four of the five Working Group meetings. If a group member expects to miss more than one meeting, they should let the facilitator or Larimer County project manager know. Group members may send an alternate if they miss a meeting, but they are responsible for ensuring that that person is caught up on the Working Group’s proceedings. Group members who are not comfortable with bringing their alternates up to speed can ask their alternates to call the facilitator for a summary of what they have missed.

**Clarifying Questions and Answers**
*How can group members bring their constituents up to speed after each meeting?*

Group members can inform their constituents via verbal reports and their own notes. They should not speak to what others thought or felt during the meeting. They should also wait to share the finalized summary with their constituents rather than circulate drafts of the summary.
There are 29 group members and only one representing the Poudre River. That may not be reasonable. There may be other members of the Working Group who share the interest of protecting the Poudre River. This perspective may be well represented after all.

(Note: The Working Group agreed not to share their contact information with one another at this juncture. Peak Facilitation and Larimer County have that contact information and can connect group members as needed.)

Project Proponent and County Role
The County, project proponents, and the facilitator discussed the appropriate role for the project proponents (the City of Thornton and Northern Water) and County staff in Working Group meetings. They decided that the project proponents and the County staff will attend these meetings so that Working Group members can ask them questions, request documents or presentations about technical subjects or the project process, or provide them with suggestions. Working Group members can draw on the entities’ knowledge and experience to assist them in finding ways to maximize community benefits and mitigate impacts from the water projects. County staff and project proponents are not members of the Working Group, but they will be expected to follow the same Protocols as Working Group members.

Clarifying Questions and Answers
What if the Working Group wants to hear from people other than County staff and project proponents?
The Working Group can agree to invite other speakers to come present or discuss with them at future meetings. County staff can help coordinate this.

Subcommittees and Task Groups
The Working Group can decide to create subcommittees or task groups to accomplish certain tasks. The Working Group will create any subcommittee or task group publicly and transparently, and those groups will not have the authority to make any decisions on behalf of the Working Group. The Working Group will decide what it will do with the information provided by subgroups.

Working Group Meeting Ground Rules
The facilitator reviewed the Working Group Ground Rules outlined in the Protocols document. The purpose of the Ground Rules is to ensure that meetings are productive and civil. If a group member violates the ground rules consistently, the facilitator will speak with them privately. If a Working Group member continues to violate the ground rules and disrupt the ability of the Working Group to do its work, the facilitator may remove that person from the Working Group. However, the facilitator would not do that lightly.

Facilitation Team Responsibilities
The facilitator summarized the key responsibilities of her team. The facilitation team is primarily focused on the fair and equal treatment of all Working Group members, keeping meetings effective and constructive, and documenting Working Group discussions.

Public Meetings and Public Notice
Working Group meetings are public. All agendas, summaries (once approved by the Working Group), and meeting materials will be posted at www.larimerwaterprojects.org. Agendas will be posted one week before each meeting. Final meeting summaries will be posted within three weeks of each meeting.
**Public Engagement**
There will be no verbal public comment during Working Group meetings, but observers may submit written comments on cards provided during each meeting. These comments will be included at the end of each meeting summary.

**Documentation**
The facilitation team will prepare draft summaries of all meetings. Working Group members will send suggestions for revision within a week of receiving the draft summaries and will not share draft meeting summaries outside of the group. Final meeting summaries will be marked as such and can be distributed.

**Media**
Working Group members are free to speak to the media, but they may not claim to speak on behalf of the Working Group or other Working Group members. No individual may speak for the Working Group unless the group decides to authorize someone to do so. The facilitator will not speak to the media or engage in social media regarding this process. Larimer County staff will provide brief updates to the Larimer County Commissioners and/or Planning Commission on the status of the process.

**UNDERSTANDING THE ISSUES**
Linda Hoffman, Larimer County Manager, addressed the Working Group on behalf of the County. Hoffman thanked Working Group participants, County staff, and the project proponents for taking part in this process and seeking solutions to this issue. The Commissioners look forward to reviewing the group’s ideas and are grateful that this creative, solution-oriented group is working to find new ways forward.

Lesli Ellis, Larimer County Director of Community Development, will manage the process so that Working Group members get the information they need to complete their assigned tasks. She provided a brief overview of the project process so far.

- For the past year and a half or so, the City of Thornton has been developing an application for a 1041 permit with Larimer County. The permit would allow Thornton to build a pipeline, pumping facility, and storage facility to move water that the City owns at Water Supply Storage Company (WSSC) Reservoir #4 to Thornton itself.
- In June, the Larimer County Planning Commission recommended that the County Commissioners deny Thornton’s application.
- The County Commissioners considered the application at a July meeting and, at an August 1 hearing, voted to table the application until December 17.
- At the August 1 hearing, the County Commissioners asked County staff to design a process for including the community in the development of the project to maximize community benefits and minimize, mitigate, or eliminate any negative impacts. The minutes from that hearing can be found here (two-thirds of the way down the page): https://apps.larimer.org/bcc/bccmin/BC180730.htm
- The pipeline would cover 26 miles in unincorporated Larimer County and pass through the towns of Timnath, Johnstown, and Windsor. The main area of focus for the Commissioners and Working Group is the water conveyance alignments generally north of Fort Collins and to the county line. Alternative project alignments are also of interest to the Commissioners. The County designed the Working Group process with these issues in mind.
- The 1041 permitting process is outlined in Section 14 of the Larimer County Land Use Code. These regulations address the applicability of a 1041 permit as a matter of “statewide interest.”
The County will post a link to those regulations on the project website. The Working Group will not spend time discussing those regulations tonight but can revisit them at future meetings if members would like to do so. These regulations are available on the County's website at: https://library.municode.com/co/larimer_county/codes/code_of_ordinances?nodeId=PTIILAU SCO_14.0ARACSTIN

- Section 14 provides 12 criteria for the Commissioners to use in considering the merits of a 1041 application.
- Northern Water would like to move forward with the NISP project in Larimer County via an intergovernmental agreement (IGA) guided by the 1041 regulations. Under an IGA, an entity can work with the County to follow the requirements of a 1041 application. However, an IGA request will still be considered by the Planning Commission and the County Commissioners and will be subject to public input, as is the case within the 1041 permitting process.
- There is overlap between the water conveyance alignments and issues for the Thornton Water Project and NISP, so County staff saw benefit in asking the Working Group to discuss alignment issues related to both projects (not other issues).
- As maps that will be made available at the next meeting will show, there is overlap between the potential northern (along County Road 56) and southern (along Douglas Road) alignment of the pipelines proposed by both projects. Both projects have also considered alternative water conveyances in the past and are surrounded by questions and ideas concerning leaving water in or taking water from the Poudre River.
- County staff do not envision the Working Group addressing new reservoir construction, recreation opportunities, or other related issues. Other public processes in Larimer County will touch on those issues.
- In conjunction with the Working Group process, there will be two public meetings about the water projects in October and November.
- County staff have issued press releases and shared information to notify the public that these meetings are open for them to come and observe. There will be other opportunities for public engagement as the process unfolds. Working Group members are encouraged to help get the word out about these meetings and other opportunities for public input.
- The project website will serve as a clearinghouse for information about project process events and related topics. County staff encourage Working Group members to keep up with the website and share it with community members as a resource.

**Group Discussion**

Group members discussed the County's briefing on the issues and project process. Thoughts and suggestions that emerged during this discussion are summarized below.

**IGA/1041: Working Group Member Perspectives**

- Save the Poudre strongly disagrees with the County about the NISP project proceeding through an IGA. Save the Poudre thinks that Northern Water should use the same 1041 permitting process that Thornton is using. Save the Poudre has testified in front of the County Commissioners to that effect and has sent them a strongly worded legal letter. In the interest of avoiding surprises (as requested in the Ground Rules), Save the Poudre wants the Working Group to be aware that this issue could escalate.
- If the NISP process proceeds under an IGA, the County will have less ability to ensure that Larimer County benefits from the 1041 process than it would under the 1041 process.
- The residents of Starlite Lane are opposed to Northern Water being allowed to use an IGA. Northern Water should use the 1041 process like Thornton.
**IGA/1041: Clarifying Questions and Answers**

Did Northern Water want to use an IGA or did the County recommend that they do that? Northern Water indicated to the County that that was their preference.

*We have heard about the differences between an IGA (which Northern Water wants to pursue) and a 1041 (which Thornton is using). Why did they use different processes? Who made that decision? What are the benefits of each process?*

The Working Group will discuss this at its next meeting because the subject deserves a more detailed answer than County staff had time to provide tonight.

*If the Working Group has suggestions that apply to either or both of the IGA and 1041, does the process that is ultimately selected effect how the County considers those suggestions?*

No. Working Group members should put their suggestions in the report as they develop them. The County can filter them by the applicable process if necessary.

**Inclusion of NISP in the Process: Working Group Member Perspectives**

- **Save the Poudre** strongly disagrees with how County staff characterized NISP in their overview of the issues. The overview was inaccurate in describing the overlap of the two water projects and the Poudre River.
- **Including NISP in the Working Group project complicates what the group was convened to do.**
- **County staff mentioned areas of overlap between the two projects in the 1041 application submitted to the County Commissioners, but not with NISP and the Thornton Water Project in general.** There are questions about how much is known about the overlap between the two projects. If the areas of overlap between the two projects are known, they should be documented and submitted to the Working Group so that the group can restrict any discussion of NISP to those defined items alone.
- **Some group members want more information about Northern Water’s proposed project timeline for NISP.**
- **The City of Thornton linked the two projects in its 1041 application.** The application used the possibility of the NISP and Thornton pipelines running down Douglas Road together to increase the favorability score that Thornton assigned to that route.
- **The Working Group has a lot of work to do in a short amount of time.** The County is diluting the focus of this group by asking it to analyze NISP in addition to the Thornton Water Project. Working Group members have learned a lot about the Thornton Water Project over the past year and a half, but many do not know much about NISP even if they are generally well-informed. While it is understandable that the Commissioners want to make this process more efficient by asking the Working Group to discuss both projects, it is a mistake to spend time on the hypotheticals surrounding NISP. If the Working Group’s report on the Thornton Water Project is focused and high-quality, the Commissioners can apply those conclusions to NISP themselves.
- **County staff do not expect the Working Group to solve all the issues surrounding NISP and the reservoirs, but it is helpful to know that there are two entities considering similar conveyance options in similar geographic areas.**
- **An advantage to the Working Group considering NISP conveyance alignments is that Thornton’s 1041 application can serve as a precedent for NISP (for example, if the County permits a pipeline for the former it is likely to do so for the latter).** The impact of the County’s permitting decisions will have long-lasting effects, so it is worth examining the projects holistically.
- **The proposed NISP route (and the original Thornton Water Project route) runs directly between houses and across roads within the Eagle Lake subdivision, the Lochland Park**
neighborhood, and potentially east to the Woody Creek neighborhood. The conveyances that both projects consider will be similar because of the proximity of their geographic starting points (meaning that they will probably run north of Fort Collins and Terry Lake). The County should explain what criteria it will use to evaluate routes because the precedent set for the first project will impact the second. The County should also state that they will follow the criteria established for the first project when deciding on the second.

- Group members proposed that Northern Water or another group present for 10-15 minutes to the Working Group about where they believe there is overlap between the two projects so that the Working Group can decide if the overlap is sufficient for the Working Group to make recommendations on NISP.
- The Working Group could create a subgroup to discuss the relevance (or lack thereof) of NISP to Working Group meetings. The subgroup could also inform the Working Group of NISP's impact on the Thornton Water Project.
- Some group members were concerned that Northern Water would be biased in its presentation and proposed that Gary Wockner of Save the Poudre also present to provide a balancing perspective. Alternatively, an independent third-party such as a water lawyer could present instead of Northern Water, Wockner, or any other group member.
- Northern Water could present about the pipeline alignments discussed in its EIS, rather than presenting on the technical or legal assumptions it has made for NISP. The EIS information would be less subjective.

Inclusion of NISP in the Process: Clarifying Questions and Answers

Have Thornton and Northern Water been coordinating on these projects?

The project proponents and County staff are working in parallel with the Working Group. That team will work with the project applicants to answer Working Group questions and concerns and bring that information back to the group. Some of the Working Group’s interests may apply to both water projects, but not all of them will. If NISP is not applicable to the interests of the Working Group, the December report can focus on ideas that apply to the Thornton Water Project alone. It is, however, important that the Working Group examine how NISP does or does not fit in with the Thornton Water Project before making those decisions.

Are the areas of overlap between the two projects known or yet to be determined? Some group members question whether overlap between the two projects extended beyond pipeline location and whether that overlap will exist only if the water flowed via pipeline.

County staff are not referring to overlap in the project processes per se. However, one of NISP’s two pipeline route alternative is also in Thornton’s 1041 application. During the August 1 hearing, the public raised concerns about the feasibility of fitting both pipelines within the same route. That is a question that the Working Group needs to answer before submitting its report to the Commissioners. Thornton also considered a northern route that closely coincides with NISP’s second alternative route. Additionally, there is overlap between the river issues facing the two projects. As Thornton proceeded with its 1041 application and Northern Water worked on the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for NISP, Larimer County staff were concerned about the possibility of completing the 1041 process for Thornton only to begin the process again for NISP shortly afterward. That is why the County thinks it is important to examine the two projects holistically (while focusing on potential pipeline alignments between Shields Street and Turnberry Road north, where both projects have proposed pipelines routes). Not doing so would not be transparent or meet the County’s obligations.
At the August 1 hearing, the Commissioners specifically stated that they wanted Thornton to examine the possibility of sending water down the Poudre River rather than building a pipeline, regardless of cost and water quality differences. If that is an option, why discuss a separate pipeline for NISP? Pipeline alignments are not the only water conveyance method under consideration. However, there are still commonalities between both projects and their options in conveying water through pipelines or the river.

Project Process and Information Options: Working Group Member Perspectives

- The Working Group could request a report on water conveyance options and the advantages and disadvantages of each. County staff could work with applicants to create such a report.
- Group members requested that the County provide more information at the next meeting about the possibility of using ditches rather than pipelines to convey water.
- During the Thornton Water Project’s 1041 process, County staff said many things that were not true. Tonight, County staff said that they would take input back to staff or the project proponents and bring information from the proponents back to the group. However, that information might be biased. A third-party science advisory team should provide that information rather than Working Group members or observers.
- FHU Engineering is working for the County to provide a third-party opinion on the traffic information that the project proponents submit to the Working Group. The County has also hired a firm to provide input on project constructability issues. If the Working Group questions information submitted by the project proponents, other consultants can be brought in to assess the information and present their findings (which the group may also dispute) to the Working Group.

Project Process and Information Options: Clarifying Questions and Answers

What will the City of Thornton do create a significantly different application while the Working Group is meeting? Will the City incorporate the Working Group’s input in its application before the Commissioners see it?

If the Working Group develops a solid plan that diverges with Thornton’s application, the County will work with its attorney to figure something out with the application process. The Working Group is free to investigate whatever it wants to, regardless of Thornton’s application details and preferences.

Other Comments: Working Group Member Perspectives

- During the August 1 hearing, the Commissioners said that the City of Thornton needed to present alternatives that better meet the 12 criteria found in Section 14 of the Land Use Code. Instead of discussing the Douglas Road route, the Working Group should focus on alternatives that best meet the needs of Larimer County.
- Although numerous ditch companies operate in northern Larimer County, there is only one ditch company represented at tonight’s meeting. Ditch companies have easements and water rights that could apply to these projects. The County should get ditch companies involved in this process to a greater degree.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

Peak Facilitation developed a summary of public comments received by the County on the Thornton Water Project. This document was provided to the Working Group and is attached here. Working Group members were encouraged to take the public comment summary home and read it and come to the next meeting prepared to identify any interests from the public comments that are not reflected in the group’s interest list (see below).
LEARNING ABOUT THE INTERESTS IN THE ROOM
The facilitator described the difference between interests and positions, and group members shared their own interests related to the two water projects. A handout shared during the meeting on interests versus positions is attached to this summary.

**Interests vs. Positions**
- Buying a car is an example of position-based negotiation. When someone buys a car, the buyer wants to get the car they want at the lowest price possible, and the seller wants to sell the car for the highest price possible. Each party knows what they want and negotiates until both can reach a price they can accept.
- Imagine two children who want the same orange. In position-based negotiation, the children’s parent would cut the orange in half and provide a half to each child (which is better than nothing but is only half of what each child wants).
- Imagine instead that the parent asks each child why they want the orange. One child is thirsty and wants the orange’s juice. The other is in a baking class in school and wants to use the orange’s zest for a new recipe. Now that the parent understands each child’s “why,” she can give one child all of the peel and one child all of the juice. This scenario illustrates that simply dividing something is not as effective as discussing the interests underlying why someone wants that thing.
- Interest-based negotiation will be the focus of this Working Group. Positions are specific demands (e.g., the pipeline should go here or go there or not be built) that often provide only two choices or divide a "pie" of resources to create winners or losers. Under the position-based model, people try to maximize their gains and only consider how to improve outcomes for themselves and their constituents.
- Someone can know if something is a position or an interest by asking themselves if there is more than one way to get what they want. If there is one way, it is probably a position. If there are multiple ways, it is probably an interest.
- The facilitator asked the Working Group participants to think about what their positions and interests were concerning the Thornton Water Project and/or NISP.

**Group Member Interests**
Members of the Working Group identified the following interests:

- Minimize the use of private lands for these projects.
- Minimize or eliminate construction impacts to Larimer County road users and residents.
- Minimize overall impacts on neighborhoods (including construction).
- Maintain the overall quality of life.
- Use objective, fact-based criteria to determine the conveyance route.
- Protect property values.
- Avoid creating significant adverse effects on public health and safety (including those created by rattlesnakes).
- Use the shortest pipeline possible to get the water out of Larimer County.
- Protect habitat and wildlife, including special designation areas that protect and support them.
- Minimize traffic disruptions.
- Ensure that WSSC users and shareholders can receive the quality and quantity of water that they have historically.
Provide a recommendation to the County Commissioners that maximizes benefits for Larimer County and its citizens, minimizes or mitigates negative impacts, respects the environment and Poudre River, and sets the standard for how counties should conduct the 1041 process.

Help the City of Thornton find an alternative conveyance route that addresses the interests listed so far, particularly the health of the Poudre River.

Prioritize the future water supply via river health.

Determine if leaving water in the Poudre River is feasible or not.

Maintain the current feel of the community and better understand what the community values.

Protect and restore the Poudre River.

Protect reservoirs near northern Larimer County neighborhoods.

Ensure that information about the project is accurate.

Prioritize, respect, and preserve the rights of Larimer County citizens, not those of those outside of Larimer County.

Assess the impacts of the project on Windsor residents.

Do no harm and ensure that any project provides benefits to Larimer County.

Be a good neighbor to the City of Thornton.

Find a solution in 2018.

Find a solution that makes sense within current conditions, not past conditions.

Find a win-win for Larimer County and the City of Thornton.

Protect agriculture and personally-owned farms.

Maintain the current aesthetics of the construction area (tree type, size, ground cover, etc.).

The group will revisit this list of interests at their second meeting to determine if anything is missing. Once the list of interests is complete, they will use the list of interests to evaluate ideas for ways to maximize community benefits and minimize or mitigate negative impacts of the two water conveyance projects.

INFORMATION NEEDS

Group members discussed their information needs for future meetings.

Questions that the Working Group would like to have answered include:

- Does Thornton’s ownership of this water give them a presumed or actual right to remove it from Larimer County? The County will provide that information at a future meeting.
- How does the WSSC system work?
- How would constructing a pipeline along a roadway affect traffic in Larimer County (including along Douglas Road and County Road 56)?
- How heavy is the current traffic along Douglas Road? Are the traffic counters that residents have seen along road corridors measuring this?
- What will the actual impact on reservoir levels be if the water was run down the Poudre River?
- Could the County keep the reservoirs full by selling or giving the reservoir space to another municipality?
- What potentially relevant water technology is on the horizon?
- What is the process for changing the diversion point from WSSC Reservoir #4? How long would that take? Is it possible?
- What are the facts about the quality and quantity changes to Thornton’s water if it were to be run down the river rather than through a pipeline?
- Can an independent speaker like a water attorney explain how water law works in Northern Colorado and the North Poudre system?
What are the potential impacts of water shrinkage on down-ditch and downstream water users?
What is the potential for using existing infrastructure and public land for water conveyance?
Could Larimer County and/or Fort Collins help the City of Thornton use the Poudre River alternative by helping to improve the river’s water quality?
What are Thornton’s reasons that the water cannot flow down the Poudre?
Have any existing studies done a comparative analysis of route options?
Does the river’s water quality vary over time? Are there better or worse times of year to draw water from the river?
Could two pipelines be legally and feasibly placed under Douglas Road? Is there a parallel path for NISP? How many pipelines could safely fit under the road?
What other pipelines currently run under Douglas Road? There is concern about Prospect Energy’s oil pipeline under Douglas Road.
What is the precise overlap between NISP and the Thornton Water Project?
What are the differences between an IGA and the 1041 process? Why did each applicant select the process that they did? What does the County believe to be the advantages and disadvantages of each process?
Is it feasible to use ditches rather than pipelines to convey the water to Thornton?
Could the County hire a water conveyance expert to pull all data together and outline a way in which water could be moved to Thornton under the Poudre River Concept?
What are the federal 404 permit requirements for taking the water out of the Poudre River?

- The WSCC could present on its entire system.
- The Working Group could hire someone and ask them what is feasible if a building a pipeline is not an option.
- No Pipe Dream hired a hydrologist to report on the quality of the river's water at Reservoir #4 and downtown Fort Collins. The hydrologist found that the quality was the same at both locations. No Pipe Dream could provide the report to the group if this information is useful.
- At a minimum, the next meeting should feature maps of the two NISP alternative pipelines.

**NEXT STEPS**
- County staff will provide a page on the project website for participants to post information, such as maps, studies, etc.
- Before the next meeting, Peak will circulate a draft of this summary. Group members will have one week to make comments on that draft before it is finalized. Peak Facilitation will provide a final summary of this meeting before the next meeting.
- The next meeting will be on October 9 and will focus on some of the information needs outlined above. County staff and the facilitator will review the information requested and determine what to provide at the next meeting based on the information that is available and critical to the group’s understanding of the projects and issues outlined above.
- If group members have any questions, they should contact Heather Bergman or Lesli Ellis.

---

**Public Comment Card Input**

Observers at the meeting had the opportunity to provide comments or questions on cards. Submitted questions and comments are included below, transcribed verbatim from comment cards.
Answers to questions are provided below; answers were provided by County staff, in consultation with project proponents were needed.

**Public Comment Card Comments**

- I would like to encourage a higher level of diversity across the working group, specifically gender and race/ethnicity that is more representative of the City/County.
- NISP should NOT be in this discussion. The topic is too broad (not enough time).
- Other ditch companies must be part of the group.
- I suggest that the Working Group divide the effort into three areas, list what it would take to achieve each, and then compare:
  - Northern routes for pipelines (including NISP).
  - Douglas Road route for Thornton pipeline alone, NISP alone, or both.
  - Non-pipeline approaches (i.e., Poudre River and canal system).
- I heard on the radio that the Federal EPA might be RELAXING the Federal requirements for permits so State and local governments can do it. This EPA action might take place within 30-60 DAYS, thus ADDRESSING Thornton’s desire to avoid a Federal permit for a surface pipeline (submerged) lake tap.
- I believe EVERY MEMBER of the working group to travel along each proposed route (reservoirs #1-4, Douglas Road, and the Poudre River). Seeing things in person is “eye-opening” and very helpful in the decision-making process.
- The Working Group should be to provide with recommendations for what elements of NISP are important or desirable for the Working Group to consider. This is a task for the County. Without clear boundaries, NISP topics will become the black hole that drains the Working Group of constructive energy and puts the Working Group at risk of failure.
- Information needs:
  - Potential economic/financial implications for the City of Fort Collins flowing Thornton’s water in the Poudre through Fort Collins.
  - Other parties who might participate in water swaps that might provide for Thornton’s needs without using the Poudre water as currently proposed.

**Public Comment Card Questions**

- During the Commissioner meeting, the public expressed concerns regarding the potential health impacts of the project. Is the Built Environment team from the Health Department involved in the discussion? If not, are there other members from the public/community health area of expertise who are working with the County?
  - Answer from Larimer County staff: Yes, the Development Services team includes staff from the Health Department (Lea Schneider) and a member of the Built Environment Team (Jenn Cram).
- Todd [Blomstrom] referenced a technical group that has been formed. Will the individuals who are part of that group be publicly identified?
  - Answer from Larimer County staff: Todd Blomstrom likely referenced obtaining extra technical consultants and services (rather than a group). We have hired additional technical expertise to look at traffic impacts for instance.
- Ditches—why aren’t existing ditches included as part of the solution?
  - Answer from the City of Thornton: It is possible that facilities within existing ditch and reservoir systems, in addition to the Water Supply and Storage Company facilities, could be used. However, like Water Supply and Storage Company, these ditch systems are owned by private ditch companies, and the facilities serve to deliver water to the ditch companies’ shareholders. Thornton is not a shareholder in these systems, and Thornton
does not have permission to use or modify those systems. These systems would not always be available for Thornton’s use due to capacity and operational limitations [i.e., we couldn’t add water to an already full ditch or reservoir, structure capacities might not be sufficient to carry Thornton’s water, and 24/7/365 operations (as required for municipal water supplies) would not be feasible for most systems, particularly in the winter].

- Is there a northern route (like Thornton’s “West One”) which runs along the west edge of Eagle Lake subdivision (east edge of Reservoir #4) such that it would NOT run through Eagle Lake subdivision?
  
  o Answer from the City of Thornton: Yes, there is. Such a route would necessitate construction across private lots that abut the east side of WSSC reservoir #4, and as such might also be considered as running “through” the Eagle Lake subdivision.

- Are there feasible “lake taps” besides tunnels under the reservoirs such as surface pipes down into the reservoir?
  
  o Answer from City of Thornton: Water from the reservoir needs to flow by gravity to the pumps, and surface pipes down into the reservoir wouldn’t allow that to happen.

- Have the lake taps for the route known as West One been reported on by a qualified consulting engineering company, both tunnel lake taps under the reservoirs AND pipe lake taps into the reservoir. If not, can such a study be commissioned now?
  
  o Answer from the City of Thornton: Thornton’s engineering firm is preparing a report on lake tap technology that will be peer-reviewed by a qualified consulting engineering company hired by Larimer County.
  
  o Answer from Larimer County staff: Yes, the County has hired an engineer to look at lake taps.

- What is Eagle Lake’s objection to West One?
  
  o Answer from Eagle Lake Homeowners’ Association: Eagle Lake has consistently sought a solution to the Thornton and NISP pipeline routing that utilizes public right of way, Thornton owned land and respect for private property and environmental concerns.

  - West Route 1 does not meet many of those criteria. We do not view the Thornton and NISP pipeline projects as mutually exclusive. They both want the same routing through the area between Douglas Road and the North end of the Eagle Lake subdivision. The conveyance path for both pipelines should be the same so as not to put all of us through this process within a couple of years of each other or the construction of two pipelines within a couple of years of each other. That said, here is how this route does not meet acceptable criteria:

  - 1) NISP has identified only two routes for their pipeline in their EIS application – one through Eagle Lake and one down Douglas Road. They have not said they would cooperate with Thornton Water on alternate conveyances and this does not meet their criteria for acceptable routing for where their pipeline needs to go.

  - 2) Once North of Eagle Lake subdivision, the pipeline turns east and crosses private land all the way past Highway 1 before going down CR 56. That, to us, is an unacceptable alternative when a public right of way is available elsewhere for routing.

  - 3) The WSSC easement land between Reservoir 3 and 8-10 homes in Eagle Lake on Reservoir 3 is extremely narrow. The pipeline may fit on this easement land once built, but resident’s land, fences, and landscaping will be torn up in the construction process to accommodate construction staging and execution.
4) Once North of Eagle Lake, the pipeline crosses wetland areas between Dixon Reservoir and Rocky Ridge Reservoir. This also is unacceptable to us with an alternate public right of way routing possible.
1. Purpose
The purpose of the Larimer Water Projects Working Group is to:

- Create a shared understanding of two water supply conveyance projects proposed in Larimer County: the Thornton Water Project and the Northern Integrated Supply Project
- Identify the interests that the community, the County, and the water providers have regarding these projects
- Explore ways to maximize community benefit and mitigate or minimize negative impacts of these projects
- Evaluate options for maximizing community benefits and minimizing or mitigating negative impacts against the identified interests
- Assess the degree to which different options meet the identified interests overall
- Prepare a report for the Larimer County Commissioners that outlines the results of the deliberations outlined above, including narrative descriptions of Working Group members’ views on the results and the options explored by the Working Group
- Share the report with the Larimer County Commissioners on December 10, 2018.

2. Membership and Substitutes
There are 28 named members of the Working Group. The members of the Working Group will attend at least four of the five scheduled Working Group meetings. If a member of the Working Group cannot attend a single meeting, they may send someone to attend the meeting in their place. It is the Working Group’s responsibility to ensure that their substitute understands what the Working Group has already discussed and what the agenda is for the meeting they are attending. Substitutes may not take the Working Group backward or delay the Group’s progression due to lack of information or insufficient preparation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Representative</th>
<th>Organization/Community</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Greg Schreiner</td>
<td>Agricultural Advisory Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard (Dick) Brauch</td>
<td>At Large Property Owner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Penny Hillman</td>
<td>At Large</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ryan Donovan</td>
<td>At Large</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karen Wagner</td>
<td>At Large</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jason Roudebush</td>
<td>Braidwood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patrick (Pat) Crotzer</td>
<td>County Road 56 Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dennis Harmon</td>
<td>Ditch Company, Water Supply and Storage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark Heiden</td>
<td>Eagle Lake HOA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mike Scheid</td>
<td>East Larimer County (ELCO) Water District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Janet Carabello</td>
<td>Hearthfire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert (Bob) Kitchell</td>
<td>Hwy. 1 Area / Douglas Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ron Linkenheil</td>
<td>Lochland Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charmaine Stavedahl</td>
<td>No Pipe Dream</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clint Hanna</td>
<td>North Shields Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christine Kratt</td>
<td>S Bar G Representation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gary Wockner</td>
<td>Save the Poudre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warren Lemerich</td>
<td>Starlite Drive</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. **Project Proponent and County Role**

   Representatives from Larimer County, the City of Thornton, and Northern Water will participate in the Working Group as informational resources and may be asked to bring, information, ideas, and suggestions to the Working Group at specific meetings. While these representatives are not members of the Working Group, they will be held to the same ground rules and protocols as members of the Working Group.

4. **Subcommittees and Task Groups**

   If desired, the Working Group may develop subcommittees or task groups to do a specific task or assignment on behalf of the full group. Subcommittees and tasks groups have no decision-making authority and will share their work product for the full Working Group to review and discuss.

5. **Working Group Meeting Ground Rules**

   Each member of the Working Group has the following responsibilities:
   - Attend at least four Working Group meetings
   - Notify the facilitator if unable to attend a Working Group meeting
   - Engage in meaningful and productive dialogue
   - Treat all Working Group members, observers, and speakers with respect
   - Avoid destructive language and personal attacks
   - Actively participate
   - Focus on the discussion at hand
   - Avoid side conversations
   - Provide an explanation for all concerns or objections
   - Read materials prior to meetings; come prepared
   - Be or become knowledgeable about the issue at hand
   - Review draft meeting summaries within the timeframe provided
   - Proactively work to keep constituents, colleagues, and managers informed about the work of the group
   - Avoid surprises
   - Characterize his/her own needs, desires, and interests; let others do the same
   - Respect the time of the group; speak briefly and on topic
   - Learn from the past but let it go; work for the future
   - Abide by the ground rules and protocols and allow the facilitator to enforce them

How to respond if Working Group members violate these ground rules or other aspects of the protocols is at the discretion of the facilitator. If multiple violations occur and impede the ability of the
Working Group to have civil and constructive dialogue or to complete its work, a Working Group member may be removed from the Working Group. Removal from the Working Group is a serious action that should not be taken lightly. Working Group members who have concerns about other members' behavior may raise them privately with the facilitator at any time.

6. Facilitation Team Responsibilities

Peak Facilitation Group will facilitate Working Group meetings. The facilitation team is responsible for:

- Facilitating meetings to be on point, productive, and on time
- Enforcing protocols and ground rules
- Equal and fair treatment of all Working Group members, observers, and speakers
- Maintaining confidentiality of any discussions that are requested to be confidential
- Preparing meeting summaries based on non-attribution, except in cases of presentations or other comments made explicitly on behalf of an agency or group
- Making a best effort to incorporate all suggestions for change into draft documents or explaining why suggestions were not incorporated

If Working Group members have concerns about the actions of the facilitation team, they may raise them privately with Lesli Ellis, Director of Community Planning for Larimer County, at any time.

7. Public Meetings and Public Notice

All Working Group meetings are open to the public. The meeting schedule, meeting agendas, and final meeting summaries will be available at www.larimerwaterprojects.org. Agendas will be posted one week prior to each meeting. Final meeting summaries will be posted within 3 weeks of each meeting.

8. Public Engagement

The Working Group will not take verbal comment during meetings, but the facilitator will provide comment cards for public observers at each meeting. All comments provided on these comment cards will be transcribed and included in meeting summaries.

9. Documentation

The facilitation team will be responsible for preparing comprehensive and neutral meeting summaries. Draft meeting summaries will be distributed to Working Group meetings within a week of each meeting; draft meeting summaries are NOT public documents and will NOT be shared outside the Working Group. Working Group members will have one week to suggest revisions to the draft summaries. The facilitation team will work to accommodate summary revisions to the greatest extent possible, consulting with Working Group members if needed to clarify or resolve proposed changes. Final meeting summaries will be distributed to the Working Group and can be shared at members’ discretion with a time limit to be determined by the group.

10. Media and Social Media Interaction

Working Groups may speak to the media or post information on social media about their own perspectives only and may NOT summarize the views or comments of other Working Group members, government entities, or water providers. No one may speak on behalf of the Working Group as a whole. The facilitator will not speak to the media or engage in social media regarding this process. Larimer County staff will provide brief updates to the Larimer County Commissioners and/or Planning Commission on the status of the process.
City of Thornton Water Project: Summary of Public Comment
Prepared by Peak Facilitation Group
September 18, 2018

Notes about this document:

- This is a summary of the public comment only. It is not a comprehensive list of all the comments provided.
- Inclusion in this document is not an endorsement of the truth or accuracy of the comments submitted.
- In the interest of brevity, multiple comments have been combined into one or two sentences. Some nuance may have been lost in the process. This was unintentional.
- The following system was applied while summarizing comments:
  - “There was concern” is used when the commenter(s) stated a concern, a worry, or otherwise expressed apprehension or alarm about an issue or possible outcome.
  - “The was a suggestion” is used when the commenter(s) expressly said “the County should,” “Thornton should,” or otherwise proposed an action.
  - “There were questions” is used when commenter(s) said “I don’t understand” or “it isn’t clear” or otherwise indicated a lack of information or knowledge.
  - “There was disagreement” is used when commenter(s) provided opinions or perspectives on both sides of an issue or point. (Some said, “X is a problem” while others said, “X is not a problem.”)
- Any mistakes in the summarizing of public comments in this document were unintentional and do not negate the value or impact of the comments themselves. The County Commissioners received all of the original comments.

1. Environmental

- There was concern that the project would impact water quality and flow levels downstream.
- There were questions about the County’s efforts to protect land and water resources and the Poudre River in Larimer County in preparation for the impacts of climate change.
- There was concern that the City of Thornton’s past and present growth policies degrade the natural environment.
- There was disagreement about whether the project would help or harm wildlife and the quality of life of property owners near several reservoirs in Larimer County.
- There was concern that vibrations from the pump station would cause the ground to shift and damage the foundations of nearby homes.
- There was concern that the construction of the pipeline would damage or otherwise affect wetlands in the area around Douglas Road.
- There was disagreement as to whether the City of Thornton is improperly taking water that belongs to Fort Collins from the Poudre River.
2. **Traffic and Construction**
   - There was disagreement about whether the construction of the pipeline would destroy trees, fences, and landscaping.
   - There was disagreement as to whether improvement and widening of Douglas Road were going to happen regardless of the pipeline construction.
   - There was disagreement about how much diesel air pollution, noise pollution, and light pollution the pump station would create.
   - There was disagreement about whether Douglas Road is being improved and widened to relieve truck traffic in Fort Collins by using the road as part of a truck route from Highway 287 to I-25.
   - There was concern about the impact of construction on the several neighborhoods along Douglas Road that have only one entrance. Blocking the entrance to these neighborhoods could endanger the lives of residents with health problems and delays could last for years. Hearthfire has been predicted to become one of those neighborhoods during the development of the Water's Edge community. Residential development plans such as Water’s Edge feed into additional access and arterial traffic flow concerns that would seem to challenge the use of Douglas Road as a pipeline route.
   - There were concerns about traffic and bicycling safety along Douglas Road and several ideas for how to improve both.

3. **Legal**
   - There was concern that Douglas Road residents are being denied equal protection and due process under the 14th Amendment of the United States Constitution, particularly because the City of Thornton did not adequately notify or consult them about the project.
   - There were questions about the City of Thornton’s degree of compliance with the intent of a 1041 permit, which typically requires the land use authority (Larimer County) to instruct the applicant (City of Thornton) as to the mitigation measures, siting alternatives, and county benefits that the project must demonstrate to win approval. There was concern that the City of Thornton is attempting to dictate the terms of the application.
   - There was concern that the City of Thornton had improperly omitted several structures (including a pump station and two pipelines) from its 1041 application to the Planning Commission. Additionally, there was concern that the application to the Planning Commission excluded numerous impacts to water quality, noise, pollution, etc.
   - There was concern that the City of Thornton has intentionally segmented its project into smaller projects to deny Larimer County the comprehensive impact assessment guaranteed by the 1041 law.
   - There were statements that the 1041 permit could not be granted if the applicant does not comply with “all applicable criteria.” There were also statements that the City of Thornton has the burden of proof to meet those criteria in a clear and convincing manner.
   - There were statements that the City of Thornton is not bound by Colorado Water Court
to use WSSC Reservoir #4 as the point of diversion.

- There was concern that Larimer County's 1041 regulations are unconstitutionally vague.

4. Project Process

- There were suggestions that if the Planning Commission approved the application, it should do so with the caveat that this was the City of Thornton's only opportunity to receive approval for all aspects of the project, so it will not receive approval for future aspects.

- There were concerns that participation in the meetings including the City of Thornton, project opponents, and/or residents of various neighborhoods was not representative of all stakeholders.

- There was disagreement as to how responsive the City of Thornton and Larimer County have been to public concerns and concerning the degree that they have modified features of the project to minimize negative impacts on residents.

- There was disagreement about whether the pipeline would benefit Larimer County.

- There were concerns that there were too many unknown details about the project's planning, construction, and the need for future easements to approve the application. There were suggestions that Larimer County should take more time to study and review the project.

- There were concerns that the City of Thornton has refused to guarantee that there would be no second and third phases of the project and would build more pipelines if given the opportunity to build this one.

- There were suggestions that the City of Fort Collins should be more involved in the process than they have been to date.

- There were suggestions that Larimer County should have been more proactive in designing and exploring possible plans rather than reacting to those put forward by the City of Thornton.

- There were concerns that the public was not given adequate time to respond to several project-related actions by Larimer County.

- There were suggestions that the City of Thornton, Larimer County, and residents should participate in a series of joint public meetings, seek the services of a facilitator, or use an intergovernmental agreement to achieve a collaborative solution. Larimer County should use the 1041 process to bring other water users to the table and facilitate cooperative rather than competitive use of the river.

- There were concerns that the Larimer County Board of Commissioners are biased in favor of developers against the interests of their constituents.

5. Property

- There was disagreement as to whether the City of Thornton would use eminent domain to seize houses along Douglas Road.

- There were concerns that the construction of the pipeline would disrupt the provision of utility services already in the Douglas Road corridor.
There were concerns that the City of Thornton has engaged in aggressive land and water acquisitions in Larimer and Adams Counties in years past.

There were concerns that the land that the City of Thornton proposes to build the pump station on is not zoned for such construction.

There were concerns about the feasibility of Douglas road being kept open during construction and of the construction activities being kept within the road's current corridor.

There were suggestions that the storage tank and pump station should not be built on residents' private property.

There was concern that the City of Thornton's 1041 application did not include a required evaluation of the project's impacts on future land uses. There was also concern that the Douglas Road pipeline would violate provisions of the Larimer County Master Plan by negatively impacting present and future land uses.

6. Pipeline Alignment

There were suggestions that any approved pipeline should run through existing right-of-way corridors rather than new land because doing so would disrupt property and wildlife to an unnecessary extent.

There was disagreement as to whether Douglas Road received the best score of the ten potential routes in the City of Thornton's rankings metrics.

There were suggestions that the City of Thornton should make a more concerted effort to use land that it owns for the project.

There was concern that federal guidelines call for selecting a pipeline that impacts the least number of people but building the pipeline along Douglas Road would impact the most.

7. Economic

There was disagreement as to whether the construction of the pipeline and pump station would harm property values, irrigation ditches, farms, and businesses along Douglas Road and elsewhere in the area.

There was disagreement as to whether the cost-sharing proposed in the project was a boon to Larimer County residents or made the County biased in favor of the City of Thornton.

There were statements that the City of Thornton has "dried up" a lot of farmland in Larimer County to divert this water and did not mention that in their application. There were concerns that historically farmers with water rights would exercise their rights largely only in a few peak months. Now the City of Thornton is storing that water permanently and removing it from the Poudre's natural cycles per rulings from the Colorado Water Court.

There were concerns that the pipeline would negatively impact two mobile home parks that form a large portion of Larimer County's available affordable housing.
8. **Alternatives**

- There were suggestions that the City of Thornton should run the water down the Poudre River to a diversion near Windsor rather than build a pipeline along Douglas Road.

- There were concerns that the alternate suggestions proposed to date would either run through private property or result in the sedimentation of bodies of water in Larimer County. These options were viewed as “non-starters.”

- There were concerns that the City of Thornton failed to meet Criterion 2 of the 1041 application, which states that applicants must present “reasonable siting and design alternatives” or explain why no reasonable alternatives exist. There were also concerns that the City also failed to meet Criterion 11 (balancing costs and mitigating adverse effects).

- There were suggestions that water should be diverted to other reservoirs that the City of Thornton owns.

- There were suggestions that the City of Thornton should sign on to a moratorium on new water projects until 2065.

- There were suggestions that the City of Thornton should draw water from the confluence of the Poudre and South Platte Rivers or at least that the water remain in the river as it passes through Fort Collins.

9. **Other**

- There were statements that the Northern Integrated Supply Project (NISP) poses problems for Larimer County that are like those posed by the City of Thornton water project. Records requests have shown that Northern Water (which is coordinating the NISP project) is interested in routing other pipelines along Douglas Road.

- There was concern about the impact of fracking and oil production activities in the area on any pipeline built nearby and about the resulting threat to water and residents. There was concern about a potentially hazardous relationship between oil production and construction, and there were suggestions that the pipeline should be analyzed in greater detail before the 1041 application is fully considered.
Larimer Water Projects  
Community Open House #1  
Block One Events  
Monday, Oct. 8, 2018, 6:00 PM-8:00 PM  
Record of Public Comments

Note: This document lists the written comments and questions received by Larimer County staff at the community open house on Monday, October 8, 2018. Comments are grouped broadly by theme and are followed by a list of questions and information needs accompanied by responses from the project proponents.

Comments

Construction and Utilities

- I don't agree that the least amount of disruption is having both pipes constructed at the same time/location. I think 2 different constructions are reasonable. This is customary with any other project- one road under construction and then another road under construction I just deal with inconvenience and 2 separate projects will actually be less disruptive than 2 coinciding projects in the same road.
- I strongly oppose running any pipelines down Douglas Road. The disruption and damage it would cause is inappropriate for a rural road and community. It would have a detrimental effect on wildlife, property values, natural areas and quality of life for Terry Lake residents.

Conveyance and Route Alternatives

- Suggest east side of reservoir 4 to join “orange” northwest route.
- This is directed to Northern Water regarding the routing of NISP line: Residents of Lochland Park subdivision would like you to consider not routing the northern route directly through our subdivision. It appears your preferred route would directly impact our lot owners between the 2nd and 3rd filings of our subdivision, including long established septic systems/leach fields as well as gardens and landscaping. Thank you kindly for any consideration you can give to not impacting 30-35-year-old residential lots.
- I'm curious as to the lack of alternative routes asked for by the Board of County Commissioners (BOCC) of Thornton with revised 1041. If the chosen route is north, NISP and Thornton should follow a similar path. Stay off Douglas Road for the many reasons on record from previous hearings. If Thornton chooses to go north, they should use Water Supply and Storage Company (WSSC) property around reservoirs for the pump station instead of using private property.
- I had hoped there would be additional alternatives: going down the Poudre, etc. The routes shown are all the same ones that have been talked about and dismissed: Eagle Lake Route, Douglas Road Route.
- Douglas Road needs to be off the table. The commissioner asked for a “significantly changed” application and Johnson voiced preference for the Poudre alternative. I prefer the river route above all others regardless if that means alignment with NISP. If water quality is an issue near Windsor, then take it below the Mulberry plant where quality is proven the same as reservoir #4. A last-ditch alternative would be a northern route. Douglas was not a scientifically chosen route but came about as an Eagle Lake alternative. The road is highly travelled by commuters as a main arterial and 310 houses (single entry) are off it between
Shields and Turnberry. The disruption would be enormous. If NISP uses the same route, you couldn't fit 2 pipes and would take eminent domain. Not acceptable. Safety and emergency vehicle access is also a concern. If you take a northern route for the least impact and to save Dick Brauch's land-pump from upper reservoirs. But understand the Poudre is the most preferred route for less disruption and the environment. It is by far my first choice.

- The NISP northern alignment pipeline route is preferred. This northern route should be shared with/coordinated with the Thornton water project. Using Douglas Road for local utility service is okay as it benefits the local community. But, using Douglas Road for all of the various big pipelines to serve non-local interests is not acceptable.

- Perhaps, at this stage, the closest thing to "out of the box" thinking on pipelines used (proposed) by Thornton and NISP is that a really hard look could be given to cooperation of pipelines on at least the northern route (and possibly even a bit more north).

**Environmental Concerns**

I strongly oppose the NISP project. The Poudre River cannot endure another diversion of water, especially at peak flows. This would cause deterioration of the habitat for wildlife, fish, and trees surrounding the river and increase risk of flooding due to silt not being flushed out with high flows. Water quality and flows will be detrimental to the Fort Collins kayak park and fish habitat and would also be a big economic loss for the City of Fort Collins community.

**Property Values**

My house is located 85 feet from Douglas Road, it is currently valued at $760,000. I am widowed and planning to sell my house soon. Obviously, if Douglas Road became a major truck route with water lines added, property values along this route will plummet. Please choose a major route north of Douglas Road, which is much less developed at this point, and one that affects property values less.

**Process Concerns**

- It seems like little has changed since the summer planning and County Commissioner hearings. I really hoped that the creative minds, for which Fort Collins is known, would come together and present some new ideas and solutions, rather than recycling the same old ideas from before. Hopefully, we really will see some good, new solutions by next meeting. Larimer County citizens need to be prioritized over Thornton. I know there must be better solutions than those being presented to us! We need to see the alternate routes as we were promised.

- I have been asked by several people “what do you want to see?” and I have said the pipelines can go anywhere but down Douglas Road. I want to amend that: they can anywhere but down Douglas Road AND down the Poudre. The solution needs to be something that benefits the citizens of Larimer County. Thornton should have addressed permitting and water law issues years ago.
Questions and Information Needs

**For Thornton/Northern**

- Is there a plan to install fiber optic cable along Douglas Road if Douglas is the selected route? If not, why not? Multiple carriers would be advisable.
- Please review going down Shields. Thank you.
- Where is the information on alternate routes? Where are the alternates and what do they entail?
- Recycled graphics being shown rather than any new ideas...unfortunately. Where are the alternative routes?
- I thought this was to be about Thornton pipeline; NISP is a separate issue. Where is "something different"? That's what I heard Commissioner Johnson order.

**For Thornton**

- Please show a map of entire scope of Thornton pipeline alternatives from end-to-end: Fort Collins to Thornton. It is hard to gauge the impact of the pipeline by just snippets on a map and does not engender a feeling that Thornton is being transparent about ultimate pipeline routes.
- Please provide a reasonable engineering report on Thornton's Route “west one” using a lake tap tunnel.

**For Northern**

- Why can’t NISP pipeline be constructed north of Lochland Park Homeowners’ Association (HOA)? That would eliminate having to “take” private land and re-construct residential leach fields for 6-7 private residences.
- Could you stay further north of Rocky Ridge Reservoir #2 before heading south of Rocky Ridge Reservoir #3?
- See if the Northern Integrated Supply Project (NISP) could avoid cutting through Eagle Lake subdivision by jogging North along the east edge of reservoir 3, like “west one.” The money required for “west one” might be well worth the elimination of controversy.
Larimer Water Projects Working Group Meeting #2
Carter Lake-Room 150, Larimer County Building
Tuesday, Oct. 9, 2018, 6:00 PM- 9:15 PM
Meeting Summary – FINAL

Notes about this document:

- This is a summary of the meeting only. It is not a comprehensive list of all the statements made during the meeting.
- Inclusion in this document is not an endorsement of the truth or accuracy of the statements made during this meeting.
- In the interest of brevity, some statements have been combined into one or two sentences. Some nuance may have been lost in the process. This was unintentional.
- Any mistakes in summarizing the meeting were unintentional and do not negate the value or impact of the statements made during the meeting.

ATTENDANCE


Larimer County staff: Todd Blomstrom, Lesli Ellis, Rob Helmick, Linda Hoffman, Mark Peterson

Facilitation: Heather Bergman, Dan Myers

Observers:
City of Thornton: Joanne Herlihy, Emily Hunt, Mark Koleber, Gerald Simpson

Northern Water: Stephanie Cecil, Christie Coleman

Public Observers: Approximately 25 members of the public observed the meeting.

ACTION ITEMS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County Staff and Project Proponents</th>
<th>Respond to outstanding group member questions, information needs, and public comments.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Peak Facilitation                   | • Send the contact list to Working Group members, after giving time for members to request that their information not be included.  
• Post presentation slides to the project website. |
| Working Group Members | • Send “what-if” ideas to Peak Facilitation by Monday, October 22, at 12:00 PM.  
• Send any additional information to Peak Facilitation or County staff for uploading onto the project website. |

**SUMMARY DISCLAIMER**  
Heather Bergman of Peak Facilitation Group provided a disclaimer on meeting summaries to the Working Group. Peak Facilitation does not speak to the truth of statements made during meetings. Peak will try to accommodate as many suggested revisions to the summary as possible, but the final meeting summary is a work product of Peak Facilitation, which will have the final call on what is included in the summary. Working Group members were encouraged to check in with Dan Myers of Peak Facilitation Group during the break in tonight’s meeting to discuss any unresolved comments on the draft summary from the first meeting.

**DEBRIEF ON OCTOBER 8 COMMUNITY OPEN HOUSE**  
The Working Group discussed the October 8 community open house.

- Around 45 people attended the meeting, including nine members of this group.
- Group members interacted with representatives of Northern Water, the City of Thornton, and the Water Supply and Storage Company (WSSC). Those representatives brought maps and answered questions.
- While the technical feasibility of Thornton using an alternate diversion point from WSSC Reservoir #4 is becoming clear, there are still questions about what the role of a water court would be in changing the diversion point.
- Save the Poudre was not invited to present at the open house.
- The project team was not sure that it had all the right information available at the open house. Attendees were asked to provide input via comment cards on what information was missing so that the project team can better meet information needs in the future. The project team hopes that Save the Poudre will help to meet those information needs at the next community meeting on November 15.
- The project team received approximately 20 comments cards with comments and questions. Peak Facilitation will type those up and use them to inform the structure of the November 15 community meeting.
- Some attendees of the open house were under the impression that they were there to comment on revisions that had already been made to the Thornton Water Project and Northern Integrated Supply Project (NISP), rather than provide input for future revisions or alternatives. The focus on the latter will be made clearer in messaging for the next community meeting.
- Thornton presented its current or proposed pipeline alignments at the community meeting, but some attendees wanted to see conveyance alternatives instead. Accordingly, Thornton was asked to give a five-minute presentation on alignment options to help inform this meeting’s presentations from Northern Water and Save the Poudre.
- There was concern at the community meeting about a lack of new alternatives from Thornton and Northern.

**PROJECT WEBSITE AND INFORMATION NEEDS UPDATE**  
Bergman provided more information about the project website and the plan for meeting the group's information needs.
Peak Facilitation and Larimer County staff are uploading information provided by group members to the project website. Each piece of information is being posted with a rough description of its content and the name of the person who submitted it parenthetically attached.

As with the meeting summaries, information posted to the website is not necessarily true. Information is posted to the website because at least one Working Group member wants the rest of the group to know said information.

Meeting summaries will be posted on the website, as well. Final summaries will also be emailed to group members individually. Group members are free to distribute final summaries to their constituencies or anyone else.

There was concern about the summary from the first Working Group meeting. During the August 1 Board of County Commissioners hearing on Thornton’s 1041 application, the commissioners said that they would not approve the project in its current form. This was not reflected in the summary. The commissioners did not ask for an alternate pipeline route. Working Group members who attended the August 1 hearing recorded the minute and second in the video of the hearing when the commissioners outlined their reasons for tabling the application. That minute and second mark summary could be posted on the project website.

A group member thanked Thornton for providing a map of Larimer Canal and lands owned by the City. This map will be posted on the project website.

At the end of the first Working Group meeting, group members listed their information needs, which the group then tried to prioritize. Meeting time would be used up quickly if there were ten-minute presentations on each information need, so it will be useful to upload information that meets some of these needs to the website when possible to conserve available meeting time. County staff and the project proponents are working to find answers to the information needs that have been raised so far. If any group member has information that could meet a need, Peak Facilitation will share it with the Working Group.

CLARIFICATION OF 1041 and IGAs
Lesli Ellis of Larimer County provided more information on the 1041 regulations and their relation to intergovernmental agreements (IGAs).

In 1974, the Colorado General Assembly enacted the regulations in question in House Bill 74-1041 (hence the name). 1041 regulations allow local governments to identify, designate, and regulate activities of statewide interest through a planning process. The regulations provide some measure of control to local jurisdictions even if the project in question is statewide.

About ten years ago, Larimer County foresaw several major projects that would pass through its planning process and decided to enact 1041 regulations for the County. The commissioners held hearings on the matter and produced a long list (power plants, wind turbines, etc.) of matters of state interest that would require a 1041 permit.

The list of matters of state interest included new or extended domestic water or sewer transmission lines and water storage expansion (with several exemptions).

The regulations detail the process, timeline, and set of hearings that the County must hold when a relevant application is submitted. In every case, the County works with the project applicant, even if the application is not for something that fits within the County’s vision. Accordingly, the County uses the process to review the project and maximize its benefits while mitigating its negative impacts for the county. The County has the authority to ask for additional process or expertise from the applicant before considering an application further. The commissioners used this authority to ask Thornton to make changes to its application at the August 1 hearing.

Group members have mentioned the criteria guiding the 1041 review process. There are 12 such criteria. They address potential impacts from the project to natural resources, public
health and safety, risks from natural hazards, etc. The Commissioners must find that the project satisfies each of the 12 criteria to approve it.

- The criteria that were most frequently cited at the August 1 hearing were:
  - Ensuring that the applicant presents reasonable siting and design alternatives (or explain why not).
  - Ensuring that the proposal does not have significant adverse impacts (or adequately mitigate those impacts) on land and natural resources, both on the project site and on adjacent areas.
  - Ensuring that the project does not adversely affect the capacity of local government to provide services (e.g., managing traffic).
  - Mitigating construction impacts.
- All 1041 applications go through the same steps. These include:
  - A pre-application conference with the County to determine the complete application.
  - The County consulting referral agencies affected by the proposals.
  - A hearing with the County Planning Commission.
  - A hearing with the Board of County Commissioners.
  - A process for obtaining additional permits for matters like construction (if the project is approved by the Board of County Commissioners).
- An Intergovernmental Agreement (IGA) is a potential part of this process. In the case of NISP, Northern is proposing the use of an IGA to comply with 1041 regulations rather than obtaining a 1041 permit.
- Section 14.8 of Larimer County's 1041 regulations addresses how an IGA works and details the circumstances in which an entity can pursue an IGA rather than a permit. To do so, both parties must authorize the agreement, and the purpose and intent of all 1041 regulations in Section 14 must be met so that all the 1041 criteria and process requirements are satisfied. In part, this means that there must be public hearings on the application, as there would be for a 1041 permit.
- The commissioners are not obligated to allow an entity to use an IGA instead of a 1041 permit. If the County and applicant cannot agree, the applicant is required to pursue a 1041 permit.
- An IGA is precipitated by a memorandum of understanding (MOU). The County has an MOU from Northern from 2016 that details the timeline and process for pursuing an IGA that addresses key issues with NISP: water conveyance siting, construction, mitigation, recreation management, and the relocation of portions of Highway 287. Northern would be required to comply with all the 1041 permit requirements to secure its IGA.

Clarifying Questions and Answers

*Because it follows both processes, is an IGA stricter than a 1041 permit?*

An IGA is comparable to a 1041 permit in the way that the County administers it. The County requires IGA applicants to adhere to the 1041 criteria and to submit a complete application. Northern submitted a draft IGA to the County in May this year, and the County requested more information. The County treats an IGA in the same way as an application for a 1041 permit by ensuring that all the necessary analysis and information is included in the application. In the case of NISP, there are multiple components to the project. Rather than pursuing three distinct 1041 permits, the applicant can address them together on a single timeline. Again, each of the components must meet the 1041 permit criteria. This is a comparable but different way of administering the 1041 regulations.
If an entity applies for a single 1041 permit, the commissioners can approve or reject it. If an entity applies for a multiple-component IGA, it sounds as if the commissioners do not meet to approve or reject each component. What do they actually do? The commissioners could tell the applicant to do more work on a certain section before bringing it back for further review. The IGA must be mutually agreeable to the applicant and County in all its components.

Take for example a scenario where there are three 1041 permits within an IGA, and the commissioners only have a problem with one of them. If the commissioners keep saying no to that particular component, does the IGA not happen at all? Or is there a way that it can go forward? The IGA must be mutually agreeable in its entirety to move forward.

The 1041 permit has a clear process for public review. Is that process the same in the extent of public review and the time and opportunity to comment? The 1041 standards do not spell out the requirements for the Planning Commission review which the 1041 regulations require. Rather, it is at the County's discretion to call for a process that allows for comparable or other community engagement to ensure adequate public involvement (note: Northern Water later stated that the MOU actually calls for Planning Commission review).

Is there an updated timeline on NISP's IGA? And has the County used its discretion to define the public outreach process for the NISP IGA yet? The answer to both of those questions is "not yet," other than a process for water transmission siting components. The County hopes that the Working Group will begin some of the public outreach processes for the NISP IGA. There is not a public outreach process for the recreation or highway siting components yet.

Is it safe to say that NISP's IGA will not be reviewed until 2019? Yes, potentially in early 2019.

The Thornton Water Project is a project of statewide interest (which 1041 regulations are designed to guide), as is NISP. I am surprised that the applicant gets to dictate how to pursue the process. The Fort Collins City Council discussed NISP at a meeting this summer and indicated that they thought that Northern Water would pursue a 1041 permit from Larimer County. I think there are considerable differences between the two public processes. At the August 1 Commissioners hearing, someone asked if there would be a Planning Commission hearing for the applicants. Commissioner Johnson said that the applicants needed to figure that out and asked for a considerably improved public engagement process. Will a Planning Commission hearing be part of that improved public process? This question will be answered at the next meeting (note that the MOU does call for a Planning Commission hearing.)

The 1041 process is regulatory, but MOUs that I have worked with in different contexts are not enforceable. Would following an MOU mean “winging it” for this process? That is partially a perception because an IGA is listed as part of the 1041 regulations. An IGA must comply with the standards of Section 14, which is essentially the 1041 regulations. So, in a sense, the IGA is not substantially different from the 1041 permit.

Why do an IGA? Because of multiple project components. The NISP project is broader than the siting of a water conveyance; there are recreation, highway siting, and other aspects. The process is more succinct in
that it allows for the bundling together of analysis and for holding one set of hearings for all three components rather than completing the 1041 permitting process separately for each component.

Is it true that Northern will be able to do some things with its project that Thornton cannot unless it gets permission from the federal government?
Northern has completed a US Army Corps of Engineers process (largely surrounding potential reservoir construction as part of NISP) that the County will not duplicate. There are some components of NISP that were not addressed by the Corps of Engineers that the County process will cover.

NISP has gone through the federal permitting process for going through wetlands. Can Thornton “piggyback” off of that permit?
No, it cannot. The federal government approved a permit only for NISP, so Thornton would have to go through its own federal permitting process if it wanted to run its project through wetlands.

THORNTON WATER PROJECT ALIGNMENT OPTIONS PRESENTATION
Mark Koleber of the City of Thornton provided a five-minute presentation of the alternatives that Thornton presented to the Planning Commission and the Board of County Commissioners.

• Thornton showed ten total alignments. Thornton decided early in the process to run the water from WSSC #4 because all the other WSSC reservoirs in the area flow to a low point there. Thornton then designed different ways to bring the water from the low point of reservoir #4 to Thornton itself.
• The preferred option that Thornton presented to both commissions was to take water from a pump station along Douglas Road and then north to County Road 56.
• Another option was to run the water along Douglas Road and up to County Road 56 a half mile east of Highway 1.
• There were also two options that ran down Douglas Road outside of the right-of-way (there were three that ran within the right-of-way). The western route ran through the Braidwood neighborhood and up along WSSC property to reach the northern end of the Eagle Lake neighborhood. The pipeline would then cross private property down to County Road 56.
• Of the options listed so far, the Douglas Road and western options could be run from the outlet works of WSSC #4. The other options would work via lake taps (big shafts on the side of the lake that are dug beneath the lake so that the pipeline does not need to run around the other side of the lake). If a lake tap were used, water would flow by gravity to a deep well and then be pumped out along a route.
• Thornton is working to listen and receive feedback about which other options might work better. Thornton will analyze those and try to come to good conclusions for moving forward.

Clarifying Questions and Answers
Did Northern Water provide a map at the open house that showed Thornton’s “West 2” route?
Yes.

Is it true that “West 1” features a lake tap but West 2 does not?
Yes.
West 2 runs on the west side of WSSC #4. Why not run it on the east side? There is a WSSC-owned margin around the reservoir. Why not run the project through that margin? Thornton looked at this (based on the feedback it received for options on right-of-way and private land) and chose west route because there is a street near the eastern margin. There are lots near the margin that nearly touch the waterline. This is not the case for the west route. Thornton believes that running the project on the east side of WSSC #4 would require going through private property.

**How much room is in the margin on the east side of Reservoir #4?**
Thornton will try to find maps of the property lines.

**What is the total capacity of Reservoirs #3 and #4, Rocky Ridge Reservoir, and Kluver Reservoir?**
Thornton will find out the total capacity.

**Early in the process, did Thornton have options for running the water down the Poudre River rather than building a pipeline?**
Thornton looked at three concepts that did not work for a variety of reasons. Those concepts are not shown in this presentation.

**Are there any alternative alignments crossing I-25 on County Road 56? I only see one.**
Early in the process, Thornton met with municipalities up and down the corridor east of I-25. That is how Thornton centered in on areas east of I-25, down County Road 56, and down to Johnstown east of County Road 17.

**Where does the water flow right now?**
Right now, the water flows via the Larimer Canal to farms owned by the City of Thornton between Fort Collins and Ault.

**Group Discussion**
- Thornton included the three Poudre River concepts in a map (which has been uploaded to the website under Karen Wagner’s name) presented to its City Council in 2014. Some group members thought that Thornton would talk through options tonight, but Thornton has been saying the same things for months.
- On August 1, the commissioners said that it did not matter if an alternative negatively affected the quantity or quality of Thornton’s water, or if it increased the cost of the project. The commissioners were not talking about pipelines. They were referring to the river.
- Thornton’s position is that while it is examining the impacts of a river option, it still needs to look at pipelines. The commissioners told Thornton to find options beyond Douglas Road. Thornton is gathering information about the water quality on the Poudre River, just like Northern is.
- The commissioners have said that the project needs to do what is best for Larimer County citizens. The Poudre River options need to be considered.

**OVERVIEW OF NISP**
Stephanie Cecil of Northern Water provided an overview of NISP.

- The project is very complicated, so Cecil was not able to cover everything about it in her presentation. There is more information on the NISP project website.
15 participants are funding NISP, including Fort Collins Loveland Water District and Windsor in Larimer County. Other participants are located north and east of Denver.

All 15 participants have water conservation programs and have reduced their per capita use by 27% since 2000. The average water consumption by NISP participants is lower than the area norm.

The goal of NISP is to provide 40,000 acre-feet of water to its participants each year.

Water will be run from the Poudre River using an existing diversion. The flow will then be modified into the new (proposed) Glade Reservoir.

Two methods will be used to get water from the reservoir to participants. One will send the water down the Poudre and pull it out where the water quality degrades. The other will involve building a pipeline that runs north of Fort Collins and then down to the participants in the south.

NISP is related to the South Platte Water Conservation Project, which includes Galeton Reservoir, and which will take water from the South Platte River up to the reservoir and down east to farming areas. This is being done to replace the Poudre water that those farmers have been using (the rights of which will be used in NISP) with South Platte water ("buy and supply"). Northern is working on agreements with those farms.

NISP will convey water via the river and via pipelines.

The stretch of the Poudre being used to convey NISP water is 12 miles long. NISP would use 18-25 cubic feet per second (CFS) of water with CFS peaking in the summer to provide benefit to the river. The excess water would run through the pipeline.

An analysis that Northern will provide shows why it selected the location that it did for taking water out of the river (just ahead of the Fort Collins water reclamation facility), primarily for water quality reasons. Northern also analyzed participant demand throughout the year, blending capabilities with cleaner water from Glad Reservoir, and site constraints in the congested area on the east side of Fort Collins. Northern is also analyzing potential benefits to the riparian channel from running water through the river.

Northern has two primary pipe alternatives. It is important to note that Northern is required to provide water to NISP participants reliably. If all the water were sent down the river, fire or flood could unacceptably degrade water quality. A pipeline is also needed for capacity.

Northern Water’s preferred route is the Northern Route, but it also has a Douglas Road alternative.

The permitting process for NISP has been happening since the 1980s when water rights were filed on. In the 1990s, the first studies on the feasibility of on-channel or off-channel reservoirs were begun. A water demand study was conducted in the early 2000s to project demand growth.

In 2004, Northern started the permitting process with the US Army Corps of Engineers. Northern hired third party consultants to work with the Corps to find the least environmentally damaging practicable alternative (LEDPA) to get water to those who need it. These studies went on for 14 years and generated draft environmental impact statements (EIS) that culminated in a final EIS earlier this year (which was adopted after a comment period).

Northern worked with the State of Colorado to comply with the Fish and Wildlife Mitigation Plan approved by Colorado Parks and Wildlife and the Colorado Water Conservation Board. That plan was endorsed by the Governor in 2017. Northern will post its mitigation plan to the project website. That plan covers recreation at Glade Reservoir, stream improvements, flushing flows, getting more fish in the river, monitoring, and adaptive management.

Northern obtained a 401 water quality certification from the state that analyzes the project’s impacts and mitigation options. Northern is also coordinating with the Colorado Dam Safety Division to use the best possible technical methods on the project.
• Northern adopted an MOU with Larimer County in 2016 to use an IGA instead of the 1041 permitting process.
• Northern held an open house about project routes in June of 2017 and has been working with the County ever since to address recreation at Glade Reservoir, Highway 287 relocation, conveyance alignments, and other comments from the County.
• The next steps in Northern’s process in Larimer County are to revise a final draft IGA that the County has not yet accepted. Northern hopes to use the Working Group process to revise the IGA. Next, Northern will ask referral agencies for comments and go through public hearings with the Planning Commission and Board of County Commissioners just as it would if it were applying for a 1041 permit.
• Northern is here to discuss conveyance and how NISP’s conveyances overlap with the Thornton Water Project. There will be continued public process on other aspects of NISP in the future.

Clarifying Questions and Answers
You mentioned that water quality degrades near the Fort Collins wastewater treatment plant. What is the difference between not being able to deliver water quality past that point and the negative impacts to water quality from flooding?
Water quality degrades not just from the plant, but from stormwater that enters the river at that location. Northern cannot pull water from further down the river. Flooding and fire are more reliability issues that could prevent NISP participants from receiving safe drinking water for weeks.

Why not use a reverse osmosis system?
That is complicated. The waste from the process would need to be injected into the earth, and reverse osmosis is not as energy efficient as pumps or gravity.

Can both projects share a conveyance alignment or are they mutually exclusive?
Northern is working with Thornton to assess a shared alignment. As has been mentioned, there are federal permitting complications, but it could be done.

You said that Northern plans to hold a planning commission hearing, but Larimer County staff said they do not know if they will ask for that yet for this project. Can you clarify?
A planning commission hearing is included in the MOU.

Larimer County staff said that Northern provided an incomplete draft with a lot of concerns. Has Northern resolved those differences?
Northern is working towards a final draft IGA to inform the conveyance piece. It is also working on recreation issues. The next steps are submitting that draft, consulting referral agencies, and then meeting with the two commissions.

When will the public see Northern’s final IGA?
Northern will let the public knows as soon as it knows.

Would a pump station be needed for either route? If so, where would they be located?
There would be a pump station (in addition to gravity) to take water from the Poudre River intake to Glade Reservoir. The station would be near the Lincoln Street gage.

So, water could flow from Glade Reservoir down either pipeline route via gravity?
Yes.
**Are the applicants listed on your slide in order of most to least water consumed within NISP?**
No. Fort Collins will be one of the largest consumers, but Left Hand Water District and the Town of Erie will both consume more.

**Can Thornton’s project go through wetlands?**
Yes, but it cannot use an open trench.

**At the community meeting, there was a conveyance map that showed the NISP route going through Eagle Lake. Thornton’s project will go north around the community, not through it. That is a potential route that Thornton could use without obtaining federal permits. Is Northern amenable to using Thornton’s route north of Eagle Lake to the mutual benefit of both proponents?**
Northern is open to discussing that further.

**Is Northern deciding between a pipeline and a river conveyance?**
No, Northern will send some water down the river and some through a pipe.

**What are the landmarks near where Northern is pulling water from the Poudre River?**
The two diversions are just after the mouth of Poudre Canyon and then 12 miles down the river behind Fort Fun near Summit View Road.

**Has Northern explored the possibility of taking the water out of the river at Windsor?**
Northern explored that possibility but found that this was the best diversion spot to maintain water quality for participants.

**What needs to be done for Northern to run all its water down the Poudre River? That seems feasible based on what other communities are doing. What are the reasons besides flood issues?**
The additional condition technical information in the EIS could help answer that question. NISP participants have no other way to get their base water supply if there are issues in the river.

**Are pump stations reviewed under the IGA?**
Larimer County looked at them as part of the 1041 process. So, potentially, yes.

**THE INTERSECTION BETWEEN THE WSSC AND THE THORNTON WATER PROJECT**
Dennis Harmon of the WSSC provided more information on the WSSC and its connection with the Thornton Water Project.

- The WSSC is a mutual ditch corporation started in 1891. Its agricultural/non-municipal users hold 199 of its 600 shares and have 40,000 acres under irrigation. Municipalities are slowly acquiring those shares.
- Ten water districts own the remaining 401 shares. Thornton owns 289 of these. 362 shares have been converted from agricultural to municipal uses through the water court process.
- WSSC mainly gets its water from five sources delivered via the Larimer County Canal, which runs from Ted’s Place to Ault and Pierce. WSSC also owns 11 reservoirs (two in the mountains and nine on the plains). The lateral ditches fed by the system are owned by subsets of shareholders whose lands are served by each lateral.
- WSSC’s water rights include direct flow rights, storage rights, transbasin rights, Colorado-Big Thompson (CBT) shares, and the rights in Jackson Ditch.
- WSSC’s service area covers the Larimer County Canal area south to the Eaton Canal. The company’s delivery season is from May to mid-September each year, during which time it delivers 52,000 acre-feet of water. Of that 52,000 acre-feet, 30,000 comes from transbasin
diversions. That water has never flowed in the Poudre downstream of the head gate just south of Ted's Place and through the Poudre in Fort Collins.

- Thornton became the biggest user of the WSSC in 1986. Terms of the settlement agreement which resolved litigation between Thornton and WSSC at the time provide that four of nine WSSC directors are to be appointed by the City of Thornton, the other five must be “local shareholders.”
- There are around 7,000 acre-feet in WSSC Reservoirs #3, #4, and Rocky Ridge Reservoir. That is based on storage decrees. The settlement agreement (see above) states that Thornton will eventually divert water between Rocky Ridge Reservoir and the river. So, there is a contractual obligation to take water out of the river there.
- WSSC’s charge is to protect its shareholders. The removal of water from the reservoirs will have a large impact on the entire system. That is why the location of the pump station is so important. Thornton’s preferred alternative pump station location will allow WSSC to dedicate storage in three of its reservoirs to Thornton while using its remaining reservoirs to serve its other shareholders. Leaving all Thornton’s water in the canal from the river to Rocky Ridge Reservoir as agreed to in 1986 will be beneficial to the operations of headgates between the river and the reservoir.

Clarifying Questions and Answers

*Are some of the municipal shareholders still leasing their rights to farmers or have most already diverted their water? If so, how do those municipalities get their water?*

All but around 21 acre-feet are currently delivered to farms, but eventually, most of it will be removed from farms.

*Are cities allowed to buy water rights because the water court explained that they would be eventually put to beneficial use in cities while being leased to farmers in the meantime?*

Generally, yes.

*Dwindling water shares are being delivered to farmers. What is there in place to stop that? Does Fort Collins or Larimer County have protection to have different municipalities buy up all the water?*

The WSSC cannot answer that. Its shareholders are willing sellers. That is a public policy question.

*In terms of the challenges posed to the WSSC system, does it matter which reservoirs Thornton takes water out from?*

Every arrangement would have its impacts. The pipeline would need to come out of #4 because it is downhill of the other two.

*How does the WSSC currently manage the level of its reservoirs?*

The WSSC Superintendent calls the Colorado River Commissioner every morning. A certain amount of water must go to the canal. In the spring, that is all river water, but in the fall, some must come from storage or CBT water shares. It can take almost three days for changes in the river to reach the east end of the system, so decisions must be made in advance.

*After delivery is done for the year, does the WSSC try to reach certain levels on the reservoirs?*

It depends on demand, but the WSSC tries to pull them down to leave some water to start up with again the following year.
Are the WSSC’s other municipal shareholders planning to propose pipelines in the near future? No, most of them are planning to take water in at treatment plants along the river. Each can only take a portion of the consumable water in the system. The percentage of recharge needed is probably between 15% and 35%.

Is the WSSC diversion at Bellvue the same as Thornton’s? If so, does water law say it must be diverted there? Yes, WSSC applied to use that diversion in the 1800s. WSSC or Thornton would need to go back to water court to change it.

Is it true that Thornton can only use ten inches of water per year from the Bellvue diversion based on the water court decree governing its use of those water rights, of which farmers were permitted to use 22-30 inches per year? That is unclear. Thornton will check in the decree.

Is there enough capacity in the Larimer County Canal and its associate ditches to run Thornton’s water through the ditches? Alternatively, could Thornton use storage capacity in other downstream WSSC reservoirs? WSSC cannot answer that question on Thornton’s behalf.

Do Thornton and other WSSC shareholders send water down Jackson Ditch? Currently, yes. Jackson ditch represents 5-10% of Larimer County Canal’s capacity.

Where is the water that Thornton does not send down Jackson Ditch going now? Down to the end of the canal to farms owned by Thornton.

The existing use of ditches by Thornton shows that no pipeline is needed. Larimer County is not responsible for Thornton’s storage problems. Thornton has an exchange that enables it to send water down the Larimer County Canal to its farms in Weld County.

PERSPECTIVES ON THE POUDRE RIVER
Gary Wockner of Save the Poudre and Zach Smith of the Colorado Water Trust each presented on the relationship between the two projects and the Poudre River. Questions were held until the completion of both presentations.

Gary Wockner’s Presentation
- Save the Poudre was founded in 2004 to protect the Poudre River from annihilation. The organization counts 4,000 members and supporters. Save the Poudre opposes taking water from the river and supports putting in back in.
- Each year, the June Rise sends the river over its banks and provides water for riparian forests, wetlands, and species that depend on the river. The June Rise creates a remarkable forest canopy on the river through Fort Collins and beyond. During the time of year, the river can reach 2,000 CFS. However, there are also pictures of the river looking terrible at Martinez Park in downtown Fort Collins with ankle-deep water of 20 CFS. If the river’s year-round CFS was 20, it would be a ditch. There are negative impacts from draining the peak flows of the river. Reduced peak flows cause warmer river temperatures, fish die-off, sedimentation in mud which prevents trout from growing up, stormwater and wastewater problems, ugliness, increased flooding, and dried-up wetlands.
A hydrograph shows that 63% of the river's original water is already diverted, mostly to upstream farm ditches. If constructed, NISP would remove 45% of the water from the river in May and 39% in June, on average. This would dramatically reduce peak flows.

Adding Thornton’s water to the river would make a big difference, particularly for peak flows. While it opposes NISP, Save the Poudre supports the Poudre River option for Thornton (which the City itself created).

Thornton wants to move around 16,000 acre-feet of water to Thornton. NISP wants to remove 40,000 acre-feet of water from the river during peak flow months alone.

NISP will need IGA/1041 permits, a 401 water quality permit from the State of Colorado (say, in 2019) and a 404 permit for the US Army Corps of Engineers (say, in 2019/2020).

All those permits are subject to judicial review, so people who disagree with the permit can sue in some level of court. These delays mean that Save the Poudre estimates that the final decision will come between 2023 and 2025.

Thornton needs a 1041 permit from Larimer County (also subject to judicial review).

Four projects currently propose to remove water from the Poudre, including the Thornton Water Project and NISP (the other two being the Seaman Reservoir expansion and a pipeline to be built by Greeley.)

Three of these four projects are being built larger than their current water rights would suggest. The projects will allow them to buy more water rights from farmers to convey via pipelines to their cities. This would mean the annihilation of the Poudre River through Fort Collins and downstream.

The four project proponents are not working together. It would make sense for them to work together to run the water down the river through Fort Collins to a treatment plant in Windsor. Instead, they are separately pulling water from the mouth of the river. While the Colorado Water Trust’s (CWT) programs create tiny base flows, peak flows are what should be of concern, and these will be dramatically reduced. The Poudre River option for Thornton provides an opportunity to restore the river.

Zach Smith's Presentation

CWT is based in Denver and was founded in 2001 to restore needed flows to Colorado's rivers. CWT is not an advocacy group but rather works in a market-based fashion like that of a land trust to purchase resources (in this case, water rights).

CWT has no position on either project. It is here to discuss flow restoration processes going on right now.

CWT does not focus on peak flows because it is cost prohibitive to purchase them. Rather, the organization focuses on base flows.

The Poudre River Report from the City of Fort Collins shows four separate zones where base flows are concerningly low. There are multiple dry-up points from the mouth of the canyon to the confluence of the river with the South Plate.

Dry-ups occur because, in Colorado, development has generally moved upstream. However, most of the senior rights on the river are located downstream, with junior rights located upstream. Junior users created upstream plains reservoirs to deliver to their users downstream. They have no legal obligation to use the river as a delivery system, so there are exchanges that dry up the river.

Colorado passed legislation in 1973 to establish an instream flow program within the Colorado Water Conservation Board (CWCB). The CWCB has two methods for protecting river water. The first is appropriation, wherein it slaps priority dates on the water in the river at any given time. That approach cannot work in the Poudre because there is no river to appropriate at dry spots. The second tool is to acquire senior water rights to protect that water from future diversion.
The best example of this strategy on the Front Range is in Boulder Creek, where the City of Boulder diverted water rights to instream flow, which has meant that water is always now in the creek (even dry ones) below the Broadway bridge.

- The Poudre River is too wide to do something similar with just one water right, so CWT is scaling up its acquisition program to clump water rights that address as many dry up spots as possible.
- Past attempts to do something similar were scuppered by the CWCB because Poudre River users objected. Today, CWT is creating buy-in via a project with the Colorado State University Water Institute called The Poudre Runs Through It. The project team worked with community members within three wide priorities: forum, funding, and flows. Now CWT is pushing the project forward with help from the CWCB, Colorado Parks and Wildlife (CPW), Thornton, Greeley, Fort Collins, and Northern.
- CWT is developing a legal structure for the project by modeling times when water can be used in different segments of the river. This will reveal gaps in what parts of the river are being protected, particularly in the winter and between July and September. The program has agreed-upon thresholds with CPW and has received (no cost) preliminary water offers from Thornton, Fort Collins, and Greeley. The next steps are to receive approvals of these offers from CWCB in the fall or winter, go to water court, and then address physical bypasses for water issues.

**Clarifying Questions and Answers**

*Can Gary Wockner explain his slide on agriculture?*

Wockner replied that the slide shows hundreds of thousands of irrigated acres in Northern Colorado. It also shows the municipalities that constitute the Northern Front Range Metropolitan Planning Organization. These cities will eventually grow into one another. NISP’s project timeline runs through 2060. Through the same timeline, this growth blob will cover 167,000 new acres of farms that will be sold off to annexation and development. 118,000 acre-feet of water rights from those farms will be sold on the open market. Save the Poudre has issues with Northern claiming that it will save farms.

*Why is CWT’s goal to protect base flows rather than peak flows?*

Smith replied that there are legal constraints within the CWCB instream flow program for how much CWT can protect, and there are market challenges to buying peak flows.

*How does CWT operate? Does CWT acquire water by purchase, donation, or what? And what are water offers?*

Smith replied that WT is a non-governmental organization (NGO) partner of CWCB. CWCB obtains water rights to protect rivers via donation, lease, or any other contractual arrangement that they make. CWT talks to people in the community to bring projects to the CWCB. In the case of the Poudre, CWT is doing that to build a legal background to protect water in the river. The negotiations between CWCB and the cities mentioned are to put water into the instream flow program.

*Which uses less water, a city acre or a farm acre?*

Wockner replied that suburbs use less than farms.

*What is the importance of base flows?*

Smith replied that fish need water all the time. Base flows maintain a certain amount of water to avoid dry-ups until peak flows pass through.
How are municipalities helping CWT? Smith replied that for instance, Fort Collins utility has identified water that they can put into the program, as have Greeley and Thornton. Northern Water got legislation to protect its water so that it stays in that 12-mile segment of the river. Northern has not offered water into the program, but if they did it would come via its deliveries.

What bypass structures exist on the Poudre now? Is there existing infrastructure to consider? Smith replied no, because many of the structures that exist are used to sweep the river during low flows. There are physical delivery issues to getting the water past structures. There will need to be bypass and measurement structures past every diversion on the river. Some projects are working on that now, and an example of a completed one can be found at Fossil Creek Inlet.

Can Gary speak at the next meeting about what legal concerns and physical limitations would need to be resolved to keep the water in the Poudre? And then Thornton could speak to why that is or is not possible, as well as the feasibility of using ditches? This will be revisited.

How does one know if 20 CFS is enough? Why not 30 or 50? Smith replied that that is a question for CPW. Their process for creating this was a legal standard in the CWCB program to protect water in the river or to improve or preserve it to a reasonable degree. The standard may not reflect the values of those who want more water in the river. CPW arrived at that number by looking at the Environmental Protection Agency's National Inspection Plan models and the R2Cross stream model as well as CPW's own measurements of river depth and flow. They then modeled the needs of fish in each river segment. The river has shrunk to the size of the water that it has so that constraint is also reflected in the CFS numbers.

What is the process for Thornton to change the point of diversion? How long would it take? Wockner replied that that is a question for Thornton to answer. Save the Poudre believes that it is Thornton’s job to figure out the details of the Poudre River option.

Is Fort Collins part of the CWT? Smith replied no, CWT is a private nonprofit, but Fort Collins has participated in CWT projects and has contributed money and (possibly) water.

Would ensuring 20 CFS in the river have mitigated recent fish die-offs in the river? Wockner replied that scientists are still hypothesizing about low, warm water causing fish kill. It is unclear if 20 CFS would make the water cool enough where the fish die-off occurred to have made a difference.

Would fish kill be minimized with maintained flow and water temperatures? Wockner replied yes, that would certainly help. Peak flows can create the riparian forests that keep water temperatures low.

Has anyone ever formally proposed melding all four projects together? Who could do that? Wockner replied that all four entities need to go through the Larimer County Board of Commissioners for permits.

Is 18-25 CFS an improvement on current river conditions? Wockner replied that there is controversy surrounding those figures because there are loopholes in Northern’s mitigation plan, which allows water to pass when Northern wants to do so. Additionally,
the total amount of water would not ramp up until all the NISP participants have built out their communities, which could happen as late as 2035. There are questions about if or when that would occur.

**Group Discussion**

- NISP will protect base flows of 18-25 CFS in the river, but its target flows are as high as 260 CFS.
- It is not temperature but lack of oxygen that kills fish.
- It is important for NISP to plan for a peak flow regime that flushes sediment from the river on some cycle.
- There is controversy surrounding NISP's peak flow regime. If it is for up to three days a year, that will not meet the current river's peak flows of three-six weeks each year. Save the Poudre commented on this in the US Army Corps of Engineers public comment process.

**ADDITIONAL Q&A FOR THORNTON AND NORTHERN**

*Are there actually technical obstacles to Thornton using a canal or river option? Or is cost the primary obstacle?*

Thornton cannot run water down the ditch in the winter because it will freeze. Thornton also needs 24/7 water availability that keeps pace with its demand. There are technical issues in disposing of brine from a reverse-osmosis plant built to mitigate water quality concerns from the river. Cost is also a huge factor because ratepayers will bear it. Thornton wants reasonable alternatives to get water to its citizens and is working with CWT to get water down the river to help address group interests as Thornton understands them.

*What would happen to the river north of the reservoirs if the water was sent down the river?*

Thornton modeled the WSSC system and compared how it would pull water out from the system to the previous agricultural system. Municipal suppliers carry water year-to-year in case of drought, whereas farmers draw water levels down further on average for their crops.

*Northern mentioned independent studies on water quality south of Fort Collins. No Pipe Dream found no difference in quality north and south of town. Why the difference, and could it be cleaned up with normal water treatment or is reverse osmosis the only way to make it potable?*

Northern worked with a third-party consultant on water quality data and will post that to the website. The data is fact-based and shows how water quality changes throughout the year and over time. The No Pipe Dream study found similar water quality above Mulberry Street and at Reservoir #4. Water quality changes dramatically by Windsor and would require advanced treatment like reverse osmosis.

*What are the pros and cons of both proponents sharing a pipeline?*

This was discussed. The issue is that the water quality in Glade Reservoir is higher than in WSSC #4, so it would negatively affect water quality for NISP participants if the water from the two projects mixed. Northern has also completed federal permits to go through wetlands, but Thornton has not so it would not be possible to share a pipeline that ran through wetlands. There are also engineering differences involved. The water from Glade Reservoir can flow by gravity all the way down the pipeline, but the water from WSSC #4 cannot.

*Does the diversion at Bellevue belong to the WSSC? How does it relate to WSSC #4?*

Thornton’s water rights are associated with its WSSC shares, so the two entities have the same diversion. Right now, water runs through the Larimer County Canal to WSSC #3, then #4, and then to Kluver Reservoir, where it would be taken out.
If water quality in the river was good and the water was taken out at Windsor, what would need to happen (e.g., permits)?
Thornton would need several federal permits for river structures, storage, gravel pits, a larger pump station, etc. Then it would go to water court.

Thornton was found with finding viable options that benefit Larimer County. Why not revisit Poudre River options for conveyance, especially since they were Thornton’s idea?
It is not reasonable. Thornton purchased the water quality of the water and storage that it purchased. Thornton is looking at alternative pipeline routes and wants to put more water into the river. Thornton also wants to minimize impacts while meeting its customers’ needs.

The commissioners said that water quality degradation was not Larimer County’s concern. Why is Thornton using water quality as an argument not to send the water down the Poudre? This was not a criterion of the tabling decision.
Thornton is focused on the criteria outlined in the 1041 regulations. Thornton believes it has met those and can protect the water quality and flows of the Poudre.

The commissioners also reminded Thornton that is has a state-of-the-art treatment facility that it could use to treat water after Fort Collins. Does Thornton disagree with this?
That plant is advanced but does not always meet the standards of Thornton’s citizens. Thornton wants good-tasting, safe drinking water.

Does Northern not use the water quality data collected by the City of Fort Collins?
Northern does its own water quality analysis on the Poudre and has an adaptive management plan to monitor water quality to meet the standards outlined in its permits. Northern will compare its results to those of Fort Collins.

Could Thornton go to water court to change its diversion point to get the water into the Poudre from the WSSC reservoirs at the headgate?
Thornton would have to resolve that with both the WSSC and a water court. WSSC would need to ensure that it could be done without injuring other shareholders.

Would Thornton still need a pipeline if it diverted water to the Poudre via WSSC Reservoirs #3 and #4? A pipeline is a reliable way to do it. Ditches could be at capacity when they needed or could freeze.

Could Thornton work with the City of Fort Collins to address pollution into the river to allay the water quality concerns? Even if this is expensive, the water could be cleaned up with the savings from not building the pipeline.
That would require significant changes to the City’s stormwater runoff beyond what Thornton is talking about in terms of cost and difficulty. It would cost hundreds of millions of dollars to bring wastewater up to quality standards. Thornton is trying to address that in its own city, and its standards still do not reach the quality found at WSSC #4. As part of NISP’s US Army Corps of Engineers process, Northern has done an alternatives analysis that included a water quality assessment. Independent water quality experts concluded that it was technically infeasible to dispose of brine from a reverse osmosis treatment process in this instance.

NEXT STEPS
• At the next meeting, the group will generate “what-ifs” around any of the subjects discussed tonight (conveyance, quality, construction, etc.) or anything else that group members would like to propose. Next meeting: This process now needs ideas. Learning, now generating ideas and
then refining them. Last meeting to evaluate meetings against interests. Next is what if meeting. Group members should work together (especially with group members they disagree with) to prepare a five-minute summary of their ideas to submit to Peak Facilitation by **Monday, October 22, at 12:00 PM.** At the meeting itself, group members will take turns presenting their ideas until everyone who wishes to do so has presented at least one idea. After everyone has presented one idea, those with additional ideas can present their second idea and so on. Group members should keep in mind that there will be time for 15 presentations or so, so the group should consider whether it wants to discuss similar ideas only once or to provide more chances to present at future meetings.

- Peak Facilitation will send out a contact list with information for group members, project proponent staff, and Larimer County staff. Those who do not wish to share their contact information can ask Peak to remove that information from the list.

---

**Public Comment Card Input**

Observers at the meeting had the opportunity to provide comments or questions on cards. Submitted questions and comments are included below, transcribed verbatim from comment cards.

**Public Comment Card Questions**

- What happens to water levels in reservoirs #3, #4, and Kluver if Thornton’s water is diverted to the Poudre River and these reservoirs are not used for storage of Thornton’s Water?
- I’d like to see all the proposed water projects (4) working together! Gary indicated none are working together. Why not?
- How many pipelines are we talking about one, two, or three? In one, two, or three trenches? All at the same time or spread out over time? How long? Months? Years? Under the road, off to the side in ROW or on private land? Width of easements?
- Why doesn’t the Larimer Ditch work for Thornton?

**Public Comment Card Comments**

- Discuss ALL alternatives; there should be an open discussion; Thornton needs to be open-minded on options. Douglas Road is NOT the least impacted route.
- If Thornton wants the cleanest/deepest water possible, Reservoir #4 is NOT the deepest lake! Reservoir #3, though it is higher in elevation, is deeper than Reservoir #4. Thornton should take the water directly out of Reservoir #3! PLEASE GO WALK THE AREA AND VISUALLY SEE THE LAKES.
- Please show us water quality at different points along the Poudre.
Larimer Water Projects Working Group: Questions and Information Needs
Updated 11/27/2018

Constructability Questions

- Could two pipelines be legally and feasibly placed under Douglas Road? Is there a parallel path for NISP? How many pipelines could safely fit under the road?
  
  *County's Answer:* Based on the information provided by Thornton and Northern and with use of trench boxes and reduced separation distances between the pipelines, it appears that it would be feasible to construct two pipelines within the Douglas Road right-of-way. Full closure of the roadway to through traffic (local access only for residents) would be required and existing utilities would need to be relocated/reconstructed in advance of pipeline construction.

  *Northern's Answer:* The Thornton Water Project and Northern Integrated Supply Project water pipelines can be concurrently constructed within Douglas Road, but it will require multiple years to construct using sequential road closures between access locations plus numerous utility relocations/replacements. Both Thornton and Northern conclude that while technically possible, it is not practical to concurrently construct both water pipelines in Douglas Road and recommend that placement of both water pipelines in Douglas Road be avoided.

  *Thornton's Answer:* It is legal to construct pipelines in road rights of way if the appropriate permissions are granted. It is possible to construct two water pipelines in the Douglas Road right of way, and the implications of doing so were discussed as part of the Constructability and Traffic Webinars.

- What other pipelines currently run under Douglas Road? There is concern about Prospect Energy's oil pipeline under Douglas Road.
  
  *Northern's Answer:* There are presently at least six utilities scattered throughout the Douglas Road right of way including two water lines, an electric line, a phone line, and two gas lines. Relocation of these utility and any others (including oil pipelines) would be necessary and would increase the duration of Thornton Water Project and Northern Integrated Supply Project water-pipeline construction in Douglas Road.

  *Thornton's Answer:* There are treated water and natural gas pipelines currently existing in the Douglas Road right-of-way. The Prospect Energy pipelines cross Douglas Road, and have been located by Thornton. If Thornton and Northern Water were permitted to construct their water transmission pipelines in Douglas Road, some existing utilities would need to be relocated, and the Prospect Energy lines would be taken into consideration during the design of the water pipeline construction to ensure construction around the Prospect Energy lines was safely completed.

- How many pipelines are we talking about one, two, or three? In one, two, or three trenches? All at the same time or spread out over time? How long? Months? Years? Under the road, off to the side in a right-of-way, or on private land? Width of easements?
  
  *Thornton's Answer:* This information was discussed as part of the Constructability Webinar.

  *Northern's Answer:* The Thornton Water Project and Northern Integrated Supply Project are proposing to construct one pipeline each. Depending on the route chosen and input received, these pipes could be placed in the road or in an easement in one or two trenches. More detailed information will be provided in the “Constructability” reports.
• The Working Group needs to know if there are “choke points” or other constraints that make it unfeasible to run multiple pipelines along a given route.

  *Northern’s Answer:* No locations have been identified, in the current route analyses, where coordinating the two pipelines in one route would be infeasible. Please see the “Constructability” reports.

  *Thornton’s Answer:* Thornton and Northern Water have provided information on the implications of constructing two pipelines in Douglas Road and CR 56. County consultants also presented information on this topic as part of the Constructability webinar.

• The Working Group could hire someone and ask them what is feasible if building a pipeline is not an option.

  *County’s Answer:* This process has looked at multiple options including pipeline and non-pipeline ideas, including analysis of their relative feasibility.

• I have not seen any information regarding how large a trench, how deep and wide, how the dirt will be disposed of, and where the huge amount of dirt will be moved to and how. Trucks will be needed to catch the soil removed and will it be track hoe and truck along side. If so, how can this be accomplished and not close the road. There will be a huge amount of soil generated and the pipe and gravel bedding and cover will result in this soil going somewhere. It would be helpful if we could see how they plan to do the actual construction, trucks and backhoes, boring, etc. At this point we are to believe Thornton when they state ”We can do it.” I would like to see specifics since once they start digging we will be stuck with whatever the job requires which could be far from what we are being told.

  *Thornton’s Answer:* The construction of pipelines in Douglas Road, including fill placement, pipe stringing and other construction information, was described in the Constructability Webinar. Construction of two pipelines in Douglas Road would, in most areas, represent the most difficult construction sequence of the alternatives involving pipeline construction.

**Ditch Conveyance Questions**

• Is it feasible to use ditches rather than pipelines to convey the water to Thornton?

  *Answer:* Addressed during Question/Answer at Working Group Meeting #2, see summary.

• Is the capacity of the Larimer County Canal and the associated ditches that feed off of the Poudre River enough to allow Thornton to run the water through those ditches? Or is there storage capacity in other downstream reservoirs that Thornton could use?

  *Thornton’s Answer:* No, there is not enough capacity in the entire length of the Larimer County Canal for Thornton to run its water in the manner needed to operate a municipal water system. The Larimer County Canal has capacity to deliver all of Thornton’s shares to the Rocky Ridge/WSSC #3 area during the irrigation season. There is not capacity to deliver all of Thornton’s shares in any single ditch below Black Hollow Reservoir. In addition, delivery through the WSSC system in the winter is not feasible. There is not capacity nor does Thornton have the right to use other ditch company facilities. Because other ditch companies use their own facilities to deliver water to their own shareholders, there would not be adequate capacity in timing and amount to deliver Thornton’s water when it is available for delivery. Like WSSC, delivery through other ditch systems in the winter is not feasible. Thornton does not have permission to use any downstream reservoirs, and we are not aware of any available capacity in downstream reservoirs.
• Why doesn't the Larimer Ditch work for Thornton?
  Thornton's Answer: Thornton plans to use the Larimer County Canal to deliver its share water to the WSSC reservoirs. Delivery of its share water down the ditch past these reservoirs would result in water quality degradation as the water travels down the ditch due to significant agricultural runoff and the influence of geologic formations. Thornton would also lose use of the reservoir storage it has purchased in the WSSC system since once water is stored in WSSC No. 4, it cannot be returned to the ditch. In addition, Thornton would lose a significant amount of water to ditch seepage if water is run down the ditch in the non-irrigation season and would not be able to make needed winter-time deliveries if the delivery point was farther down the ditch.

• I have a question regarding the use of the Larimer County Canal to convey Thornton’s water. Unfortunately, Thornton only looked at utilizing the canal all the way to the Weld County line. According to the presentation the water quality diminishes severely along the route. Thornton also stated that there would be various legal and technical difficulties. Another option would be to utilize the canal as far as Thornton’s property in the vicinity of Elder Lake which is where they plan to have their Douglas Road pipeline go anyway. This much shorter use of the canal would neither diminish water quality nor require a pipeline on either Douglas Road or CR56. This would greatly decrease the 1.2 Billion dollar cost associated with greater water treatment cost and the need for additional reservoirs which is what drives the higher price tag. It might even be cheaper than the Douglas road route. My question is, can we get this option examined and if not, why not.
  Thornton’s Answer: Thornton’s webinar information was predicated on the Working Group’s request that Thornton look at using the Larimer County Canal to convey water out of Larimer County. The legal and operational constraints of running Thornton’s water in the Larimer County Canal are comparable whether the water is run in the ditch to the Elder Reservoir area or to the Weld County line. As was mentioned in the webinar, running water through the Canal in the winter would not provide the reliable operation needed for a municipal water system. In addition, if Thornton didn’t take its share delivery out of WSSC #4, Thornton would need to amend its agreement with WSSC, and the company has indicated it would not be willing to do that. The quality of water in the Larimer County Canal degrades the farther the water travels down the ditch, because of this, it is likely that water quality would have degraded less by the time it reaches the Elder Reservoir area as compared to farther down the ditch in Weld County. Thornton has not specifically looked at the quality of water in the LCC at Elder Reservoir, nor what treatment technology would be required to achieve a water quality comparable to what Thornton would have available from WSSC #4. Conveying Thornton’s water in the Larimer County Canal up to the Elder Reservoir area, and then in a pipeline going east from there, would save approximately 2.6 miles of pipeline in Douglas Road from Bayshore to Turnberry, or approximately 2 miles of pipeline along or in County Road 56 from Hwy 1 to Turnberry. Using average pipe construction costs, this would save approximately $9 to $12 million in pipeline construction along these roads. If the WSSC system storage was used to store and regulate Thornton’s water, it would cost approximately $18 million to construct the pump station and pipeline to return Thornton’s water to the ditch, for a net cost increase of approximately $6 to $9 million, not including any needed additional water treatment that might be necessary to treat the water from farther downstream on the Larimer County Canal. If Thornton didn’t use the WSSC system storage, Thornton would have to replace that storage at a cost of approximately $88 million. Elder Reservoir is owned by the Windsor Reservoir and Canal Company, and has a capacity of approximately 1500 af, so the storage in this facility is insufficient and not currently accessible by Thornton. There could be additional costs for
pump stations and pipelines depending on where the replacement storage was located. There would also be a cost for water being lost by conveying Thornton’s water in the ditch.

**General Conveyance Questions**

- **Have any existing studies done a comparative analysis of route options?**
  
  *Thornton’s Answer:* Thornton prepared an analysis of ten alternative routes in the area from the WSSC reservoirs to Turnberry Road, and from Douglas Road to Highway 1. In addition, Thornton prepared a comparative analysis of possible pipeline corridors from Fort Collins to Thornton.
  
  *Northern’s Answer:* Through the Environmental Impact Statement and Larimer County Intergovernmental Agreement development processes, impacts associated with the Douglas Road Pipeline and North Pipeline have been evaluated. Based on lower traffic impacts and fewer utility conflicts and physical obstructions, the North Pipeline is NISP’s preferred route.

- **Where is the information on alternate routes? Where are the alternates and what do they entail?**
  
  *Thornton’s Answer:* Thornton compared ten alternate routes as part of its Alternative Alignment Analysis presented with its 1041 application submittal.
  
  *Northern’s Answer:* This information is available on the Larimer Water Projects website from both Thornton and Northern Water.

- **What is the potential for using existing infrastructure and public land for water conveyance?**
  
  *Thornton’s Answer:* Thornton proposes to use the Larimer County Canal and the WSSC reservoirs, which are existing facilities, to transport and store water. Use of the Larimer County Canal to transport water farther to the east would result in degraded water quality and loss of water delivery reliability for Thornton. Transporting the water through other existing ditches, or down the river, also results in impacts to Thornton. Thornton plans to locate its pipeline, as well as Northern Water’s pipeline, on Thornton-owned property where it is feasible, and will use public rights-of-way where appropriate.

**Legal Questions**

- **What is the process for changing the diversion point from WSSC Reservoir #4? How long would that take? Is it possible?**
  
  *Answer:* Addressed during Question/Answer at Working Group Meeting #2; see summary.

- **Can an independent speaker like a water attorney explain how water law works in Northern Colorado and the North Poudre system?**
  
  *Answer:* Colorado Water Law document provided at 10/8 open house and 10/9 Working Group meeting. [Available online here](#).

- **What are the differences between an IGA and the 1041 process? Why did each applicant select the process that they did? What does the County believe to be the advantages and disadvantages of each process?**
  
  *Answer:* Addressed during “Clarification of 1041 and IGAs” and Question/Answer portions of Working Group Meeting #2; see summary.
• Is it true that Thornton can only use ten inches of water per year from the Bellvue diversion based on the water court decree governing its use of those water rights, of which farmers were permitted to use 22-30 inches per year?

Thornton’s Answer: The specific measurement statistics in the question are not accurate. Thornton’s water court decree terms and conditions limit how much water is available for Thornton to deliver to the its water customers, and on a per-share basis that amount is, in comparison, less than the amount delivered to a farmer for irrigation use.

• Does Thornton’s ownership of this water give them a presumed or actual right to remove it from Larimer County?

Thornton’s Answer: Thornton’s Water Court decree changed the use of its WSSC and JDC water right to allow use in Thornton.

• How can we test the WSSC/Thornton assertion that going back to water court is a non-starter? Could this just be a red herring?

County’s Answer: This question is a matter for the Board of County Commissioners and their legal staff, so the County does not have specific responses on those questions now.

• Does Larimer County have its own water attorney who could review legal questions surrounding the Thornton Water Project? If not, why not?

County’s Answer: This question is a matter for the Board of County Commissioners and their legal staff, so the County does not have specific responses on those questions now.

• What is the difference between an easement and eminent domain?

County’s Answer: An easement is an interest in a particular piece of property granted by the owner of the property (“grantor”) to another person or entity (“grantee”). The easement allows the grantee to use the specified area of the grantor’s property for a set period of time (e.g., a number of months, years, up to perpetuity) for a specified purpose (e.g., for access, trails, installation of pipes, lines, etc.) Eminent domain is a right given to an entity (usually a governmental entity although there can be private rights of ED to acquire an access across a neighboring property to prevent a landlocked parcel). The right of ED is given by a statute or by the constitution. It allows the entity to condemn (i.e., involuntarily take) another person’s property for a particular purpose provided the entity pays just compensation (i.e., the fair market value) for the property taken. Although an interest less than total fee ownership may be condemned, most often fee ownership (rather than some lesser interest such as an easement) is condemned.

Northern’s Answer: An easement is a right to cross or use someone else’s land for a specified purpose – in this case to install, operate, and maintain a buried pipeline. Typically, an owner retains the rights to most uses of the land but cannot build structures on an easement. Eminent domain is the right of a governmental entity to appropriate private property for public use with fair compensation to the property owner.

Thornton’s Answer: An easement is an interest in real property that allows use of the property while title to the property remains with the property owner. Eminent domain is a process to acquire real property interests, such as easements, for public purposes.

Pipeline Conveyance Questions

• At a minimum, the next meeting should feature maps of the two NISP alternative pipelines.

Northern’s Answer: Addressed during the “Overview of NISP” portion of Working Group Meeting #2; see summary.
• Please show a map of entire scope of Thornton pipeline alternatives from end-to-end: Fort Collins to Thornton. It is hard to gauge the impact of the pipeline by just snippets on a map and does not engender a feeling that Thornton is being transparent about ultimate pipeline routes.

Thornton’s Answer: This map is available on the Working Group webpage under the “Info and Data” tab and the “Info about the Thornton Water Project (Provided by the City of Thornton)” heading. This map or a similar map has been available on Thornton’s project webpage beginning with Thornton’s Open Houses in late 2016.

• Please provide a reasonable engineering report on Thornton’s Route “west one” using a lake tap tunnel.

Thornton’s Answer: Thornton’s consultants provided a report on the constructability of lake taps.

• Why not use the “margin” on the east side of WSSC#4? Can Thornton provide maps of the property lines on that side of the reservoir?

Thornton’s Answer: WSSC’s property line is generally 25’ beyond the normal high water line, which would not be enough room to construct the pipeline entirely on WSSC property. Constructing the Thornton Water Project pipeline along the east side of WSSC #4 would require easements across private property. Thornton will provide a copy of the Eagle Lake plat for posting on the Working Group webpage.

• Why can’t NISP pipeline be constructed north of Lochland Park Homeowners’ Association (HOA)? That would eliminate having to “take” private land and re-reconstruct residential leach fields for 6-7 private residences.

Northern’s Answer: Based on public feedback, the updated Northern Tier route does include going north of Lochland Court before veering south.

• Could you stay further north of Rocky Ridge Reservoir #2 before heading south of Rocky Ridge Reservoir #3?

Northern’s Answer: Routing the pipeline this far north results in the following negative impacts: 1) Additional length for the pipeline resulting in more friction losses and potential upsizing requirements; 2) Additional rocky areas that could require blasting or difficult trenching; 3) Other potential negative impacts as this route was not analyzed as part of the EIS.

• See if the Northern Integrated Supply Project (NISP) could avoid cutting through Eagle Lake subdivision by jogging north along the east edge of reservoir 3, like “west one.” The money required for “west one” might be well worth the elimination of controversy.

Northern’s Answer: Based on public feedback, the updated Northern Tier route does include jogging around Eagle Lake subdivision before veering south.

• Apples to Apples: Watching these webinars has really brought into focus the great and often convoluted lengths so many are going to in order to avoid the shortest, most direct, point to point route for a pipeline that likely has the most minimal traffic impacts - the Central Route. For purposes of comparison to these other proposals we are reviewing, I’d like to request that the Central Route be put back into the evaluation process and compared to the others in terms of Constructability and Geotechnical, Water Flow and Quality, and Traffic. I want to emphasize that I am not advocating for selection of the Central route, but none of the previous 10 routes were objectively evaluated. They were created based on subjective recommendations by a small, select group residents. If we are going through this process, please, let’s compare apples to apples.

Thornton’s Answer: The Central Route was not a route that the Working Group determined to include in their discussions. Thornton objectively compared the Central route with nine
other routes as part of its Alternative Alignment Analysis presented with its 1041 application submittal.

- **Douglas Road option is severely abbreviated. We really don’t know how the water gets to Thornton after Douglas Road...is that the whole intention? To have limited follow-through on how it really gets to Thornton?**
  
  *Thornton’s Answer:* A map of the proposed route of the Thornton Water Project east of I-25 is available on the Working Group web page under the “Info and Data” tab and the “Info about the Thornton Water Project (Provided by the City of Thornton)” heading. This map or a similar map has been available on Thornton’s project webpage beginning with Thornton’s Open Houses in late 2016.

- **What is the estimated cost of a lake tap under Reservoir #3?**
  
  *Thornton’s Answer:* The cost for tunnel construction was discussed in the Constructability Webinar.

- **In as much detail as possible, what is Thornton’s long-term plan for one or more additional pipeline, maybe in 2065? Where would Thornton put a second pipeline if it needed one?**
  
  *Thornton’s Answer:* Thornton will propose the siting and construction of any pipelines needed in the future in accordance with the Larimer County regulations in place at the time when and if any additional pipelines are needed in Larimer County.

- **Another option could also be included and evaluated in terms of the three criteria (1) Constructability and Geotechnical, (2) Water Flow and Quality, and (3) Traffic, that were done for the other five routes. I’d like to see an evaluation that would run Thornton’s pipeline up along the west edge of Reservoir #4, rather than through Vista Lake Drive. Essentially it would be [Penny Hillman’s] East Concept proposal, but with the pipe going along the western edge instead of eastern.**
  
  *Thornton’s Answer:* Thornton acknowledges that this concept was raised.

**Project Process Questions**

- **What is the precise overlap between NISP and Thornton Water Project?**
  
  *Northern’s Answer:* Addressed during the “Overview of NISP” portion of Working Group Meeting #2; see summary.

- **I thought this was to be about Thornton pipeline; NISP is a separate issue. Where is “something different”? That’s what I heard Commissioner Johnson order.**
  
  *Thornton’s Answer:* This information is available on the Larimer Water Projects website from both Thornton and Northern Water.

- **Recycled graphics being shown rather than any new ideas...unfortunately. Where are the alternative routes?**
  
  *Thornton’s Answer:* This information is available on the Larimer Water Projects website from both Thornton and Northern Water.

- **I’d like to see all the proposed water projects (4) working together! Gary indicated that none of those entities are working together. Why not?**
  
  *Thornton’s Answer:* Thornton and Northern Water are working together to appropriately locate and construct the conveyance pipelines, and to implement the Poudre Flows program. The Halligan (Fort Collins) and Seaman (Greeley) reservoir expansion projects aren’t proposing pipeline through Larimer County, but are working with Thornton and Northern to implement the Poudre Flows program.
Northern’s Answer: NISP is a collaborative, regional water project with 15 different Participants working together on the project. Water rights, purpose and need, permitting requirements, timing, funding, etc. are different for different projects, which influences type and extent of coordination with those projects.

- **At the August 1 Commissioners hearing, someone asked if there would be a planning commission hearing for the applicants. Commissioner Johnson said that the applicants needed to figure that out and asked for a considerably improved public engagement process. Will a Planning Commission hearing be part of that improved public process?**
  
  **Answer:** Addressed during the “Group Discussion” section under the “What Is Next For the Working Group” portion of Working Group Meeting #3; see summary. This will also be addressed at Working Group Meeting #5.

- **Why have we heard not one word from the representative of the City of Fort Collins?**
  
  **Answer from the City of Fort Collins:** The City of Fort Collins (City) appreciates the opportunity to participate in the working group. The focus of the Larimer County working group has been on either different alignments of Thornton’s pipeline or leaving their water in the Poudre River. For the most part, the different pipeline alignments are outside the City or its Growth Management Area (GMA). If a portion of the pipeline goes through the City or its GMA, Thornton would need to meet the City’s requirements for pipelines and street standards. The City is interested in improving flows through Fort Collins and/or other benefits related to Thornton’s project. The City is willing to work collaboratively with Thornton and others to achieve these benefits. Examples include securing property to provide open space and a buffer between Fort Collins and Wellington and working with Thornton and others on the Poudre River In-Stream Augmentation Plan (as discussed by the Colorado Water Trust in meeting #2 of these meetings).

- **How will the December 17 Commissioners hearing be run?**
  
  **County’s Answer:** As of Nov. 26, the BCC proposes to hear a presentation from the applicant and open the meeting to public comment.

- **Why aren’t people allowed to ask questions to more than one person? We have many people here with different expertise and perspectives. Why can’t more than of them answer any given question by people in the Working Group?**
  
  **County’s Answer:** Questions can be directed to various independent experts or the applicant after meetings, depending on the topics.

**What is the single biggest barrier to each option for Thornton? What could be done to overcome each of those barriers?**

**Answer:** Addressed during the “Clarifying Questions” section under the “Review of Community Input from the November 15 Meeting” portion of Working Group Meeting #5; see summary.

---

**Reservoir and Storage Questions**

- **What will the actual impact on reservoir levels be if the water was run down the Poudre River?**
  
  **Thornton’s Answer:** The levels in the WSSC reservoirs (#3, #4, Kluver) would likely be lower if Thornton’s water was returned to the river instead of being diverted into the Larimer County Canal and stored in the WSSC reservoirs.
• How does the WSSC system work? The WSSC could present on its entire system.  
  Answer: Addressed during the “Intersection Between the WSSC and the Thornton Water Project” of Working Group Meeting #2, see summary.

• Could the County keep the reservoirs full by selling or giving the reservoir space to another municipality?  
  Answer: Addressed during Question/Answer at Working Group Meeting #2; see summary.

• What is the total capacity of WSSC #3, WSSC #4, Rocky Ridge, and Kluver Reservoirs?  
  Thornton’s Answer: The decreed capacity of the reservoirs are:
  
  o WSSC #3 – 4,826 Acre Feet
  o Kluver – 1,448 Acre Feet
  o WSSC #4 – 1,466 Acre Feet
  o Rocky Ridge – 4,000 Acre Feet

• What happens to water levels in WSSC Reservoir #3, #4, and Kluver Reservoir if Thornton’s water is diverted to the Poudre River and these reservoirs are not used for storage of Thornton’s Water?  
  Thornton’s Answer: The water levels are likely to be lower than if Thornton’s water was stored in those reservoirs.  
  WSSC’s Answer: The height of the dam at Reservoir #3, per the State Engineer’s records, is 41’ to the crest of the dam (different than the spillway elevation). The maximum water depth for calculating capacity, as measured from the bottom of the outlet pipe to the spillway, is 34’. In other words, the maximum water storage for that reservoir occurs at 34’ above the bottom (invert level) of the outlet pipe. The bottom of the reservoir may be somewhat deeper than the outlet pipe and structure, but that water is not accessible for irrigation or other uses because the reservoir bottom is lower than the outlet pipe invert level. If a new outlet were to be installed, say for sending water to a pump station, the depth might increase some and the capacity be increases slightly if the pipe to the pump station were lower than the existing outlet pipe.  
  The current reservoir water depth is about 18’. That’s fairly typical for this time of year for this reservoir.

River Conveyance Questions

• What are Thornton’s reasons that the water cannot flow down the Poudre?  
  Thornton’s Answer: addressed during Water Quality Webinar; see webinar.

• Could the County hire a water conveyance expert to pull all data together and outline a way in which water could be moved to Thornton under the Poudre River Concept?  
  County’s Answer: The County is not planning to hire additional consultants at this time.

• Can we combine NISP and Thornton in Poudre River- not have NISP in Douglas Road at all either?  
  Northern Answer: The NISP project will be conveying 18-25 cfs through the Poudre River year-round. NISP will need a pipeline to convey the remaining water to the NISP Participants for increased water quality and resiliency of the conveyance system (incase of poor water quality or emergency situations in the Poudre). NISP’s preferred route is the alignment north of Douglas Road closer to CR 56.
Traffic Questions

- **Traffic numbers:** We were told traffic volume numbers at intersections during peak hours. I'd like to know Average Daily Traffic Counts, please.
  
  *County's Answer:* Felsburg Holt & Ullevig conducted peak hour intersection counts at a number of intersections in the region as part of obtaining existing conditions traffic data. These data were covered in the webinar on November 6th and the traffic memo is posted on the website. Additionally, Larimer County Engineering conducts average daily traffic (ADT) counts of mainline County roads every two to three years. Data are collected using road tube traffic counters located at specific Traffic Stations. Traffic count data for individual traffic stations are available on our Road Information Locator (RIL) website: [https://maps1.larimer.org/gvh/?Viewer=RIL](https://maps1.larimer.org/gvh/?Viewer=RIL). It should be noted that the 2018 data are still in the process of being posted to this system so a tabulation of recent count data for Douglas Road is posted on the project website.

- **How would constructing a pipeline along a roadway affect traffic in Larimer County (including along Douglas Road and County Road 56)?**
  
  *Answer:* Addressed during Traffic webinar; see webinar.

- **How heavy is the current traffic along Douglas Road? Are the traffic counters that residents have seen along road corridors measuring this?**
  
  *County's Answer:* Felsburg Holt & Ullevig conducted peak hour intersection counts at a number of intersections in the region as part of obtaining existing conditions traffic data. These data were covered in the webinar on November 6th and the traffic memo is posted on the website. Additionally, Larimer County Engineering conducts average daily traffic (ADT) counts of mainline County roads every two to three years. Data are collected using road tube traffic counters located at specific Traffic Stations. Traffic count data for individual traffic stations are available on our Road Information Locator (RIL) website: [https://maps1.larimer.org/gvh/?Viewer=RIL](https://maps1.larimer.org/gvh/?Viewer=RIL). It should be noted that the 2018 data are still in the process of being posted to this system so a tabulation of recent count data for Douglas Road will be posted on the project website.

- **How is the concern about Water’s Edge and Hearthfire, etc. being integrated into the County’s analysis of Thornton’s 1041 and the County’s third-party traffic research/analysis (with FHU Engineering)? What communications have gone on with the city and the residential project planners to confirm their own timeline data and traffic estimates?**
  
  *County’s Answer:* These existing (Hearthfire) and proposed (Water’s Edge, Country Club Reserve) developments are being accounted for in the traffic conditions considered to be in existence at the time of pipeline construction. In other words, the Thornton pipeline construction impacts will be evaluated assuming these developments are built-out. Signalization of Douglas Road/SH1 and Country Club/Turnberry intersections is also expected to be complete prior to pipeline construction.

- **Disrupted homes:** Just based on my knowledge of where I live, the posited approximate number of disrupted homes (287) along Douglas Rd. appears to be very optimistically on the low side. What methodology was used to arrive at this number? For point of reference, there are 101 homes just in my single entry access Terry Point subdivision off Douglas Rd. To the west of me, Bayshore has 6 homes. Across from Bayshore, Starlight has 16 homes, to the east of me Terry Point Townhomes has 20, east of them a trailer park has 25, east of them Terry Cove has 18. That’s 186 homes in single access entry neighborhoods just within short walking distance - and I didn’t even count the homes located directly on Douglas Rd. There are several more single access communities and many more homes directly on Douglas Road. At one time, we
undertook a physical count. If memory serves between Turnberry and Shields, the number was over 400. Will look back and see if I can locate that info. 

*County’s Answer:* See Working Group Meeting #4 Summary, under “Option B (Douglas Road): Questions.”

**Water Quality, Flow, and Supply Questions**

- **What potentially relevant water technology is on the horizon?**
  *Thornton’s Answer:* Thornton monitors emerging technologies in facility construction and water treatment. Examples of these include forward osmosis and ion-selective membranes. However, these emerging technologies are for specialized, small-scale, low rate systems and not proven for the large scale, high rate systems typical for a municipal drinking water supply. As a municipal water supplier charged with providing sufficient quantities of water that meet federal drinking water standards, Thornton utilizes proven technologies to maximize reliability and minimize risk to public health and supply quantity.

- **What are the facts about the quality and quantity changes to Thornton’s water if it were to be run down the river rather than through a pipeline?**
  *Answer:* Addressed during Water Flow and Quality Webinar; see webinar.

- **Water quality testing has been done at current water flows. Running Thornton’s water down the Poudre would increase flows, dilute pollutants, and improve water quality at Windsor. Can you quantify this improvement? How much would it be improved?**
  *Thornton’s Answer:* There is no current authority or means to protect such dilution flows from being used by other water users by diversion, exchange, or other means. Consequently, it is not a given that water quality would improve which makes quantification of any improvement infeasible.

- **Provide third-party consultant water quality data for the website.**
  *Northern’s Answer:* Provided link to US Army Corps of Engineers website for all FEIS data, which includes Water Quality data.

- **Provide more information about how the City of Fort Collins water quality data compares to Northern Water's.**
  *Northern’s Answer:* The data utilized for the US Army Corps of Engineers permitting and State 401 Water Quality work is from a large database that was built by Northern Water utilizing data from the City of Fort Collins, Greeley, USGS, CDPHE, and others. The data is therefore, the same.

- **Provide EIS technical information regarding issues with ensuring base supply from using the river.**
  *Northern’s Answer:* Provided link to US Army Corps of Engineers website for all FEIS data, which includes Water Quality data.

- **Donovan-"willing sellers"-at what cost?**
  *Northern’s Answer:* Through its Fish and Wildlife Mitigation and Enhancement Plan, NISP is committing nearly $60 million toward mitigation and enhancement for the local environment and wildlife including recreation/fishery benefits at Glade Reservoir and habitat conservation covering about 1,400 acres around Glade Reservoir.

- **Why not take water from Weld County? That’s where their water is! 95%.**
  *Thornton’s Answer:* The Flows/Water Quality webinar provided information on the many considerations associated with the suggestion that Thornton divert its water from the Larimer County Canal in Weld County. Those considerations included degraded water quality, and an inability to reliably deliver Thornton’s water at all times necessary.
• Does the river’s water quality vary over time? Are there better or worse times of year to draw water from the river?
  Thornton’s Answer: Water quality in the river varies over time and degrades as it moves downstream from the mouth of the Poudre Canyon to the confluence with the South Platte east of Greeley. It also varies over time due to natural influences and flow fluctuations, as well as runoff from agricultural and urban areas. Information on river water quality is provided in the Water Quality and Flows webinar.

• No Pipe Dream hired a hydrologist to do a report on the quality of the river’s water at Reservoir #4 and at downtown Fort Collins. The hydrologist found that the quality was the same at both locations. No Pipe Dream could provide the report to the group if this information is useful.
  Answer: The No Pipe Dream water quality report was provided to Larimer County as part of Thornton’s 1041 Permit process and is part of the record. It can be found on the project website under “Participant Items.”

• What are the potential impacts of water shrinkage on down-ditch and downstream water users?
  Thornton’s Answer: Water loss is assessed against the entity transporting water downstream or down a ditch. The assessed water loss is intended to ensure that other water users, such as downstream water users, are not injured. Thornton’s pipeline will not decrease water flows for users downstream on the Poudre, and Thornton will operate its system such that users down ditch on the Larimer County Canal receive the water flows to which they are entitled.

• Could Larimer County and/or Fort Collins help the City of Thornton use the Poudre River alternative by helping to improve the river’s water quality?
  County’s Answer: This topic would have to be addressed by the Commissioners and ultimately through the County’s policy and budgeting process. At this time, the County does not have a goal or policy to do this, nor has it budgeted to support financially. Fort Collins would also have to address this from a budget and policy standpoint.

• Is the water that Northern and Thornton could add to the Poudre River exciting for Save the Poudre? What CFS or peak flow would Save the Poudre like to see?
  Save the Poudre’s Answer: Long story short, the river needs a lot more water to be “healthy.” See “Figure 4” (“Recommended Flow Regime) in “Constructing an Interdisciplinary Flow Regime Recommendation,” posted under the “Participant Items” tab on the project website.

• Would Thornton’s water quality consultants take exception with any of the measurements or conclusions found in LRB Hydrology and Analytics’ analysis of water quality in the Poudre? If there are differences, how would Thornton’s water quality consultant justify those?
  Thornton’s Answer: Thornton provided information on this topic as part of the Water Quality and Flows Webinar. Thornton’s water quality experts did not complete a point-by-point comparison of their studies and the LRB report.

Other Questions

• Please provide:
  o A detailed listing of who Thornton sells water to, as noted in the 2018 budget below page 304, under “Bulk Water Sales”.
    Thornton’s Answer: The bulk water lease in the budget is a lease Thornton has with the City of Westminster for 2.2 million gallons per day (mgd). This lease has been in place since 1982.
- A detailed listing of who Thornton leases water to, as noted in the 2018 budget below page 304, under "Water Leases".
  *Thornton’s Answer*: The water leases in the budget are:
  a. Leases to the Central Colorado Water Conservation District for augmentation of their irrigation wells.
  b. Leases of WSSC water to WSSC farmers.
  c. Leases of other South Platte and Clear Creek ditch company shares to local farmers.

- Related to "Oil and Gas Leases" in the 2018 budget below page 304, I want a detailed listing of each oil and gas lease and its location.
  *Thornton’s Answer*: A summary of the city’s properties encumbered by oil and gas leases will be posted on the project website, as will a summary of Thornton’s Water Fund revenue.

- Is there a plan to install fiber optic cable along Douglas Road if Douglas is the selected route? If not, why not? Multiple carriers would be advisable.
  *Thornton’s Answer*: Thornton plans to install multiple fiber optic conduits along with the pipeline.
  *Northern’s Answer*: There is a potential to install a small fiber optic cable for data transfer for the pipelines if in Douglas Road or outside of Douglas Road. This would not affect the trench size, easement, or duration of installation. We do not have a plan to include public-use fiber but would coordinate with any cable company's plan for fiber-optic installation.

- Siano, etc.-Purchase parcels to become parks. Question: who pays?
  *Answer*: Addressed during Working Group Meeting #3; see summary under “What if both pipeline projects use the Douglas Road public right-of-way corridor as a shared conveyance?”
Larimer Water Projects Working Group Meeting #3
Hearing Room, Larimer County Building
Wednesday, Oct. 24, 2018, 6:00 PM - 9:00 PM
Meeting Summary – FINAL

Notes about this document:

- This is a summary of the meeting only. It is not a comprehensive list of all the statements made during the meeting.
- Inclusion in this document is not an endorsement of the truth or accuracy of the statements made during this meeting.
- In the interest of brevity, some statements have been combined into one or two sentences. Some nuance may have been lost in the process. This was unintentional.
- Any mistakes in summarizing the meeting were unintentional and do not negate the value or impact of the statements made during the meeting.

ATTENDANCE


(*Alternate)

Larimer County Staff: Todd Blomstrom, Lesli Ellis, Rob Helmick, and Mark Peterson

Facilitation: Heather Bergman and Dan Myers

Observers:
City of Thornton: Emily Hunt, Mark Koleber, and Gerald Simpson

Northern Water: Carl Brouwer and Christie Coleman

Public Observers: Approximately 35 members of the public observed the meeting.

ACTION ITEMS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County Staff and Project Proponents</th>
<th>Use list of remaining information needs to prepare for the three informational webinars.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Peak Facilitation</td>
<td>• Post “what-if” presentations on the project website.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Send instructions for how to tune into the three informational webinars.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Send group members an email inviting initial questions for the webinars.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
REVIEW AND FINALIZATION OF INTEREST LIST
Heather Bergman of Peak Facilitation Group welcomed the Working Group and led a discussion of the group's list of interests. The discussion is summarized below.

- At the end of the first Working Group meeting, group members reviewed a summary of public comments made about the Thornton Water Project and the Northern Integrated Supply Project (NISP). Group members then listed those of their interests that were not included in the summary of public comments. Since then, several group members have submitted additional suggestions of interests to include on the list to Peak.
- Peak provided a categorized list of group members interests and asked group members if any of their interests were missing from the list, which will be used to assess "what-if" ideas and new ideas from the project proponents.
- A group member suggested that "the outcome of the project must include a 1041 permit" should be included as an interest. There were concerns about that interest being somewhat binary and potentially limiting the number of ideas that could meet that criterion.
- A group member suggested that "creating the shortest possible pipeline out of Larimer County" should be an interest, because doing so would cause the least disturbance and destruction to wildlife, trees, etc. Protecting wildlife and maintaining the type and size of trees currently found in the construction areas are already found on the list of interests.
- It might be overambitious to decide whether any alternatives meet the 1041 criteria because it could take years to research those alternatives. However, the goal is to provide a thorough list of interests so that group members can use it to determine which ideas might work.
- There were questions about the need (or lack thereof) to include NISP in future group discussions. At the last meeting, Peak said that it is up to the group to decide whether and how more information about NISP should be provided in this process. The will of the group will be considered when deciding whether or not to address NISP at future meetings. There will probably be at least one group member who disagrees with each "what-if" idea or information need, and it is fine if group members do not agree on what should be included in those conversations.

PRESENTATION OF WORKING GROUP "WHAT-IF" IDEAS
Group members presented their "what-if" ideas for ways for the City of Thornton or Northern Water to maximize community benefits and mitigate any negative impacts of their respective water projects. Key themes from each presentation are summarized below. The full version of each presenter's speaker notes and/or PowerPoint slides can be found on the project website (www.larimerwaterprojects.org) under the “Wednesday, Oct.24” header within the “Working Group” tab.
Mark Heiden, Christine Kratt, Ron Linkenheil, Jim Rios, Jason Roudebush, and Priscilla Siano

Note: Mark Heiden could not attend this meeting.

What if both pipeline projects use the Douglas Road public right-of-way corridor as a shared conveyance?

- The presenters assumed that it was most likely that the pipeline will go down Douglas Road because Thornton will probably not allow its water to go down the Poudre River. If that is the case, both Northern and Thornton should minimize the disruptions and negative impacts of their projects by using the same conveyance route.

- The shared route should run along as much public right-of-way and Thornton-owned land as possible.

- One way to minimize negative impacts would be for the City of Thornton to purchase land adjacent to the pipeline to preserve the area north of Fort Collins. There is an 80-acre parcel at the southwest corner of Turnberry and Douglas Roads that could be purchased as a buffer for the Montava and Water’s Edge developments. Other potential land to use as buffer includes a 246-acre parcel (owned by the Water Supply and Storage Company (WSSC)) off of County Road 56 that could serve as an open-space buffer to development north and west of Highway 287 and a 300-acre parcel (owned by Thornton) at the northeast corner of Turnberry and Douglas Roads that could be used as a conservation easement.

- The Powerline Trail near Loveland serves as a Larimer County precedent for this approach.

What if (as a condition of 1041 approval) Thornton dedicates a long-term fund to acquire senior water rights from willing sellers to improve flows in the Poudre River?

- This approach would lead to a tangible increase in base flows through Fort Collins while engaging Thornton to take an interest in the river over the long term. It has the added benefits of providing a framework for mitigating the negative impacts of future water projects and of being compatible with existing Colorado water law.

- The most significant drawback to this option is that it would require the City of Fort Collins to improve existing diversion structures on the Poudre River.

Ideas for mitigating pipeline construction impacts and potential post-construction benefits

- The project implementers could mitigate disruptions to traffic (which is particularly heavy between Shields Street and Highway 1) by doing as much of the more disruptive work as possible at night to minimize lane closures. More broadly, the bid sent out to contractors for this construction could ask applicants to be as creative as possible about minimizing the impacts of the project.

- The presenters discussed (but did not agree on) the idea of closing Douglas Road to everything but local traffic during construction.

- The project could also use short, temporary roads to provide access to single-entry areas.

- The contractor could work under certain noise limits during daytime hours or use noise mitigation fences when communities request them.

- The project could be expedited by providing contract incentives to finish the project early and penalties for completing it late.

- An ambulance could be staged near Douglas Road as part of an emergency response plan designed to reduce emergency response times during construction.

- The construction will hopefully include the installation of a traffic light at Highway 1 to improve safety as well as new bike lanes.
The importance of buffer zones in conserving agricultural land and wildlife habitat

- Creating buffer zones could help to meet several group interests and to meet the requests from the County Commissioners to consider the possibility of NISP and the Thornton Water Project aligning their conveyances and to provide a clear benefit to Larimer County residents.
- Residents of the area north of Fort Collins chose to live there because of the beautiful natural environment, wildlife, low traffic, and agricultural land (among other reasons).
- Thornton has preserved some land in the area to protect its water rights. Much of that land will eventually be transitioned to farming or developmental uses.
- Thornton and Northern Water could support the Poudre River alternative by preserving land for those most directly impacted.
- Gifted land could create buffer zones that protect animals, decrease traffic, maintain agricultural land, provide potential tax benefits, and fits within a new northern Fort Collins nature park.
- The area includes several Conservation Development neighborhoods and one of only two Important Bird Areas in Larimer County. These special areas should not be crossed by any pipeline. Setting aside more land to protect areas like these could help to preserve important wildlife such as monarch butterflies, mountain lions, herons, protected raptor species, and mountain bluebirds.

Ryan Donovan

Note: Ryan Donovan could not attend this meeting, so Heather Bergman read his written ideas to the group.

What if Thornton funded an organization to secure in-stream water rights and administer other mitigation funds?

- The organization could purchase senior water rights from willing sellers and dedicate those to the Colorado Water Conservation Board (CWCB) for use in its in-stream flow program.
- It could also fund physical improvement to infrastructure along the Poudre through Fort Collins.
- The group could be formalized into a special district or nonprofit with a diverse board of directors (from recreation, conservation, municipal, and agricultural interests) that administers mitigation funds from Thornton and others.
- This idea is consistent with Colorado water law, sets a framework for mitigating future water projects, ensures that Thornton stays engaged in keeping water in the Poudre, and maintains local control of the process rather than subjecting those involved to the water court process.

Penny Hillman

What if Thornton used a modified “West 2” route in alignment with Northern Water’s preferred route for the NISP pipeline?

- If Thornton will not access its water via the Poudre River, it needs to provide a reasonable alternative that minimizes negative impacts and maximizes benefits to Larimer County residents.
- The first segment of the “West 2” route could be modified to run east of WSSC Reservoir #4 and then north. Thornton has shown that this route is possible, and this option would avoid running through the Braidwood community west of WSSC Reservoir#4.
• The modification would also minimize construction costs, impacts to property, and traffic impacts.

What if Thornton mitigated impacts on private property by paying a prorated amount of property tax on easements that it acquires for pipelines?
This agreement could apply to all subsequent owners of the land involved.

What if Thornton donated farms that it owns in Larimer County to the Larimer County Open Lands program?
• This option would benefit recreational and natural areas while preserving the heritage of northern Larimer County.
• A 2013 Larimer County report stated that land conservation in Larimer County could add up to 30% to the value of homes in Conservation Developments. The same report stated that proximity to open space resulted in a residential property value increase of $414 million.
• Thornton’s 2017 farm operations report stated that the City owned 802 acres of farmland that will continue to be irrigated until 2030. The City also has 788 acres in its revegetation program.
• The Larimer County Assessor values dry farmland at $122 per acre, which makes the value of the revegetation acres around $96,000 (much less than what Thornton would have paid to rebuild Douglas Road if that option had been approved). Thornton’s Municipal Code allows Thornton to sell or dispose of its farmland if the City Council agrees. Donating the land aligns well with the Northern Colorado Community Separator Study and Larimer County’s Open Land’s Master Plan, and would maximize benefits to Larimer County, especially because county residents cited open space as a top concern in a 2013 “quality of life” survey.

Bob Kitchell

What if Thornton used “the northern route” for its pipeline?
• This “what-if” does not presume that Thornton prefers to use a pipeline to convey its water from WSSC Reservoir #4.
• The County Commissioners tabled Thornton’s application for a 1041 permit to build a pipeline along Douglas Road because the application did not meet several of the 1041 review criteria, including #2, which specifies that applicants must provide reasonable siting and design alternatives or adequately explain why such alternatives are unavailable.
• Both Northern Water and Thornton have investigated the possibility of using a northern route. The northern route is Northern Water’s preferred route for moving water from Glade Reservoir to NISP participants. Three out of four of Thornton’s preferred routes ran along Douglas Road.
• It is worth considering the respective benefits of using a public right-of-way versus a dedicated right-of-way on private land. The former minimizes the use of private land, and the latter allows relative ease of construction, minimal disruption to the public, and easy access for maintenance.
• Northern Water has written that it considers a dedicated right-of-way to be its best case scenario. There are also benefits to routing both pipelines through the same corridor.
• This routing option would have the disadvantages of running along a heavily used arterial road, requiring extensive construction, and being difficult to access for maintenance.
• The northern route should be further studied to avoid subdivisions/residences and to find ways to accommodate up to three pipelines.

Janet Carabello

• Polling showed that 90% of residents from Hearthfire (a community of 146 homes where the presenter lives) who responded to a survey opposed the use of a pipeline along Douglas Road because of the possibility of closures near Water’s Edge, among other reasons.
• There were many comments from the survey of Hearthfire residents in support of the Poudre River option.

What if Larimer County joins Thornton and WSSC to explore the possibility of using water swaps to get Thornton its water while reducing or eliminating the need for new conveyances? Thornton could use the same pipeline as Northern Water east of I-25.

What if Save the Poudre produced a scientific assessment of river flows and collaborated with the project proponents to meet peak and base flow objectives?

What if the City of Fort Collins evaluated the soft and hard dollar benefits that would accrue to the City of Fort Collins if Thornton’s water is a) left in the Poudre or b) put back in the Poudre and then the City agreed to share some of those benefits with Thornton?

What if all the communities and businesses with a stake in keeping the Poudre River viable at peak flows put pressure on the US Army Corps of Engineers to expedite a permit for Thornton to put its water back into the river and divert it in Windsor?

• If Thornton’s biggest obstacle to using the Poudre River is the federal permitting process, those with a stake in keeping the river viable could use letters, petitions, phone calls, etc. to pressure the Corps to allow Thornton to put the water back in the river in a shorter timeframe.
• The cost of this effort could be financed by stakeholders.

Jim McCauley

What if Thornton used the Poudre River option?

• The County Commissioners asked Thornton to get more input from citizens and to provide more benefit to Larimer County when they tabled Thornton's 1041 application.
• City of Thornton staff developed the option to keep the water in the Poudre. They presented that option to their City Council in 2014. The Poudre River option was even used the option as its “baseline” and listed it first among its proposed routes. City staff estimated that using the Poudre River for conveyance and building a new reservoir would cost roughly $400 million, which is $15 million less than the pipeline option.
• The City of Thornton has implied that there will be more than one phase to this project.
• The rough budget for the Poudre River option includes the construction of a new reservoir and the total replacement of an existing water treatment plant.
• One of the key criteria for evaluating 1041 applications is the “reasonableness” of a given option. The Poudre River option is less disruptive than a pipeline, so it seems more “reasonable.”
• While the pipeline might maximize benefits to Thornton citizens, it would cause disruption, diminish property values, create a pumping station, etc., which does not benefit Larimer
County. The County has no obligation to provide a benefit to Thornton residents at any cost to Larimer County residents.

- The concerns of Larimer County residents would be addressed by eliminating the need for new infrastructure north of the river. Thornton views applying for a federal permit to send the water down the Poudre as the greatest risk within the project. However, other entities like Northern Water, the City of Greeley, and the City of Fort Collins have applied to the US Army Corps of Engineers for permits, so it is reasonable for Thornton to do so, too.

- The Poudre River option saves Thornton money, complies with the Larimer County Land Use Code, protects private property, and is reasonable. If it were not, Thornton staff would not have presented it to their City Council.

Gary Wockner

**What if Thornton used the Poudre River option?**

- Open Records Act requests have shown that, despite their previous statements to the contrary, Thornton has ideas for overcoming obstacles (water quality, water quantity, water court, reservoir storage, firm yields, costs, etc.) to using the Poudre River option.
- Thornton does not want to comply with federal law by going through the federal permitting process.
- The City of Fort Collins’ Poudre River Report Card shows that the area where Thornton would put its water back into the river under this option is one of the parts of the river in greatest need of that water.
- The water could benefit recreational river uses like tubing by greatly increasing the number of floatable days through downtown Fort Collins.
- The positive impacts of extended peak flows in the river from the addition of Thornton’s water include benefits to native fish, sediment flushing, easier spawning for trout, less algae growth, flourishing wetlands, expanded recreation options, decreased flooding, and natural beauty.
- It is reasonable for Thornton to help to save the Poudre.

Charmaine Stavedahl

**What are the economic benefits to Fort Collins of Thornton using the Poudre River option?**

- A 2011 assessment of the possibility of creating a white water park in Fort Collins stated that annual sales revenue for nearby businesses would increase with increased river flows.
- A 2010 survey of kayakers indicated that the kayakers would visit the area more often if peak flows added more time to the best portion of the kayaking season. Those drawn to the area for recreation would spend money in Old Town or elsewhere along the river if Thornton put even more water into the river.
- The Director of Public Works for the City of Golden estimated that Golden’s water park and waterfront brings $2 million in annual revenue to the city. Golden has filed for in-stream water rights to protect in-stream flows through the park. The Poudre River needs similar protections and flows.

Karen Wagner

**What if the Thornton Water Project offered benefits to Larimer County?**

- The need for Thornton to provide benefits to Larimer County has been largely absent from
Work Product of Peak Facilitation Group

Working Group discussions even though it was central to the decision of the County Commissioners to table the 1041 application.

- During the August 1 hearing, Commissioner Johnson cited a case in which Eagle County denied a 1041 permit to Colorado Springs because the project benefits Colorado Springs residents while burdening Eagle County residents. The takeaway is that Thornton’s application will be denied if it does not provide significant benefits to Larimer County.
- There are similarities between the Thornton Water Project and the City of Colorado Springs’ Southern Delivery System, which took water from Pueblo County.
- Since the August 1 hearing, Thornton has made statements that are not in keeping with the County Commissioners’ direction to return with a significantly different application that benefits Larimer County. Thornton has dismissed proposed alternatives as unreasonable.
- The cost of the project to the applicant is not part of the 1041 criteria. Thornton also knows from its own analysis that the Poudre River option will save it millions of dollars and prevent additional delays.
- The Poudre River option provides pure benefits to Larimer County residents with no negatives and offers benefits to Fort Collins.
- The City of Fort Collins is already working to create community separators for dried out properties, so that can happen in conjunction with the Poudre River option.
- It seems counterproductive to discuss pipeline routes and their different impacts on properties in neighborhoods when the Commissioners do not want to pick winners and losers among their constituents. The Poudre River option avoids the need to do so.

Bobbi Norman

What if Thornton used the Larimer County Canal?

- The Larimer County Canal runs near three large Thornton properties in Larimer County, but the vast majority of the City’s farm properties are in Weld County. Thornton could run the water down the canal into Weld County and build any necessary reservoirs on its own property.
- The problem with the pipeline options is that they would be disruptive to residences, cross under canals and ditches, and potentially crack layers of shale in a manner that could flood nearby basements.
- Using the canal would remove the need to go under canals and ditches, eliminate the need to cross I-25 and Highway 1, and maintain historic water levels in Kluver, WSSC #3, and WSSC #4 Reservoirs. As Commissioner Gaiter said at the August 1 hearing, the job of the Commissioners is to protect Larimer County citizens. This option would do that.

What if Thornton used the Poudre River option?

- Using the Poudre River option would eliminate 20 miles of new pipeline and the resulting destruction and disturbance. This disturbance would remove mature trees that would take decades to come back. The trees take in bad gases and provide habitat for wildlife. This is about more than just traffic and homes.
- The option would save Thornton Citizens $50-100 million by eliminating the need for the 20 miles of extra pipeline.
- Thornton could use the savings to build needed reservoirs that it has discussed in the past.
- Thornton’s main objections are the difficulty of the federal permitting process, water quality/quantity concerns, and building a new reservoir at Windsor.
- The question is whether a given option is reasonable. At the August 1 hearing, Commissioner Johnson stated that none of those objections are part of the 1041 criteria.
Commissioner Donnelly said that this project would have impacts forever, so it is crucial to plan and consider options carefully.

One option is to use the Larimer County Canal, but the best option is to send the water down the Poudre.

WHAT IS NEXT FOR THE WORKING GROUP

Heather Bergman provided an outline and options for how the Working Group could use its remaining meeting time, as well as details on upcoming opportunities to meet outstanding information needs.

- Peak Facilitation and County staff want to make sure that all unanswered information requests are met. These requests will be rolled into one more opportunity for information.
- The plan is to ask the project proponents to provide information on water flows/quality (November 5 from 4:30 pm-6:00 pm), constructability (November 5 from 12:00 pm-1:00 pm), and traffic concerns (November 6 from 10:00 am-11:00 am). Since not all group members want to hear more presentations, these three topics will be discussed during webinar sessions that are optional for Working Group members to attend or watch. The project proponents will invite questions in advance from group members watching the webinars so that the presentations can be as pertinent as possible. Peak will send instructions on how to access the webinar. The webinar will be recorded, and a link to the webinar will be posted on the project website and sent to the entire Working Group. Peak Facilitation will also provide more easily digestible summaries of the webinars for those who do not want to watch the recordings or attend the live webinar. There will also be an option to ask follow-up questions on the webinars at the fourth Working Group meeting.
- The next Working Group meeting will be on November 13. There are several options for how the Working Group can use its time that evening:
  - Additional “what-if” presentations.
  - Responses to information requests (including those raised by the “what-if ideas”).
  - Discussion of existing “what-if” ideas.
  - Responses from Thornton, Northern, and/or Larimer County to Working Group “what-if” ideas.
  - “Sneak peek” at Thornton’s presentation for the November 15 community meeting.
- The Working Group can also provide other ideas for how to spend that meeting time.
- The second community meeting is scheduled for November 15. Working Group members who attended the first community meeting were frustrated that Thornton did not provide new ideas. Thornton will prepare new ideas and alternatives to present at this meeting. The community will be asked to evaluate those ideas against the Working Group’s list of interests. There will also be an opportunity to provide other ideas for alignment options. The role of Northern Water in this meeting is still unclear because few of tonight’s “what-if” ideas pertained to Northern Water.
- At the last Working Group meeting on November 27, the Working Group could discuss what was presented at the November 15 community meeting. This meeting will be the Working Group’s chance to do a final evaluation of options, “what-if” ideas, and Thornton’s new ideas against the interest list. Group members can also make statements that will be conveyed to the Commissioners.


**Group Discussion**

Group members discussed the next steps for the Working Group. The discussion is summarized below.

- Thornton has spoken at many meetings and hearings throughout this process. Thornton has rebutted alternative ideas at the 1041 hearings and Working Group meetings. Thornton should not be driving this process. The community should decide what happens. There is no need to hear from Thornton again.
- Thornton was asked to provide viable alternatives. The Working Group should not entertain the same ideas from Thornton. It should not be difficult for Thornton to work with the group to find reasonable alternatives rather than revisiting old ideas, especially if Thornton has new ideas to present at the community meeting. The fourth Working Group meeting should be used to hear new ideas.
- Thornton will bring new ideas to the community meeting. The facilitator will hold Thornton to its agreement to provide new ideas rather than rehashing old ones.
- The webinars will cover the same pipeline ideas that Thornton has proposed before because they will be held before the next opportunity for input. If group members want to see new ideas in the webinars, they can suggest that. The webinars will cover what Thornton knows now, but the community meeting presentation will feature new ideas.
- The webinars are being offered because group members have requested more information on each of those three topics.
- The webinars will discuss pipeline impacts and costs, among other topics.
- The webinars will cover three conveyance alignments: the northern route, Douglas Road, and Shields Street.
- The traffic webinar should measure impacts on routes adjacent to County Road 56.
- The webinars will be presented by third-party consultants hired by Larimer and Thornton. County and Thornton staff will be in the room to answer questions if needed. A list of remaining information needs will be used to inform the content of the webinars.
- Larimer County retains consultants as part of its intergovernmental agreement (IGA) with Thornton and Northern Water. Larimer County chose the consultants, and the project proponents pay for them.
- After the November 27 meeting, Peak Facilitation will prepare a report on the Working Group process for the County Commissioners. Peak will send the group a draft of that report by December 3 with all of the group’s meeting summaries attached. The report will mostly be a summary of what happened at the Working Group meetings. There will be ten days to review the report between when it is submitted to the Commissioners on December 7 and the hearing on Thornton’s new 1041 application on December 17. If the group decides to present its preliminary ideas at the November 13 meeting, it could have a little more time.
- Peak Facilitation can show the Working Group an example of a similar recommendation report that the company has prepared in the past, although these reports are different for different public processes. The report will contain everything the Working Group has discussed at each meeting, all of the relevant attachments, and every meeting summary. That is why it is important for Working Group members to ensure that the meeting summaries are accurate.
- There is not enough time for reviewing the issues and alternatives on the table after the November 27 meeting in time for the Commissioners hearing on December 17. There also needs to be a Planning Commission during that time. The next meeting should be spent working on specific ideas rather than exploring more information.
- There is no Planning Commission hearing planned for the Thornton Water Project, but there is one anticipated (but not scheduled) in the future for NISP. The Commissioners
could decide to hold another Planning Commission hearing for Thornton after their December 17 hearing, but that seems unlikely.

- Unless the County Commissioners are prepared to vote yes or no on the 1041 application at the December 17 hearing, the public comment period needs to be extended.
- The Working Group can make a recommendation about extending the process if it wishes.
- The Save the Poudre legal team has said that if Thornton comes to the December 17 hearing with a new application, the 1041 application process will need to start over again.
- The Working Group and Thornton could spend one of the next meetings discussing a compromise with open minds to find a win-win alternative to submit to the Commissioners.

Thornton is in the process of developing the three webinars so that it can incorporate the ideas of Working Group members. Thornton is willing to have two conversations (one on pipeline options and one on Poudre River questions) with the Working Group about “what-ifs” and "yes-ifs." The involved parties could look at maps and spend a meeting on each subject.

- The Working Group could examine areas of overlap between the “what-if” ideas and see if the Working Group, Thornton, and Northern can provide some agreed-upon recommendations to submit to the Commissioners.
- The Working Group could hear proponent and County responses to “what-if” ideas, but not if they will simply rebut them.
- The proponents could provide "yes, if" feedback on four major project concepts: the Douglas Road pipeline, the northern route pipeline, the Poudre River option, and the Larimer County Canal option.
- The group could spend the first hour of its next meeting identifying answers to questions posed by the “what-if” presentations.
- The group could create a couple of broad packages of ideas to evaluate against the list of interests and submit those to the Commissioners rather than sending an overwhelming amount of ideas.
- The Working Group needs more data to vet all of the ideas under consideration properly.
- Working Group members could attend a Thornton City Council meeting to inform City Council members of the positions of Larimer County residents.
- The WSSC’s board is committed to using a pump station at WSSC#4 but is open to different alignment options.
- Northern Water should be in this conversation. It would be disappointing to have to have the same conversation about NISP rather than dealing with it at the same time as Thornton.
- This process will have lasting impacts and should not be rushed.
- A campaign to pressure the US Army Corps of Engineers to permit the Poudre River option could be effective.
- The Working Group could evaluate a package of ideas from each of those conversations and send those to the Commissioners.
- The group could focus on the best two or three new ideas.
- Larimer County staff held more times for meetings but released those times once they had found time for the five meetings that were originally planned. Staff could look for availability for a subgroup meeting if the group wishes.
- There should not be any subgroups at this point in the process.
- The Working Group can discuss the Douglas Road route, northern route, Larimer County Canal option, and Poudre River option. The group could also discuss other ideas like land conservation that could apply to any alternative.
- If Thornton could have saved a lot of money by sending the water down the river but chose
not to, there may be ways in which it plans to profit from the pipeline. The Working Group should be cautious about that possibility. The fracking industry is buying a lot of water right now.

- It is Thornton’s job to solve the problems involved in the project based on the ideas that Working Group members have provided.
- It is concerning that Thornton said that the Larimer County Canal would not work because it freezes in the winter, because it does not seem clear why that is. Trickery is a worry.
- It is not financially realistic to expect Thornton to pay $50-100 million to buy other water in the Poudre. The market-based minimum stream flow plan is smoke and mirrors. The webinars also sound like discussions of building pipelines. The community should focus on putting its own ideas forward.
- The Douglas Road option should be off the table. The Commissioners will not approve it.
- It is unfair to determine a solution without involving all stakeholders, including Thornton.
- It is important to know if it is feasible to fit two or three pipelines within one or any of these route options.
- Unreasonable routes need to be debunked soon so that the group does not waste its time on options that cannot work.
- The Commissioners did not say that the pipeline could not come down Douglas Road. They said to mitigate impacts and to consider other routes including the Poudre River.

NEXT STEPS
- The November 13 Working Group meeting will be spent discussing the Douglas Road route, northern route, Larimer County Canal option, and Poudre River option. Group members should come with an open mind and be prepared to work around tables with maps.
- Working Group members should send their presentations or speaker notes to Peak Facilitation for posting on the project website. The presentations will also be included in Peak’s report to the Commissioners.
- Group members should reach out to each with questions about “what-if” ideas and could find commonalities to work on between those ideas.

Public Comment Card Input

Observers at the meeting had the opportunity to provide comments or questions on cards. Submitted questions and comments are included below, transcribed verbatim from comment cards.

Public Comment Card Questions
- Why not take water from Weld County? That’s where their water is! 95%
- Siano, etc.-Purchase parcels to become parts. Question: who pays?
- Donovan- “willing sellers”-at what cost?
- Why have we heard not one word from the representative of the City of Fort Collins?
- How can we test the WSSC/Thornton assertion that going back to water court is a non-starter? Could this just be a red herring?

Public Comment Card Comments
- Eagle Lake Presentation: Sadly, the Eagle Lake presentation the same as always- not in my backyard, put it down Douglas Road. Our County Commissioners told us Thornton needed to look at other options, not just Douglas Road. The Eagle Lake owners were at that meeting. They simply will not hear! They are very selfish! Goal of Eagle Lake-not in our backyard! We constantly hear about the "great wildlife" in the Eagle Lake area. The wildlife live on our
property! We share with deer, fox, bunnies, birds, etc. Not only Eagle Lake has wildlife! We have seven acres to our property-full of wildlife.

- River option-best presentation!
- Choose most northern route. Do not put pumphouse on Dick’s property. Do not go down Douglas Road. Thank you.
- Are present regulations for permits, etc. being relaxed by our federal government at this time. Might this have a quick and positive result for any permit to run their water through the Poudre River.
- Hillman- “pie in the sky.”
- Stavedahl-water park=more I-25 traffic!
- McCauley- “unreasonable” Thornton pipeline.
- Wagner- Good facts. Counterproductive pipeline. Ideas. Application to respect all Larimer County residents.
- Norman-shale factures, LCC Canal to Weld County. Canal route. 20 miles of disturbance and destruction. “Forever.”
INTRODUCTION
Lesli Ellis, Director of Community Development for Larimer County, provided a brief overview of the Larimer Water Projects engagement process and the alternatives that the webinars will address.

- This is the first of three webinars being offered to answer the technical questions that have come up in the Working Group process so far. The second webinar (on water quality and flow) will be offered on November 5 at 4:30 PM and the third webinar (on traffic) will be offered on November 6 at 10:00 AM.
- The webinars are part of a broader engagement process requested by the Board of County Commissioners when they tabled Thornton’s 1041 permit application. The process has included Working Group and community meetings held to review new ideas and alternatives related to Thornton’s 1041 application and to consider possible co-locations of Thornton and Northern Water conveyances.
- The Working Group is being asked to provide the Board of County Commissioners with ideas about how to mitigate or minimize the negative impacts and maximize the benefits of the ideas and alternatives for Thornton’s application.
- More information about the engagement process can be found at: [www.larimerwaterprojects.org](http://www.larimerwaterprojects.org)
- Key upcoming events for the engagement process include:
  - Working Group Meeting #4-November 13
  - Public Meeting #2-November 15
  - Working Group Meeting #5-November 27
  - Board of County Commissioners Hearing-December 17
- Note that this schedule is still subject to change.
- County staff have used the input they have received so far to create a list of five broad options for discussion in these webinars. There is room for variation in these options. The Working Group will examine various options and discuss ways to minimize the negatives and maximize the benefits of each of them.
- The range of options is as follows:
  - **Option A: Canal Conveyance.** This conveyance would use a pumpstation and return pipeline at Water Supply and Storage Company (WSSC) Reservoir #4 to take water to the Larimer County and North Poudre canals. The canals would convey the water from the northwest corner of WSSC Reservoir #3 to County Line Road, where a pipeline would convey the water to Thornton.
  - **Option B: Douglas Road (County Road 54).** A pipeline carrying Thornton’s water would run from WSSC Reservoir #4 to Douglas Road, where it would run east in parallel with a pipeline for the Northern Integrated Supply Project (NISP).
Option C: North Route (County Road 56). A pipeline carrying Thornton’s water would run from the south end of WSSC Reservoir #4 to another pipeline just south of WSSC Reservoir #3 by either running north Vista Lake Drive on the west side of WSSC Reservoir #4 or by running on the eastern edge of WSSC Reservoir #4. The pipeline would then run from south of WSSC Reservoir #3 (where it would meet a NISP pipeline) along the property boundaries outside of the Eagle Lake neighborhood until both pipelines reached County Road 56 just north of WSSC Reservoir #3 and ran east.

Option D: Poudre River Conveyance. Water would flow from the Larimer County Canal headgates down Segments 10, 11, and 12 of the Poudre River to a diversion near Windsor.

Option E: Shields (CR 17) Pipeline and Poudre River Conveyance. A pipeline would run some of the water from the south end of WSSC Reservoir #4 down two possible Shields Street routes to the Poudre River. The first route option would run the water west from the south end of WSSC Reservoir #4 and then south along Shields Street. The second route option would run the pipeline south from Douglas Road along Bayshore Road to some easements along Blue Heron Lane and then east to Shields Street. The water would be taken out of the Poudre at the Timnath Inlet near South Mulberry and run east to County Line Road. The remainder of the water would be conveyed east to County Line Road via a pipeline along either Douglas Road or County Road 56.

- This webinar will focus on Options B, C, and E because the constructability and geotechnical analyses are focused on pipelines.
- John Bambei, Owner of Bambei Engineering Services, will present on water pipeline constructability, and Robin Dornfest, President of Lithos Engineering, will present on geotechnical considerations. Both consultants are being retained by Larimer County to provide independent assessments of the ideas and alternatives under consideration.

JOHN BAMBEI: CONSTRUCTABILITY

- John Bambei has 42 years of water works experience, including from his time as Chief Engineer at Denver Water. He is also an active member of the American Water Works Association and the American Society of Civil Engineers. Both of those organizations are involved in pipeline work.
- Bambei’s scope of work from Larimer County asks him to advise Larimer County on constructability issues.
- Thus far, Bambei has examined Google Earth images of the project alignment options, driven the area to view pipeline routes where they are visible from the road, and reviewed the following documents from Thornton’s consultants (draft dates in parentheses):
  - Douglas Road Dual Water Pipeline Construction Sequence and Schedule (October 29, 2018)
  - County Road 56 Construction Sequence (October 29, 2018)
  - Shields Street Alignment and Construction Sequence (October 26, 2018)
  - Modified Poudre River Alternative (October 17, 2018)
  - Shields Street/Poudre River Alternative to the Thornton Water Project Proposal (September 24, 2018)
- Bambei qualified his analysis of Options B, C, and E by stating that he only received the documents mentioned above a few days before this webinar and has not had an opportunity to do field verification of the document sequencing and methods. Further evaluation is
necessary. These are very preliminary routes. Bambei is not commenting or expressing an opinion on which alternative should be selected, whether a river or a pipeline should be used for conveyance, etc.

- When choosing a pipeline route, there are some key points to consider. Note that this is not a complete list of considerations, just some of the important ones:
  - Route points (specific points in question, using a public right-of-way or easements, etc.)
  - Compliance with design conditions (e.g., flows by gravity where needed)
  - Existing and future utilities (fit within rights-of-way or easements, possibility of future enlargement, etc.)
  - Impacts to traffic (e.g., daily movement of vehicles in and out of houses)
  - Emergency access (mail routes, schools buses, possibility of staging vehicles to allow for closures, using night work or incentives to finish the project early to minimize closures and delays, etc.)
  - Soil and groundwater conditions (Robin Dornfest will discuss this)
  - Permits (county or city street cut permits, environmental permits, grading, erosion, and sediment control permits, dust control permits, etc.)
  - Installation means and methods (open cut, tunnel, type/length of pipe, available space in roadways and easements, etc.)
  - Operations and maintenance (ability to access pipeline for servicing air valves line valves, etc.)
  - Cost (always a consideration for routing)

Option B: Douglas Road
- It appears that routing considerations have been taken into account for this option, but refinements are possible for future work.
- The biggest challenges are impacts to utilities and traffic. There are pipeline spacing issues that make it difficult to provide space for future utilities, and there is a need to ensure that raw and potable water pipelines are spaced in compliance with Colorado Department of Public Health and Environment (CDPHE) regulations.
- The project proponent estimates that it will take four years to complete this alignment. That might be conservative because construction needs for the tunnels are not yet known. It is also unclear whether this alignment will require permits to cut across ditches.

Option C: North Route (County Road 56)
- It appears that routing considerations have been taken into account for this option, but there are some possible refinements.
- There needs to be a close examination of the possibility of running the NISP and Thornton pipelines on the east or west sides of WSSC Reservoir #4. There are many homes and residential lots on the west side of the reservoir.
- The pipeline would mostly fit within rights-of-way outside of the roadway, except where it runs between Annex and Windsor Reservoir.
- The application shows the pipeline running close to the embankment for Reservoir #8. There is a need to refine this feature because there are concerns about running a pressurized pipeline near a dam.
- The application says that it will be possible to run the pipeline across roads one half at a time to maintain some traffic flow. However, it is very difficult to keep a road open when crossing with pipelines of these sizes. The crossing could be completed in one long day of
work. Construction of a shoofly or alternate roadway could be another solution. This issue should be considered in the future.

**Option E: Shields Street to Poudre River**

- It appears that routing considerations have been taken into account for this option, but refinements are possible for future work.
- Once in the Shields Street corridor, the pipeline would run south to the Poudre River using both rights-of-way and easements off of the road. There are some roadway crossings to consider along the route.
- Going directly down Shields Street would require pumping, but the Bayshore Road option could work using gravity.
- The possible future expansion of Shields Street should be considered. It is important not to interrupt that expansion if there is information about which cross-sections of the road are candidates for expansion.
- The impacts to traffic and utilities in this alignment are minimized because the pipeline is outside of the right-of-way at points along its route.
- Thornton's application requires the use of a pipeline on County Road 56 or Douglas Road to complete this alternative.

**ROBIN DORNFEST: GEOTECHNICAL CONSIDERATIONS**

- Robin Dornfest has 18 years of experience in geotechnical engineering and engineering geology. Lithos Engineering is a Fort Collins-based company focused on tunneling and geotechnical engineering, with considerable experience along the Front Range. Dornfest is focused on the subsurface conditions and ground behavior involved in this project for either a trench or tunnel used to route a pipeline.
- Dornfest was hired as a consultant to provide Larimer County with technical support and has no preference on routing.
- There are several geotechnical considerations to think about when putting a pipeline in the ground:
  - Subsurface conditions (soil and bedrock type)
  - Ground behavior
  - Appropriate means and methods for constructing the pipeline
  - Shallow groundwater (difficult to excavate, requires dewatering wells along pipeline, requires treatment or disposal of removed water per CDPHE requirements)
  - Shallow bedrock (more difficult to excavate and dewater, which impacts project design)
  - Support of excavations to hold a hole open for pipeline (could use a shoring system to limit the project footprint or could use an unshored, sloped excavation to keep workers safe)
- There are several reasons to use a tunnel for a pipeline:
  - Not always an option to use an open-cut trench (potentially due to opposition from a municipality, landowner, railroad, ditch company, or department of transportation)
  - Avoids impacts to infrastructure or environmentally sensitive areas can be avoided by tunneling under those features
  - Can reduce permit requirements
  - Minimizes impacts to third parties
• There are several reasons not to use a tunnel for a pipeline:
  o Comes with inherent risks
  o Entails high financial costs
• All of the lake tap options listed in an early technical memo from Thornton that Dornfest reviewed are feasible. There is room for optimization for each lake tap option. Further development of the lake tap options could include shortening tunnel lengths, conducting geotechnical investigations, refining tunnel and shaft designs, and refining the intake riser design.
• Lake taps are expensive and inherently risky, but they are increasingly common for water supply and conveyance projects in Colorado and the US.
• There is nothing in Dornfest’s experience that precludes the selection of a lake tap for this project.

NEXT STEPS
• The consultants will conduct more in-depth analysis based on their scopes of work by the November 15 public meeting. If new and complex questions arise in the meantime, the consultants may need more time to conduct further analysis.
• Peak Facilitation will post the relevant technical memos and documents referenced by the presenters on the project website by the end of the week. Peak will inform the Working Group when those documents are posted.
• Peak will also post a list of information needs and corresponding answers from the Working Group process by the end of the week.
• Peak will email out a link to a recording of this webinar as soon as possible. Peak will also post the webinar on the project website.
• Bambei and Dornfest will be available to answer the Working Group’s questions in the future.
Larimer Water Project
Technical Information Webinar: Water Quality and Flow
Monday, Nov. 5, 2018, 4:30 PM-6:00 PM
Summary

Presenters: Todd Barnes, William Bellamy, Jason Curl, Emily Hunt, and Dave Taussig
Larimer County Staff: Lesli Ellis and Mark Peterson
Facilitation: Heather Bergman and Dan Myers

INTRODUCTION
Lesli Ellis, Director of Community Development for Larimer County, provided a brief overview of the Larimer Water Project’s engagement process and the alternatives that the webinars will address.

• This is the second of three webinars being offered to answer the technical questions that have come up in the Working Group process so far. The first webinar (on constructability and geotechnical considerations) was offered on November 5 at 12:00 PM and the third webinar (on traffic) will be offered on November 6 at 10:00 AM.
• The webinars are part of a broader engagement process requested by the Board of County Commissioners when they tabled Thornton’s 1041 permit application. The process has included Working Group and community meetings to review new ideas and alternatives related to Thornton’s 1041 application and to consider possible co-locations of Thornton and Northern Water conveyances.
• The Working Group is being asked to provide the Board of County Commissioners with ideas about how to mitigate or minimize the negative impacts and maximize the benefits of the ideas and alternatives for Thornton’s application.
• More information about the engagement process can be found at: www.larimerwaterprojects.org
• Key upcoming events for the engagement process include:
  o Working Group meeting #4—November 13
  o Public meeting #2—November 15
  o Working Group meeting #5—November 27
  ○ Board of County Commissioners hearing—December 17
• Note that this schedule is still subject to change.
• County staff have used the input they received so far to create a list of five broad options for discussion in these webinars. There is room for variation in these options. The Working Group will examine various options and discuss ways to minimize the negatives and maximize the benefits of each of them.
• The range of options is as follows:
  o Option A—Canal Conveyance: This conveyance would use a pump station and return pipeline to remove water from Water Supply and Storage Company (WSSC) Reservoir #4 and take it to the Larimer County and Northern Poudre canals. The canals would convey the water east to County Road 1, where a pipeline would convey the water south to Thornton.
Option B—Douglas Road (County Road 54): A pipeline carrying Thornton’s water would run from WSSC Reservoir #4 to Douglas Road, where it would run east in parallel to a pipeline for the Northern Integrated Supply Project (NISP).

Option C—North Route (County Road 56): A pipeline carrying Thornton’s water would run from the south end of WSSC Reservoir #4 to the north via either Vista Lake Drive west of WSSC Reservoir #4 or by the eastern edge of WSSC Reservoir #4. Thornton’s 1041 application had more variance in the potential route east of WSSC Reservoir #4. The current option would the pipeline along property and neighborhood boundaries. The pipeline would meet a NISP pipeline and run parallel to that pipeline east along County Road 56.

Option D—Poudre River Conveyance: Water would flow down the Poudre from the west of Fort Collins through Poudre River Segments 10, 11, and 12 to a diversion near Windsor.

Option E—Shields (CR 17) Pipeline and Poudre River Conveyance: A pipeline would run some of the water from the south end of WSSC Reservoir #4 down a Shields Street route to the Poudre River. The remainder of the water would be conveyed east to County Line Road via a pipeline along either Douglas Road or County Road 56.

- This webinar will address Options A, D, and E because water flow and quality questions are most applicable to those options.

RECENT DEVELOPMENTS REGARDING FLOWS FOR THE POUDRE RIVER
Todd Barnes, Communications Director for the City of Thornton, and Emily Hunt, Water Resources Manager for the City of Thornton, provided an update on Thornton’s efforts to augment flows in the Poudre River. Their comments are summarized below.

- On October 23, Thornton City Council approved Thornton’s participation in Poudre Flows, which is a collaborative effort with other water providers and state agencies to develop a program to preserve and improve flows on the Poudre River. As a part of Poudre Flows, Thornton would provide up to 3,000 acre-feet (AF) each year to the Colorado Water Conservation Board (CWCB) to augment flows in the Poudre River from the mouth of the canyon to the confluence with the South Platte.
- Thornton has participated in Colorado State University’s Poudre Runs Through It partnership to improve river health. That group formed a subcommittee of water users to provide supplemental flows to the river while ensuring that user rights are protected.
- Thornton has worked with the CWCB, Colorado Parks and Wildlife (CPW), the Colorado Water Trust, the City of Greeley, the City of Fort Collins, Northern Water, and the Cache la Poudre Water Users Association over the past three years to develop Poudre Flows. The program complies with Colorado water law and protects river flows in critical locations and at critical times.
- Thornton intends to commit up to 3,000 acre-feet a year of water to Poudre Flows. 3,000 acre-feet of water on the Poudre River would be valued at $45 million on the open water market.

Legal Considerations
Dave Taussig, legal counsel with the firm White & Jankowski, provided information on the legal considerations surrounding the Poudre Flows program. His comments are summarized below.
• Taussig is working with the City of Thornton on the Poudre Flows program. He is a nationally-known water attorney with extensive experience in water law, natural resource law, and litigation. He represented Grand County in negotiations on the landmark Colorado River Cooperative agreement and worked with diverse stakeholders on Wild and Scenic River issues on the Upper Colorado River.
• In Colorado, water must be put to beneficial use (agricultural, municipal, etc.), as defined by the state’s water courts. In the 1970s, the Colorado legislature approved the preservation of the natural environment as a beneficial use. The legislature granted the CWCB the exclusive ability to appropriate water toward that end. That exclusive authority means that CWCB partnership in any flow restoration program is critical.
• Instream flow rights protect specific flow rates at specific locations and times. Instream flow rights are based on CPW establishing minimum flows needed to preserve the natural environment to a reasonable degree.
• Two statutes have enhanced the CWCB’s ability to boost stream flows. The first clarified that the CWCB has the authority to obtain senior water rights (not just junior water rights) to protect flows. The second authorized the CWCB to acquire water to improve the environment to a reasonable degree, which extended instream flow rights beyond the absolute minimum.
• The CWCB can use its authority by filing an application and a plan for augmentation in water court. A plan for augmentation is a detailed program designed to increase the supply of water for beneficial use by pooling water resources, substituting supplies, etc.
• Poudre Flows will use the CWCB’s authority to create an instream flow augmentation plan. The program will unfold in three phases:
  o Organizing interested parties and determining engineering feasibility
  o Obtaining water court and CWCB approval
  o Implementing the program once administrative and judicial approvals have been obtained.
• The water that Thornton would put into the program comes from WSSC and Jackson Ditch Company (JDC) shares that a water court converted to municipal use for Thornton in the 1980s. The water court decree specifically allows the share to be used for augmentation in this program.
• In addition to the 3,000 AF of water that Thornton is providing, the Poudre Flows program will have a mechanism to allow other users to boost flows in the river by adding their water shares to the program.

ALTERNATIVE CONCEPTS: POUDRE RIVER AND DITCH SYSTEM CONVEYANCE OPTIONS
Barnes summarized two alternative conveyance concepts and introduced two of Thornton’s consultants to discuss the water quality implications of those alternatives.

• The first concept would require Thornton to return water to the Poudre River at the Larimer County Canal headgate and remove the water at Windsor.
• The second concept is to convey some of Thornton’s water to the Poudre River via a pipeline along Shields Street.

Water Quality Concerns with the Poudre River and Larimer County Canal Options
Dr. William Bellamy, Professor of Practice at the University of Wyoming, provided an overview of water quality concerns surrounding the Poudre River. His comments are summarized below.
Dr. Bellamy has 30 years of practical experience in developing, designing, and delivering drinking water supply projects. His work has resulted in enhancements to public health protections through the development and implementation of improved drinking water technology such as ozone and ultraviolet light disinfection.

In reviewing the water quality issues along the Poudre River, Dr. Bellamy drew on the water quality report prepared for the NISP project by GEI Consultants, a report on water quality prepared for No Pipe Dream by Lisa Buchanan, and industry experience in developing water supplies for communities around the world.

There are several wastewater treatment plants located along the river between the Larimer County Canal headgate and Windsor. This portion of the river is also surrounded by developed urban and agricultural areas with significant impacts on water quality.

There is a longstanding tenet among water quality experts that supplies should be drawn from the best available source, and that pollutants should be kept out of drinking water if it can be done at a reasonable expense.

Water quality concerns to consider for drinking water sources include:

- Pathogens
- Total dissolved solids (TDS)
- Sulfates
- Nitrogen compounds
- E.coli and coliforms
- Pesticides and herbicides
- Contaminants of emerging concern (CECs)
- Disinfection byproducts (DBPs)
- Total organic carbon (TOC)
- Consistency of supply

E.coli is a particularly important indicator because it points to the presence of other pathogens present as a result of fecal contamination from mammals. There is a greater concentration of these pathogens downstream of wastewater treatment plants.

Treatment systems for drinking water are based on removing a percentage of a contaminant rather than an absolute amount of it, so treatment does not remove the risk from drinking-water pathogens if the overall concentration of e.coli in source water increases (as it does downstream of wastewater treatment plants).

A single system failure in a treatment system can be extremely damaging to public health, as was shown by the case of a coagulation system failure in Milwaukee, which resulted in some 200,000 cases of illness from the pathogen Cryptosporidium.

If water were run from the Larimer County Canal headgate to Windsor, it would pass through Segments 10, 11, and 12 of the Poudre River.

Segment 10 is above most of the development on the river and is designated as a suitable water supply by the Colorado Department of Public Health and Environment (CDPHE).

Segments 11 and 12 are not considered suitable as water supplies because of the risk posed by pathogens, human-derived contaminants, and geological contaminants. There is substantial urban and agricultural runoff in Segment 11. The runoff brings oil, sediment, pet waste, road salts, and other contaminants into the river. There are also significant increases in E.coli concentrations when compared to Segment 10.

Segment 12 has all of those concerns plus inflows from local groundwater gradients that carry pollutants like salts and TDS.

A study conducted in Philadelphia in 2007 found that raw and treated wastewater are significant sources of pathogens and can reach water supply intakes at significant concentrations up to 100 miles down a river.
• Below the wastewater treatment plants, the Poudre River has additional contaminants including nutrients, TOC, CECs, and DBP precursors, all of which are health risks and could also result in changes to water taste, color, and odor.
• CECs are particularly concerning because they have exhibited endocrine-disrupting characteristics. CECs are being studied closely, and there are calls to regulate them more closely as well.
• High levels of TOC can cause regrowth in the distribution system, and an increase of DBPs. Distribution regrowth can also lead to a loss of public confidence in the water supply because of changes to the water's taste and odor.
• There are benefits to Thornton using the WSSC system. The ditch system can be operated so that it protects the water supply from potential contamination events like floods, fires, or spills. The WSSC reservoirs can be used to blend water of variable qualities to provide consistent water quality for treatment plants to process.
• If water were to be conveyed through the Larimer County Canal to Weld County, and then delivered to Thornton, the quality of the water would degrade due to residential and agricultural runoff, inflows, and geologic features.
• Without the use of the WSSC reservoirs, Thornton would not be able to blend its water to reduce peak pollutant levels.
• To continue use of the WSSC storage, Thornton would need to construct a pump station and pipeline to convey its water from the reservoirs to the canal.
• Complex water treatment would increase the overall cost.
• Winter operations would be difficult or impossible because of water freezing in the ditch.
• The existing Larimer County Canal headgate diversion and storage in WSSC reservoirs is the best alternative for public health, reducing environmental impacts, operational considerations, and project costs.

Treatment Cost Considerations
Jason Curl, Principal Water Treatment Technologist for Jacobs, provided an overview of water treatment cost considerations. His comments are summarized below.

• Curl has over 15 years of practical experience developing, designing, and delivering drinking water supply projects.
• If the diversion point on the Poudre River were to be moved upstream of the Mulberry Water Reclamation Facility, membrane filtration would be necessary to address TOC and pathogens in the water supply. The treatment would bring $85 million in capital costs and $5.5 million in annual operations and maintenances costs, assuming a treatment capacity of 40 million gallons per day (mgd).
• If the diversion were moved to Windsor, additional membrane filtration, reverse osmosis (RO), and a disposal system for the brine waste from the RO would be necessary to address further increases in pathogens, CECs, nutrients, and TDS. These treatment processes would bring $600 million in capital costs and $44 million in annual operations and maintenance costs.
• These treatment processes would come with costs to the community at the treatment plant location, including:
  o Increased truck traffic (four times more than the base case if the diversion were at Windsor)
  o Increased amounts of solids being sent to landfills
  o Increased greenhouse gas emissions (two times more if the diversion were at Mulberry and 14 times more than the base case if the diversion were at Windsor)
There are also future impacts to consider if water regulations are modified, particularly if the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) amends its Contaminant Candidate List to include multiple DBPs or reduces the maximum allowed contaminant levels from current requirements.

**THORNTON'S SHARES IN THE WSSC**

Taussig discussed legal and financial questions surrounding Thornton’s shares in the WSSC. His comments are summarized below.

- Thornton’s water court decree requires the water that Thornton purchased in the WSSC and JDC systems and changed through the water court for municipal use to be diverted at the WSSC headgate near Ted’s place. Sending the water down the Poudre River would require Thornton to amend its agreement with WSSC and go to water court to change the point of diversion. Both could be long, contested processes with uncertain results.
- Changing the diversion point would mean additional system losses, operational changes, and infrastructure improvements. Thornton would need to apply to change the water’s diversion point and storage location. The water court case could cost $750,000-1 million. That does not include the costs associated with water treatment, lost infrastructure, water losses, and permitting. It could take six to eight years to go through the water court process.
- In filing for a change of the point of diversion, Thornton would risk reopening its water court decree. This risk would be softened by a statutory change that determined that historical water use would not be requantified, but that statute allows the court to impose additional terms and conditions placed on its operations.
- If WSSC declined to renegotiate its agreement with Thornton, no one could force them to do so. In renegotiating the agreement, Thornton would lose the value it purchased in using the ditch, reservoir storage, and use of excess reservoir capacity. Thornton paid WSSC over $10 million, and 1,049 units of Colorado-Big Thompson Project water as compensation for the 1986 Agreement.
- The negotiations alone could cost $300,000-500,000. That does not include the costs associated with the loss of water, building additional facilities, and making operational changes. It could take three to five years to renegotiate the agreement.
- It would cost $2 million to reconstruct the headgates necessary to bypass existing ditch structures on the river. Ditch companies are reluctant to modify headgates because they prefer the status quo. It could take five to ten years to reach an agreement with the ditch companies and another five to ten years to secure federal permits to reconstruct the headgates.
- Water rights users between the WSSC headgate and Windsor would try to divert the water, which would create conflict between ditch owners, state officials, and Thornton.
- Flooding would increase along the Poudre because Thornton would need to take its water from the river as needed. If the river were in flood stage, Thornton adding its water to the river would increase flood risk.
- Unlike the Poudre Flows program, intervening ditch users could run exchanges on Thornton’s water as it passed down the river, increasing pollutant concentrations and also removing instream flow benefits.
- State officials charge a stream loss rate of 0.5% per mile. Thornton would lose 70 AF of water per mile. The market value of 1 AF of high-quality Poudre River water is $15,000-60,000, so Thornton would lose at least $1 million per mile.
• Thornton would also need to create a large structure to move water from the Larimer County Canal to the Poudre River. WSSC would need to approve the structure. Administering the river would become more difficult because river flows would fluctuate rapidly due to the WSSC’s five days on/two days off water delivery schedule.
• Thornton would also need a federal permit (which could take five to ten years to secure) to build a new pumping station at the new diversion location. Thornton’s current proposal is to tunnel under the river to minimize environmental impacts.

WATER STORAGE FACTORS
Hunt discussed Thornton’s use of the WSSC reservoirs. Her comments are summarized below.

• Sending the water down the Poudre would eliminate Thornton’s pro rata share (5,635 AF) of 11,740 AF of storage and excess reservoir capacity. This storage is important to Thornton’s water operations because it allows water to be delivered to Thornton year round. Thornton’s investments in the storage would be lost.
• Thornton’s current storage of water in the WSSC reservoirs and delivery of water out of WSSC #4 allows the WSSC to deliver to agricultural shareholders. Because WSSC Reservoir #3, Reservoir #4, and Kluver Reservoir are all below the ditch, water cannot be conveyed back to the canal by gravity. As a result, WSSC can only deliver water to agricultural shareholders via unreliable “handshake trades” with other ditch companies. Delivering Thornton’s water from WSSC Reservoir #4 provides the most protection to other WSSC water users.
• Working Group members have expressed interest in maintaining or enhancing water levels in the WSSC reservoirs. Modeling done by Thornton showed that the water levels are higher in scenarios when Thornton is utilizing the WSSC reservoirs to regulate its water because municipal suppliers tend to carry water in reservoirs year-to-year whereas agricultural users tend to use all of the water that they store in a given year.
• If Thornton delivered its water from WSSC Reservoir #4, it would need to build a pipeline to convey the water back to the river. Using ditches to do so would be unreliable because ditch capacity is not always available, and Thornton would need to pay to use excess ditch capacity. Using natural drainages to convey the water back to the Poudre could create flooding hazards.
• If Thornton could no longer use its WSSC reservoir storage, it would need new storage facilities. It takes years to identify new reservoir sites, and these sites are uncommon and difficult to develop.
• Thornton would likely need to develop gravel pit reservoirs, which requires partnership with gravel mining companies, (often contested) gravel mining permits, etc. Gravel pit reservoirs are often located on river floodplains and are subject to flooding causing infrastructure loss and water quality problems.
• Acquiring off-stream reservoir land and the necessary permits would also take years.
• Developing additional reservoirs would also harm the riparian environment.
• It costs $5,000-10,000 per AF to develop water storage, so replacing Thornton’s WSSC storage would cost $60 million-120 million.
• Thornton would need storage to use the Poudre River conveyance option given WSSC’s five days on/two days off delivery schedule. Without storage, Thornton would need to take water as it came rather than controlling or scheduling it. Without storage, Thornton would at times need to take flows at higher rates than necessary, which would require the use of a
60 mgd (rather than 40 mgd, as proposed in Thornton’s 1041 application) pump station and pipe.

- Fluctuating flows (and the accompanying water quality variations) would also impact the ability of water treatment plants to operate smoothly.
- Reservoir storage is essential because it allows municipal providers to carry water from year to year, which helps mitigate against drought, infrastructure failures, and other water shortages.

2014 PRESENTATION TO THORNTON CITY COUNCIL
Hunt discussed the water transport concepts presented at a 2014 Thornton City Council meeting. Her comments are summarized below.

- During the meeting, staff presented conceptual ideas for transporting Thornton’s water. Not all of the concepts presented were reasonable; they were merely possible options.
- The Windsor option was included in this presentation because it was a possible delivery concept but the options presented were not necessarily reasonable options. The staff presentation culminated in a staff recommendation to build a pipeline to transport the water from WSSC Reservoir #4. Council directed staff to pursue the recommended option.

OTHER CONVEYANCE OPTIONS AND COST IMPACT SUMMARY
Barnes discussed conveyance options beyond running Thornton’s water down the Poudre River to Windsor. His comments are summarized below.

Shields Street Options
- One of the concepts mentioned by Lesli Ellis was to run part or all of Thornton’s water down a pipeline along Shields Street to the Poudre River. This option would keep water in the WSSC system and allow WSSC operations to continue as required.
- In one scenario, a 40 mgd primary pipeline would run down either County Road 56 or Douglas Road to ensure that water is deliverable to Thornton when water in the river is unusable because of fire, flooding, or a spill. A secondary diversion would allow Thornton to deliver up to ten mgd of Thornton’s water down Shields Street to the Poudre. Water would be conveyed down the Poudre to the area around the Mulberry Water Reclamation Plant, where it would be re-diverted and conveyed in a pipeline parallel to Northern’s NISP pipeline to County Line Road. This option would have construction implications for Shields Street, the Mulberry Water Reclamation Plant area, and the pipeline route taking the water east from the Mulberry plant area to County Line Road. Water quality considerations would also apply.
- In another scenario, all 40 mgd of Thornton’s water would flow down the pipeline along Shields Street to the Poudre River to be re-diverted at the Mulberry Plant area. This would require a much larger pipeline and water quality considerations would still apply.
- If either volume of water were taken down Shields Street as far as Windsor, the water quality and larger facilities considerations would also apply.
- The traffic impacts of these options will be addressed in the November 6 traffic webinar.

Canal/Ditch Conveyances
- Thornton only has the right to use the WSSC system, must divert its water at the Larimer County Canal headgate, and must take delivery of its water above Rocky Ridge Reservoir.
Otherwise, Thornton would need to renegotiate its agreement with WSSC and amend its water court decree.

- To use the WSSC system storage, Thornton would need a pipeline and pump station to return its water from WSSC #4 to the ditch. The pump station and pipeline would be similar in size to those necessary to deliver water down Douglas Road or County Road 56.
- If Thornton could not use the WSSC system storage, replacement storage would need to be constructed farther down the ditch.
- Thornton needs the ability to deliver its water year-round in a controlled manner to meet the operational demands of its treatment plant.
- It is unreliable to run water down ditches in the winter because ditches can freeze solid and the flow cannot change during moderately cold periods which would interrupt flows to the treatment plant. Weeds could block the canal in the spring, which would also interrupt flows to the treatment plant. Running water down the ditch would result in significant water loss via ditch seepage.
- Thornton does not have the right to use other ditches or canals, and they may not have additional capacity in their system to convey water at Thornton’s planned delivery rate.
- Thornton would need to purchase new usage rights and modify existing infrastructure and would likely result in Thornton not being able to deliver water in the time and quality required.

**Douglas Road Pipeline**

- This option has no impact on water quality or existing Poudre River flows.
- This option would create a long construction timeline of four years on Douglas Road.

**County Road 56**

- This option has no impact on water quality or existing Poudre River flows.
- There are more private property impacts under this alternative.

**Cost Impact Summary**

- It would cost Thornton $58.7 million-117.4 million to replace its WSSC storage.
- Treatment of Poudre River water to achieve equivalent water quality would cost (in additional capital):
  - $65 million for ten mgd of water above the Mulberry plant
  - $261 million for 40 mgd of water above the Mulberry plant
  - $194 million for ten mgd of water at Windsor or downstream on the Larimer County Canal
  - $776 million for 40 mgd of water at Windsor or downstream on the Larimer County Canal
- Pipelines would cost:
  - $20.5 million to run ten mgd of water from Shields Street to the Poudre and from the Mulberry plant to County Line Road
  - $39.6 million to run 40 mgd of water from Shields Street to the Poudre and from the Mulberry plant to County Line Road
- The cost of each option and its variations would be as follows:
  - A1: Canal conveyance using WSSC storage: $1.2 billion
  - A2: Canal conveyance with replacement storage: $1.2 billion
  - B and C: Douglas or County Road 56 pipelines: $423 million
  - D1: Poudre River to Windsor with replacement storage: $1.2 billion
  - D2: Poudre River to Windsor with no storage: $1.4 billion
o E1.1: 10 mgd of water from Shields Street to the Timnath Inlet: $521 million
o E1.2: 10 mgd of water from Shields Street to Windsor: $628 million
o E2.1: 40 mgd of water from Shields Street to Timnath Inlet- $641 million
o E2.2: 40 mgd of water from Shields Street to Windsor: $1.1 million

RECENT DEVELOPMENTS REGARDING BENEFITS FOR LARIMER COUNTY
Hunt discussed recent developments regarding benefits to Larimer County. Her comments are summarized below.

- Thornton is working with the City of Fort Collins regarding Thornton’s farm property near Douglas Road and Turnberry Road. Fort Collins would like to acquire this property to help create an open space buffer between Fort Collins and Wellington. The property could be transferred to Fort Collins in the next couple of years.
- In 2019, Thornton will begin to engage with communities near its farms to ensure that they have an active role in the planning process for the future use of Thornton’s farms in Larimer and Weld Counties.
- Thornton will work with Larimer County and its Agricultural Advisory Board regarding the preservation of agricultural uses of Thornton’s farm on North Shields Street.
- Thornton is committed to helping maintain flows in the Poudre and is considering how it can operate its water rights to enhance the Fort Collins whitewater park.
- Thornton could provide Larimer County with a fiber optic conduit in the pipeline corridor that the County could utilize for fiber optic internet service.
- Thornton is working with CPW to manage limited public access for hunting on some of Thornton’s farm properties.

NEXT STEPS
- Questions about this webinar can be emailed to Heather Bergman. Peak Facilitation will provide those questions to speakers so that they can be answered right away. Peak will track those questions and their answers in a single document from all of the webinars. It would be helpful if questions referenced specific slide numbers from this presentation, but general questions are fine, too.
- Any questions that Peak receives by midnight on November 6 can be answered at the November 13 Working Group meeting.
- Peak will send Working Group members a link to a recording of this webinar, followed by a summary of this webinar.
INTRODUCTION
Lesli Ellis, Director of Community Development for Larimer County, provided a brief overview of the Larimer Water Projects engagement process and the alternatives that the webinars will address.

- This is the third of three webinars being offered to answer the technical questions that have come up in the Working Group process so far. The first webinar (on constructability and geotechnical considerations) was offered on November 5 at 12:00 PM and the second webinar (on water quality and flow) was offered on November 5 at 4:30 PM.
- The webinars are part of a broader engagement process requested by the Board of County Commissioners when they tabled Thornton’s 1041 permit application. The process has included Working Group and community meetings held to review new ideas and alternatives related to Thornton’s 1041 application and to consider possible co-locations of Thornton and Northern Water conveyances.
- The Working Group is being asked to provide the Board of County Commissioners with ideas about how to mitigate or minimize the negative impacts and maximize the benefits of the ideas and alternatives for Thornton’s application.
- More information about the engagement process can be found at: www.larimerwaterprojects.org
- Key upcoming events for the engagement process include:
  - Working Group meeting #4-November 13
  - Public meeting #2-November 15
  - Working Group meeting #5-November 27
  - Board of County Commissioners hearing-December 17
- Note that this schedule is still subject to change.
- County staff have used the input they have received so far to create a list of five broad options for discussion in these webinars. There is room for variation in these options. The Working Group will examine various options and discuss ways to minimize the negatives and maximize the benefits of each of them.
- The range of options is as follows:
  - **Option A-Canal Conveyance:** This conveyance would use a pump station and return pipeline at Water Supply and Storage Company (WSSC) Reservoir #4 to take water to the Larimer County and North Poudre canals. The canals would convey the water from the northwest corner of WSSC Reservoir #3 to County Line Road, where a pipeline would convey the water to Thornton.
  - **Option B-Douglas Road (County Road 54):** A pipeline carrying Thornton’s water would run from WSSC Reservoir #4 to Douglas Road, where it would run east in parallel to a pipeline for the Northern Integrated Supply Project (NISP).
Option C-North Route (County Road 56): A pipeline carrying Thornton’s water would run from the south end of WSSC Reservoir #4 to another pipeline just south of WSSC Reservoir #3 by either running north on Vista Lake Drive on the west side of WSSC Reservoir #4 or by running on the eastern edge of WSSC Reservoir #4. The pipeline would then run from south of WSSC Reservoir #3 (where it would meet a NISP pipeline) along the property boundaries outside of the Eagle Lake neighborhood until both pipelines reached County Road 56 just north of WSSC Reservoir #3 and southeast of WSSC Reservoir #8 and ran east.

Option D-Poudre River Conveyance: Water would flow down the Poudre from the Larimer County Canal headgates, through Poudre River Segments 10, 11, and 12, and to a diversion near Windsor.

Option E-Shields (CR 17) Pipeline and Poudre River Conveyance: A pipeline would run some of the water from the south end of WSSC Reservoir #4 down two possible Shields Street routes to the Poudre River. The first option would run the water west from the south end of WSSC Reservoir #4 and then south along Shields Street. The second option would route the pipeline south from Douglas Road along Bayshore Road to some easements along Blue Heron Lane and then east to Shields Street. The water would be taken out of the Poudre at the Timnath Inlet near South Mulberry Road and run east to County Line Road. The remainder of the water would be conveyed east to County Line Road via a pipeline along either Douglas Road or County Road 56.

- This webinar will address Options B, C, and E because traffic questions are most applicable to those options.

TRAFFIC CONSIDERATIONS
Rich Follmer, Transportation/Traffic Engineer with Felsburg, Holt, and Ullevig (FHU), provided an overview of traffic considerations surrounding Options B, C, and E. His comments are summarized below.

- Follmer has over 30 years of experience in transportation and traffic engineering. Larimer County is retaining Follmer to provide independent analysis of existing traffic conditions near potential routes and comparative analysis of traffic impacts and level of service impacts. Follmer’s scope of work also asks him to provide recommendations for mitigating traffic during construction and to attend Working Group and community meetings so that he can respond to questions and any technical issues that arise.
- Follmer has evaluated 21 intersections near the Douglas Road and County Road 56 corridors. His analysis is reflected in an "Existing Conditions" memo that has been posted on the project website and which will be included with the posting of this webinar as well. After evaluating current conditions, Follmer typically looks at how access points would be impacted and how any of these options may disrupt a typical trip.
- Existing conditions analyzed include:
  - Morning and evening peak traffic volumes
  - Left, through, and right vehicle movements (e.g., could have exclusive left lane or lane with both left-turning and through traffic)
  - Intersection characteristics (intersection geometry, traffic signals, and volume)
- At the intersection of State Highway 14 and Shields Street, for example, traffic volume is highest moving from east and west along State Highway 14 with a variety of turn movements during peak hours. This kind of analysis is available for all 21 intersections in...
Folmer’s “Existing Conditions” memo (note that morning peak volumes are listed first with afternoon volumes listed second in parentheses).

- Folmer uses traffic volume information to understand how well intersections are operating. This is called a level of service analysis and is conducted based on methodologies developed by the Federal Highway Administration’s Transportation Research Board in its Highway Capacity Manual as the standard for evaluating the level of service regardless of intersection type.

- Two-way stop controlled intersections are assigned a letter grade for the level of service based on the length of delays at those intersections. For example, a level of service of F means an average delay of 50 seconds or more.

- The criteria for evaluating signalized intersections are slightly different. Accepted length of delays typically increase, with an F being a delay of 80 seconds or more, because a green light will allow a driver to complete their maneuver eventually. At a stop sign, drivers are typically less patient in waiting for a gap in oncoming traffic.

- The 21 intersections are operating fairly well, with a few exceptions. For example, traffic operation samples show that at the intersection of State Highway 1 and Douglas Road, most of the movement is flowing north-south on State Highway 1. Left turns from State Highway 1 onto Douglas Road are relatively smooth. However, traffic service turning left onto State Highway 1 from Douglas Road receives a rating of C or D. By contrast, movements at the intersection of County Road 56 and State Highway 1 receive A or B ratings.

- Intersections not operating as well as others include the Country Club Road/Lemay Avenue/Gregory Road intersection. Drivers turning right from Lemay Avenue onto Country Club Road are receiving a level of service of F during the PM peak hour. Drivers also experience a level of service of F when making eastbound left or right turns from Country Club Road onto Turnberry Road.

- Folmer analyzed how construction on any of the three alignments considered in this webinar would disrupt access for homes and business in these corridors. While the homes impacted will not be impacted in the same way at the same time, the approximate number of homes impacted along each road is as follows:
  - Douglas Road: 287
  - County Road 56: 8
  - Shields Street: 125

- As construction moves down one of these corridors, the possible directions of travel for homeowners during disruption will change. For example, when construction is taking place at the west end of a corridor, homeowners may be prevented from traveling west. However, as the construction moves east, homeowners may be able to travel normally to the west but not to the east, etc.

- Available detour routes during construction disruptions would vary for each corridor.

- On County Road 56, residents could use County Roads 13 or 11. Douglas Road residents would have similar opportunities along Shields Street, State Highway 1, or State Highway Road. Shields Street residents could use Douglas Road or State Highway 1 to reach their access points. Major intersections would only be disrupted for short times, but regional traffic routes may be disrupted. Residents along these roads would have one form of access or another.

- Based on analysis of traffic volume and access impacts along each road, it is clear that County Road 56 would be the least impacted during potential construction, Shields Street would be moderately impacted, and Douglas Road would have the highest impacts.
NEXT STEPS

• At the November 15 public meeting, Rich Follmer will provide more analysis of the traffic impacts along the three primary pipeline routes. This analysis will include possible detours for motorists who typically travel from one end of a corridor to another and the resulting impacts to other intersections. Follmer will provide recommendations for mitigating those impacts.

• Larimer County staff will ensure that Follmer's forthcoming analyses are also posted on the project website.

• Questions about this webinar can be emailed to Heather Bergman. Peak Facilitation will provide those questions to Rich Follmer so that they can be answered right away. Peak will track those questions and their answers in a single document from all of the webinars.

• Any questions that Peak receives by noon on November 7 can be answered at the November 13 Working Group meeting.

• Peak will send Working Group members a link to a recording of this webinar, followed by a summary of this webinar.
Larimer Water Projects Working Group Meeting #4  
Hearing Room, Larimer County Building  
Tuesday, Nov. 13, 2018, 6:00 PM- 9:00 PM  
Meeting Summary – FINAL

Notes about this document:

- This is a summary of the meeting only. It is not a comprehensive list of all the statements made during the meeting.
- Inclusion in this document is not an endorsement of the truth or accuracy of the statements made during this meeting.
- In the interest of brevity, some statements have been combined into one or two sentences. Some nuance may have been lost in the process. This was unintentional.
- Any mistakes in summarizing the meeting were unintentional and do not negate the value or impact of the statements made during the meeting.

ATTENDANCE


(*Alternate)

Larimer County Staff: Todd Blomstrom, Lesli Ellis, Rob Helmick, and Mark Peterson

Facilitation: Heather Bergman and Dan Myers

Observers:
City of Thornton: Emily Hunt, Mark Koleber, and Gerald Simpson

Larimer County Consultants: John Bambei, Robin Dornfest, and Rich Follmer

Northern Water: Stephanie Cecil and Christie Coleman

Public Observers: Approximately 25 members of the public observed the meeting.

ACTION ITEMS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Larimer County staff</th>
<th>Larimer County and project proponents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Ensure that traffic information is up to date&lt;br&gt;• Verify that the list of community benefits and negative impacts for each option distinctly apply to Larimer County residents and are separate from those that apply to Thornton and others</td>
<td>Answer new questions and update the Information Needs document</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Attachment K: November 13 LWPWG Meeting
REVIEWING THE GROUND RULES AND THE PROCESS PLAN TO REACH DECEMBER

Heather Bergman of Peak Facilitation Group provided a review of Working Group ground rules and the timeline for the Working Group process leading up to the Board of County Commissioners hearing on December 17. Her comments are summarized below.

- The official charge of the Working Group from the Board of County Commissioners is to:
  - Create a shared understanding of the Thornton Water Project in Larimer County and the Northern Integrated Supply Project (NISP) where there is potential for coordination.
  - Identify the interests that the community, County, and water providers have for these water projects (Note: this was done explicitly with the creation of the Working Group’s list of interests, which was available as a handout at this meeting).
  - Explore ways to maximize community benefit and mitigate or minimize negative impacts from these projects.
  - Assess the degree to which different options meet the identified interests overall (Note: at this meeting, Working Group members were asked to think of ways to improve five project concepts based on the list of interests at small group stations. Group members were asked to assess the degree to which each option met specific and overall identified interests).
  - Prepare a report on the Working Group’s deliberations for the Board of County Commissioners that includes a description of ideas the group has to maximize community benefits and minimize negative impacts, and a description of how well various options rank against the interests. Heather Bergman will write the report with input from the Working Group. She will submit the report to the County Commissioners by December 10, 2018.

- The Working Group has two remaining meetings: tonight’s, and a fifth meeting on the evening of November 27. There will also be a community meeting on Thursday, November 15.

- At tonight’s meeting, Working Group members reviewed five project options or concepts. Group members had the opportunity to ask questions of Northern, Thornton, and Larimer County’s consultants on about each one.

- Working Group members also spent a portion of the meeting circulating around five stations (one for each concept). Group members were asked to apply their what-if ideas to however many of the five options they wished to consider in order to maximize the community benefits and minimize the negative impacts of each. Group members provided written input on maps of each project option, and facilitators were present at each station to document missing potential benefits or negative impacts. Working Group members were asked to work as collaboratively as possible to maximize the benefits of each option and to consider (in a preliminary manner) whether each option is viable or whether minimizing the negative impacts of an option is not possible.

- The November 15 community meeting will begin with a brief presentation from Heather Bergman on the Working Group’s work so far and a description of the five options from Lesli Ellis. The remainder of the meeting will be an open house with stations based on the Working Group’s work at tonight’s meeting. Thornton, Northern Water, and Larimer County’s consultants will also have stations, but they will not have an opportunity to speak in front of the meeting attendees.

- Community members will be asked to evaluate how each option compares to the interest list and to identify the most important community benefit and negative impact for each option.
At the fifth Working Group meeting on November 27, the group will hear a report about community input for each option. The group will also receive additional technical analysis information from the consultants. Finally, the group will evaluate the options based on the new community- and consultant-provided information, the list of interests, and the potential benefits and negatives for each option. The Working Group will also be asked to consider colocation of the two projects in relation to the options.

At the end of the November 27 meeting, Working Group members will be asked to say which options compare most favorably to the interest list, which community benefits are the most important, and which negative impacts are the most concerning. The Working Group will not choose one option, but rather will identify the options that can potentially maximize community benefits and minimize negative impacts.

Bergman’s report will discuss all of the options fairly and will not make any recommendations about the options. The report will include all of the meetings summaries and Working Group documents (e.g., what-if presentations).

Thornton may or may not decide to resubmit its 1041 application in December.

Larimer County staff will prepare a staff memo for the Commissioners that may include recommendations related to the project process, conveyance options, etc.

The Commissioners hearing will be held on December 17 in the Larimer County Courthouse Hearing Room. The Working Group will be kept informed if there are any changes to the schedule.

The facilitator reminded the Working Group of the meeting ground rules, which can be found on the second page of the agenda document for this meeting on the project website, halfway down the “Working Group” page.

While all Working Group members approve or disapprove of some of the project options, the five options were included on the agenda because they are of interest to one or more Working Group members. Working Group members do not need to agree on these options, but it is important that they are civil to one another.

**Group Discussion**

Working Group members discussed the process plan. Their discussion is summarized below.

- Peak Facilitation and County staff will find more information about how the December 17 Commissioners meeting will be run and will share that information with the Working Group when more details are known.
- There is only one representative for the Poudre River in the Working Group, and there are 29 other representatives. Save the Poudre is not allowed to have a station or to speak at the November 15 community meeting. This process needs to be fair.
- One of the reasons that the Working Group will not be voting on the project options is that Working Group members do not represent equal numbers of stakeholders, so a conversation will be more appropriate than a vote. The facilitator is sensitive to Save the Poudre's point.
- There was confusion as to why some members of the Working Group have not participated much to this point in the process. It is up to each member of the Working Group to decide how much or how little they participate. Working Group members are encouraged to ask other Working Group members for their opinions during meeting breaks or breakout sessions.
- The Town of Windsor noted that it had spoken but was waiting to see the impacts of the project options on Windsor and its Larimer County taxpayers.
There was concern about Thornton (rather than a non-biased third party) having presented on water quality and flow during the recent webinars. As was discussed that the last Working Group meeting, Larimer County’s consultants are those focusing on geotechnical considerations, constructability, and traffic. Thornton paid for water consultants.

REVIEWING THE CONCEPTS AND OPTIONS
Lesli Ellis of Larimer County provided an overview of the five project options for discussion at this meeting. Her comments are summarized below.

- Ellis qualified her remarks by noting that these concept overviews were meant to prepare the group for this meeting’s discussion but did not represent a technical analysis of all of the information on every option. Ellis noted that her concept overviews are not advocating one option or another.
- These options came from Thornton's original 1041 permit application, Working Group discussions, and (for Option E) from a community suggestion.
- The options are as follows:
  - **Option A: Canal Conveyance**: This option came from the Working Group. Under this concept, water would be taken from Water Storage and Supply Company (WSSC) Reservoir #4 via pipeline to the Larimer County Canal at Reservoir #3. The water would run in the canal to County Line Road and would be transported from that point south to Thornton. Northern Water would need a different conveyance route.
  - **Option B: Douglas Road**: This option came from Thornton’s 1041 permit application. Water would be conveyed south from Reservoir #4 to Douglas Road. There would be potential for Thornton to collocate its pipeline with Northern’s in this option. Larimer County’s traffic and construction consultants considered the impacts of this option in scenarios where Thornton alone builds a pipeline and scenarios where Northern and Thornton collocate their projects.
  - **Option C: County Road 56**: This option came from Thornton’s 1041 permit application. Water would be pulled from the southern end of Reservoir #4 and run north to County Road 56 via Vista Lake Drive, along the eastern edge of Reservoir #4, or through a lake tap on the western side of Reservoir #4. There would be potential for Thornton to collocate its pipeline with Northern’s in this option. Northern and Thornton have noted that there may be some alignment adjustments to round out corners on the pipeline route if this option proceeds.
  - **Option D: Poudre River**: This option was suggested by the Working Group and Save the Poudre. Water would be diverted from the Larimer County Canal headgates to the Poudre River, where it would flow through River Segments 10-12 to Windsor. It would then be diverted south to Thornton. Northern would need a different conveyance route.
  - **Option E: Shields Street to the Poudre River**: This option generally was proposed by a community member. Water would be carried in a pipeline from Shields Street to the Poudre River, where it would flow through downtown Fort Collins. A primary pipeline along either County Road 56 or Douglas Road would still be needed to carry water in case the river is compromised by fire, flooding, an oil spill, etc.
DISCUSSION WITH THORNTON, NORTHERN, LARIMER COUNTY, AND CONSULTANTS

Working Group members asked representatives of Thornton (Emily Hunt, Mark Koleber, and Gerald Simpson) representatives of Northern Water (Stephanie Cecil and Christie Coleman), Larimer County staff (Todd Blomstrom, Lesli Ellis, Rob Helmick, and Mark Peterson), and Larimer County's consultants (John Bambei, Robin Dornfest, and Rich Follmer) questions about the five project options. Their discussion is summarized below, and questions are indicated in italics where applicable.

Option A (Canal Conveyance): Questions

*It would be a disservice to the rest of Larimer County if we did not consider the full length of a pipeline out to County Road 1 and Weld County Road 13. Are we going to consider the whole routes or the abbreviated versions of the routes shown on the maps?*

Other maps as part of the 1041 process show the routes to the east. Working Group members can think and discuss beyond the extents shown of the maps if they are so inclined.

*Thornton would need to build a pumpstation on Douglas Road near Reservoir #3 or #4 under this option. If Thornton took its water at the farm near Elder Reservoir, it would have a source of water where it wanted, the same storage capacity, and less water degradation. Could Thornton put a tank on its or Fort Collins' land and use part of the canal for conveyance? Is this feasible?*

Thornton measured the water quality at the Reservoir #3 entry in the canal and where the canal crosses County Road 56. Although those points are only part of the way down the canal, the water quality degrades substantially. Thornton would need to build a pumpstation near the reservoir and a second pumpstation to get water to the pipeline on County Line Road. If Thornton ran water down the canal in the winter, there would no guarantee that it could control the water near Elder Reservoir if the water in the ditch were cold and fluctuating. Additionally, sending the water down the ditch would be difficult during irrigation because the WSSC uses a lot of the ditch’s capacity.

*For 100 years, Thornton’s WSSC water has been flowing to Weld County, where 95% of its water and properties are. Why does Thornton need to be in Larimer County if most of its water and property is in Weld County?*

Storage associated with Thornton’s water supply is important to Thornton and running water down the canal will not work during most of the year.

*One of the roadblocks to this option is that Thornton would not be able to run its water through the ditch for a year-round supply. Could Thornton construct two pipelines through the ditch? Construction could take place during the winter to avoid summer disruptions.*

Constructing a pipeline on the bottom of the ditch is not the most direct route so it would be more expensive. It also unlikely the WSSC shareholders would be amenable to this idea.

*The first section of this option would run through the Braidwood community. Is it possible to use a laketap to go around Braidwood? Thornton could go around Braidwood to the north in the inlet between Reservoir #3 and Kluver Reservoir and then go down WSSC property. Thornton looked at putting a lake tap from Travis Road on the southern end of Kluver Reservoir to the lower portion of Reservoir #4. There were cost reliability risks. Thornton wants to meet with Braidwood residents to discuss what going through Braidwood would like if that occurred, how new community benefits could be maximized, and how negative impacts could be mitigated.*
Is it possible to use directional drilling techniques to go through Braidwood without tearing up streets or taking too long on construction?
It is expensive and risky, but feasible.

Why does Thornton not take water through a pipeline seasonally and build a reservoir on its own property for year-round water supply access?
Thornton considered that, but it purchased the WSSC shares for access to storage to avoid building storage in another place. Storage options near Thornton along the South Platte River are largely exhausted, including most gravel pits. Additionally, if Thornton took water deliveries on the WSSC’s five days on, two days off schedule, that water would come in at a higher rate than it currently does. This would require a 60-70 million gallon per day (MGD) pumphouse rather than that 40 MGD structure that has been proposed.

Is creating storage in Thornton a feasibility or a cost issue?
Thornton does not believe that it could find a reservoir location. If money was no object, it could purchase one, but money is always an object for a municipal water provider.

Option A (Canal Conveyance): Group Discussion

- There was disagreement about when Thornton would need to take water down the ditch. Some participants said that Thornton needed its water to be available every day of the year, and others said that Thornton has other sources of water and could take its water before November.
- Thornton could build a reservoir on its #52, #63, or #82 properties east of I-25.
- The WSSC reservoirs are established, and the WSSC says that Thornton needs to take its water there.
- While it may be the case that there is no property available for Thornton to acquire in Adams County, Thornton could solve its problem by dealing taking the property of unwilling sellers there rather than doing so in Larimer County.

Option B (Douglas Road): Questions

Does Thornton intend to amend its 1041 application given that the County Commissioners deemed Thornton to have inadequately addressed four 1041 criteria? If so, when will it amend the application?
Thornton plans to continue to listen to the community to gather information on interests, community benefits, negative impacts, etc. so that it can review the options on the table and develop a submission to include in the December 10 packet sent to the Commissioners.

The traffic webinar included a statement that 287 homes would be impacted under Option B. That is a gross underestimate, as there are 146 homes in the Hearthfire community alone. How did the traffic consultant come up with that number?
While some roadways were researched via Google Earth and not in person, 287 is relatively close to the number of homes with only a driveway on Douglas Road or from a group of homes with only one way in and out. Hearthfire has access to Turnberry Road, so it was not included in that calculation.
When the traffic consultant counted traffic volumes on given roads, was the growth of the Water's Edge development that will block Hearthfire's second exit considered? How would closures on both exits be coordinated?

Those counts were made on existing traffic volumes. In the most recent traffic memo (since the webinar), Rich Follmer (who worked on the Water's Edge project) evaluated other potential impacts from Water's Edge, Country Club Reserve, and construction traffic coming to Douglas Road from other routes. Access might be temporarily restricted to construct pipelines, but public streets cannot be totally closed.

What information is contained in Rich Follmer's traffic studies? When was that information pulled together?

A study with new analysis of the impacts of project options on 21 intersections was handed out at the meeting and has been posted on the project website since the traffic webinar. The existing traffic volume data was recorded in September and October of 2018.

Thornton has said that it is putting two pipelines in Douglas Road over three project phases. Have Thornton or the consultants reviewed the possibility of three pipelines being built anywhere? Thornton is not looking at constructing two pipelines in Douglas Road.

Is there enough room for to build a pipeline along Douglas Road in the half-mile where houses are only 50 feet away from the road?
The location of the homes is not relevant in this case, because the pipeline would be constructed in the Douglas Road right-of-way.

Why does Thornton want to jog north on County Road 56 under the Douglas Road alignment? Why not just continue east?

Thornton identified going up the east side because members of the public provided input that it should go west and north of Cobb Lake. Thornton is using its property going east to maximize the use of its property and to minimize the use of other properties.

Would there be fewer pumping costs associated with using a gravity flow towards Douglas Road rather than going north with a pumping station?
The costs are probably about the same to pump water from the edge of Reservoir #4 to the tank under Options B and C.

What are the potential traffic impacts at the intersection of Shields Street and Douglas Road from construction and the potential widening of Douglas Road?

Rich Follmer has created tables listing the traffic impacts from each alternative. There would be impacts to that intersection that may require temporary rerouting or detouring. The current proposal for Option E would complete most of the work on Shields Street on the easements on the northeast side of the road. There would be one lane open with flaggers on Shields Street at all times under Option E. The intersection of Shields Street and Douglas Road would probably remain open, but some people would need to detour along Douglas Road to get to their residences.

The benefits listed for Option B on the handout to be used for the small group station portion of the meeting are specifically identified as existing if the pipeline is built in the right-of-way. Thornton has maintained that there is a quarter-of-a-mile-wide right-of-way on Douglas Road. Why can Thornton not commit to keeping construction in the right-of-way?
The map provided for Option B shows the pipeline zigzagging in and out of the right-of-way. The aim is to minimize impacts to the properties adjacent to the right-of-way in those cases. The quarter
mile-wide area is not the right-of-way but the area where the County has told Thornton that is
could work, either on an easement or in the right-of-way. If the County tells Thornton to put the
pipeline in right-of-way, Thornton will do that.

_Thornton conducted a utility search along Douglas Road after the September 18 Working Group
meeting to determine whether a pipeline could fit in the right-of-way. Thornton said that this was
possible. Why do we no longer know what is in the road?
_Thornton has had a lot of time to identify the utilities in the road and has confirmed that a Thornton
pipeline and a NISP pipeline could fit with certain spacing requirements. John Bambei has not had a
chance to review that information yet.

_Why has the estimate of the construction process doubled from 18 months-two years to four years?
The 18 month schedule was for the single pipeline in Thornton’s original application. The four year
estimate would be to accommodate both the Thornton and the NISP pipeline. The additional time
was added because to build two pipelines, the project implementers would have to close the road
between access points in addition to relocating and upgrading an existing East Larimer County
(ELCO) Water Company line before construction begins. The four years could also include
coordinating with construction to improve the intersection of Douglas Road and Highway 1.

**Option B (Douglas Road): Group Discussion**

- On October 29, Thornton’s engineering consultant, CH2M Hill, recommended against
  placing two pipelines on Douglas Road.
- There were questions about whether or not Morningstar Way (which leads to Turnberry
  Road) would be closed as part of the Water’s Edge project. The County will make sure that
  its traffic information is up to date.
- A Working Group member’s “boots on the ground” visual count identified 329 homes whose
  only access was on Douglas Road.

**Option C (County Road 56): Questions**

_Considering the blowback on the Douglas Road route, why is the northern route not getting more
attention?
From Thornton’s perspective, it has been receiving attention. However, when Thornton originally
evaluated its options, building a pipeline alongside NISP’s down Douglas Road or County Road 56
was not an option. Constructing just Thornton’s or Thornton and Northern’s pipeline(s) down
either route is now workable. At this point in time, Thornton is listening and deciding what to
submit to the Commissioners.

_An earlier version of this option involved the pipeline(s) crossing Highway 1 via a different route. Did
something prompt the route to be moved?_Thornton and Northern discussed ways to get from the northern end of Eagle Lake to Highway 1.
Community input on wetlands and choke points provided to Northern probably informed these
changes.
There is a narrow area between Windsor Lake and Annex Reservoir #8. Is it possible to fit two pipelines through that gap? Thornton believes that two pipelines can fit through that gap. There may be a need to change something about the route there if something not observable from the surface is found during design, but that is not the plan as of now.

In the webinar, Robin Dornfest said that the lake tap options being considered by Thornton were viable. How feasible would it be for NISP and Thornton to go through the lake, under Reservoir #3, and to place a pump station near Eagle Lake to send water to a storage facility east of I-25? It would be feasible but costly and risky. Risks from such an operation could include getting stuck under the lake, losing equipment, or leaking hydrofracturing fluids into the lake. All of those risks can be mitigated, but the length of the tap would push the limits for a tunnel of the size, and money is an object. Tunneling costs one or two times per foot more than an open cut trench. Thornton will produce a cost estimate for this conveyance.

Will Northern’s potential route on the northern side of Reservoir #4 avoid the Lochland Park neighborhood? Yes.

What are the County’s thoughts on the alignment options? The County is thinking about how disruptive construction on Douglas Road would be. Traffic detouring may be an even bigger issues than driving on Douglas Road itself because there are not many alternate routes. The traffic values on County Road 56 are substantially less than on Douglas Road. John Bambei and Rich Follmer will conduct further analysis on construction and traffic impacts. Beyond that, County staff will not share opinions about options at this time.

How deep is Reservoir #3 when full? Maybe 25 feet. More information will be found on this question.

If Reservoir #3 is not always full, why not use an open trench rather than a tunnel? Thornton would need a US Army Corps of Engineers permit to cut below the highwater line. Thornton does not have time to pursue that permit because it needs the water online by 2025. Boring underneath the lake keeps the Army Corps of Engineers satisfied that environmental impacts are being avoided. Thornton wants the pipeline to be above ground so that it does not need to drop the reservoir’s level to perform maintenance. There are a number of other reasons not to put a pipeline underwater. Workers can use casing pipe to work during tunneling.

What exactly is the issue with the pipeline being underwater? If one uses a straight bore under a pipe, that is a more solid installation as opposed to putting it in the lake. Underwater is different than under the lake in this case.

Why has Thornton not previously considered going under the lake? It would be 10 to 100 times more expensive to do so.

If the Commissioners decide on Northern and Thornton aligning on Option B or C, will Northern be bound by that decision? What are NISP’s other options? If one of these options is selected, Northern will be held to the Commissioners’ decision as a condition of Thornton’s permit and its own intergovernmental agreement (IGA). If Thornton and Northern collocating their projects is a condition of a granted permit, it is feasible that Northern
and Thornton will work together under any of the alignments. County staff recommended that both Northern and Thornton participate in this process for that reason.

*Is Reservoir #3 designated for agriculture? If so, does the Clean Water Act still apply when water is not in the river? Thornton might not need a jurisdictional 404 permit from the Army Corps of Engineers.* The Corps said at a meeting with the WSSC that a lake tap would be jurisdictional. Installing a municipal pipeline in an agricultural reservoir would not be exempt from the Clean Water Act.

**Option D (Poudre River Conveyance): Questions**

*During what months is most of Thornton’s water diverted at the Larimer County Canal? What is the average high cubic feet per second (CFS) that Thornton diverts?* Diversion season generally provides consistent flow from early May until after Labor Day, with supplemental flows from the WSSC’s mountain reservoirs provided as needed. Thornton’s diversion share is 150 CFS.

*Could Northern Water use the Poudre River?* As part of the US Army Corps of Engineers permitting process, Northern added a refined conveyance to send 18-25 CFS down the river all year to be picked up downstream of Fort Collins. Northern did a lot of analysis to determine that amount of water, including how the water would benefit aquatic habitats. Northern drew the water out upstream of where the water quality in the river degrades. Northern still needs a redundancy pipeline in case there are issues with the Poudre River because it needs its water to be available year round. Northern wanted to add the 18-25 CFS outside of its normal operations.

*Would Thornton’s water quality consultants take exception with any of the measurements or conclusions found in LRB Hydrology and Analytics’ analysis of water quality in the Poudre? If there are differences, how would Thornton’s water quality consultant justify those?* This question will be conveyed to Thornton’s water quality consultant.

*Thornton’s City Council has agreed to release 3,000 acre-feet of water into the Poudre. That is 4 CFS year-round which is not a lot of water on a daily basis. Is that release of water down the Poudre conditional on acceptance of a pipeline by Larimer County?* Thornton is hoping to create a package of benefits for the County as part of getting its permits approved. Thornton worked on increasing the river flows for years before the permit application and is committed to helping the river when it can. Thornton hopes to get something back that helps its citizens.

*Why does Thornton continue to discuss water quality and quantity when the Commissioners have said that those are not issues for them? Why push it?* Water quality for a safe, healthy drinking water source is critical to the City of Thornton, and the WSSC reservoirs have the best water quality. Thornton’s 1041 proposal and analysis is based on its water rights there.

*Why does Thornton not meet its water quality and quantity needs in Weld County?* The water quality and quantity that Thornton purchased from the WSSC starts high at the headgates and degrades some at the reservoir but is still usable for municipal supply. Water running down the ditch would be a different water quality standard.
Why did the County list impacts to Thornton in its write-up of potential benefits and negative impacts? That is not part of the land use process. The County just listed what it had heard on all options. County staff will ensure that this was consistent in its approach across all of the options.

Going through the US Army Corps of Engineers permitting process is not listed as a potential negative impact for Option D? Is that no longer a consideration for Thornton? That is still a consideration. Thornton would need a permit from the Corps to create a new diversion on the Poudre and new structures to get water around ditches.

Yes or no: When Thornton these bought water rights, did they come with a guarantee of water quality? Thornton declined to answer this question.

Is the water that Northern and Thornton could add to the Poudre River exciting for Save the Poudre? What CFS or peak flow would Save the Poudre like to see? A study from seven or eight years ago about healthy flows in the Poudre involved increasing peak flows by 30-40% and increasing base flows. Save the Poudre sees that Northern is trying to take away peak flow and use a third of it as base flow. Save the Poudre will send more information on this question to Peak Facilitation.

Is there any more room between Thornton’s water court decree and how much water Thornton’s farms have used that is positive for the Poudre River? That is the concept of the augmentation plan. Thornton has additional water in interim years that it could decide to put into the augmentation plan on a yearly basis. Thornton needs administration approval to remove water from agricultural usage, but the augmentation plan is designed to allow Thornton and others to provide additional water year to year on top of the committed 3,000 acre feet.

Could Save the Poudre be an entity in Thornton’s Poudre River augmentation program? Absolutely. The difficulty is that, under the instream flow statute, the State of Colorado cannot shoot for Save the Poudre’s desired peak flows.

What is the main reason that Thornton does not want to go through the US Army Corps of Engineers permitting process? There are many reasons why going down the river does not work for a municipal water supplier on an ongoing basis.

Option D (Poudre River Conveyance): Group Discussion

- The worksheet for Option D lists potential flooding from the Poudre River onto adjacent properties as a potential negative impact. The 2013 flood was 10,000 CFS and did not cause much damage in Fort Collins because owned many natural areas and stormwater retention projects along the river. The idea that 150 CFS would cause flooding is false and should not be on the worksheet, nor in any presentation at the November 15 community meeting.
- The 3,000 acre-feet that Thornton is looking to provide is new water to the Poudre. For comparison, the pipeline would deliver 14,000 acre-feet, so that is 20% of that total. The water will not solve all of the river’s problems, but the river needs many water rights to be added to it.
• The Poudre River flows through Fort Collins today at 7 CFS. Thornton and Northern could add an additional 21 CFS.
• There was disagreement surrounding Thornton’s pursuit of certain levels of water quality and quantity. Some participants said that Thornton’s water court decree does not guarantee water quality and quantity. Other participants said that Thornton purchased a certain quality and quantity of water and needed that for its residents.

Option E (Shields Street to the Poudre River): Questions

Where did this option come from?
This option largely came from a comment provided by a community member to the Commissioners in August. After hearing from a Working Group member about including the option, County staff decided to include it in their analysis.

There were no pipelines under this option as it was originally conceived. What are Thornton’s thoughts?
If putting water in the Poudre is to work at all, Thornton needs backup pipelines to protect its supply in case of fire, flood, etc.

Why not include these pipelines in the Poudre River option? How is this option different?
That option has Thornton diverting water farther upstream and into the river. Thornton would never get into this situation.

Why is the community member who proposed this idea not present tonight?
A Working Group member will invite him to the community meeting on Thursday.

One of Thornton’s sources of water is the South Platte River. Thornton does not have any pipelines on that river, does it? What does it do in case of fire and flood?
Thornton uses a bypass for its water on the South Platte River so that it can shut off the flow of water into its reservoirs as needed. That is the concept for this option, as well.

Would this option require a US Army Corps of Engineers permit for working within the high water mark of the Poudre River?
Probably, but it depends. Thornton would consider taking the water out at the Timnath Reservoir Inlet for the concept. Thornton has not talked to the Corps yet.

Option E (Shields Street to the Poudre River): Group Discussion

• This option does not solve anything because it still requires a pipeline and because Shields Street is one of the highest-traffic roads in town.
• A member of the Working Group brought this option, but there was frustration that this option did not originate in the Working Group.
• There are enough options.
GROUP REPORT OUTS: REFINING OPTIONS AND ADDRESSING IMPACTS AND BENEFITS

Working Group members circulated among five stations (one for each option) to maximize community benefits and mitigate negative impacts for each option. Each station featured:

- A large map of the option in question
- A list of the community benefits identified so far
- A list of the negative impacts identified so far
- A list of all of the what-if ideas from Meeting #3
- A summary of all the questions/answers received to date
- Markers and stickies to mark up maps and track ideas
- A station “host” from Larimer County or Peak Facilitation to take notes and report out
- Note: Thornton, Northern, and the consultants were available to answer questions at the stations if requested.

Station hosts reported on conversations at their stations to the larger group. Their comments are summarized below.

Option A (Canal Conveyance) Comments

- Benefits listed by Working Group members for Option A included:
  - No pipelines/minimum pipelines
  - Could build reservoir and pumphouse on Thornton’s property east of I-25 and pipeline from there.
  - No traffic impacts
  - No construction impacts
  - No environmental impacts
  - No utility impacts
  - No new crossings on Highway 1/I-25, canals, ditches
  - No eminent domain, private property impacts
  - Like idea of putting pipeline in canal
  - Historical path/use of the water
  - A ditch rider said that there is minimal seepage after the ditch is filled and flowing (Note: This benefit was submitted as a written comment during the meeting but was not recorded in time to be included in the list of benefits provided for this option during the November 15 community meeting)

- Negative impacts discussed by Working Group members for Option A included:
  - The beginning of the pipeline would tear up streets in Braidwood
  - Zero impacts to Larimer County residents
  - Potential loss of water in the ditch during winter
  - If lower quality water can be treated in the Mississippi River, why not here?
  - A reservoir could be built on Thornton’s property for year-round use
  - Thornton would need to acquire private property for a pump station under this option (Note: This impact was identified by a Working Group member via email on November 27 and was confirmed by Thornton as an impact under its version of this concept.)

Option B (Douglas Road) Comments

- Benefits listed by Working Group members for Option B included:
  - Rebuilding Douglas Road would bring cost savings
  - Rebuilding ELCO water lines would bring cost savings
Traffic relief from extending Turnberry Road

Negative impacts discussed by Working Group members for Option B included:
- 2-4 years construction impact. Like a war zone (Note: this impact was erroneously originally recorded as “2-4 years.” It was described as approximately four years in the November 5 constructability webinar and corrected on 12/3/2018. The statement was left as written here because that is the form in which Working Group members and the community assessed it.)
- Not Northern Water’s preferred option
- What recourse to the contractor or applicant would there be if the pipeline failed?
- Utility shut offs (water, sewer, power, cable)
- Prospect Oil pipelines (Note: this negative impact was verbally identified, but not written, during the option report-out portion of the meeting. As a result, it was not included in the list of negative impacts provided at the November 15 community meeting)
- Wetlands impact – wildlife
- Is the right-of-way really wide enough for two pipelines?
- No need to improve/rebuild Douglas
- Thornton would need to acquire private property for a pump station under this option (Note: This impact was identified by a Working Group member via email on November 27 and was confirmed by Thornton as an impact under its version of this concept. This impact was not added to the summary of the November 15 community meeting)

Option C (County Road 56) Comments

- Benefits listed by Working Group members for Option C included:
  - There is an 100-foot buffer on the east side of Reservoir #4 that cannot be built on
  - Running the pipeline on the east side of Reservoir #4 keeps it out of Braidwood
  - No taking of private property
  - Fewer traffic impacts than the Douglas Road option
  - Pave County Road 56 east of I-25 to County Line Road
  - Use of easements would be the same as before
  - Does not bisect properties

- Negative impacts discussed by Working Group members for Option C included:
  - The application should be amended to keep the pipe in the right-of-way. There is a quarter-mile project corridor from I-25 to County Line Road
  - If this project option is used, the pipeline should be constructed in the winter so that rattlesnakes are not driven into subdivisions and boat ramp access is not interrupted
  - Potential impacts to trees along the east side of Reservoir #4
  - Impacts on 36 properties on the east side of Reservoirs #3 and #4
  - Impacts on eight homes and private properties along County Road 56 and eight homes and private property Eagle Lake, respectively.
  - There is a need to clarify the terms of property acquisition (simple fee versus easements or eminent domain)

- There were conversations about the potential route alignment on the west side of Reservoir #4
Option D (Poudre River Conveyance) Comments

- Benefits listed by Working Group members for Option D included:
  - No traffic impacts
  - No environmental impacts
  - No impacts to private or public property
  - Open land, parks, and trails benefits
  - Downtown economy and water park
  - Ecological health with river through City as a result of increased flows
  - Reasonable alternative
  - Meets the Commissioners’ directives
  - Eliminates 20 miles of pipeline
  - Wetland, forest, wildlife habitat enhancement
  - No eminent domain issues
  - Everybody wins
  - Community assists Thornton in federal permitting

- Negative impacts discussed by Working Group members for Option D included:
  - What are impacts to neighborhoods at the diversion point? How is their voice heard?
  - Why has Thornton proposed the standard of water quality that it has proposed?
  - Why is water quality such a big issue through Windsor?
  - What is the feasibility of treating the river’s water like they do on the Mississippi River? (Note: this negative impact was verbally identified, but not written, during the option report-out portion of the meeting. As a result, it was not included in the list of negative impacts provided at the November 15 community meeting)
  - Is there a faster alternative? (Note: this negative impact was verbally identified, but not written, during the option report-out portion of the meeting. As a result, it was not included in the list of negative impacts for this option provided at the November 15 community meeting)
  - How about storage? Where will it be in Windsor?
  - Would there be negative effects on water levels in the WSSC lake system (and corresponding recreation and property values)?

Option E (Shields Street to Poudre River) Comments

- Benefits listed by Working Group members for Option E included:
  - A pipeline coming out of Reservoir #4 via gravity could be a good way to get water to the Poudre River and could only involve a pipeline down Shields Street

- Negative impacts discussed by Working Group members for Option E included:
  - How the issue of water quality from keeping the water in the Poudre be addressed?
  - Pipelines north or east along Douglas Road or County Road 56 would create unnecessary negative impacts
  - Traffic impacts on Shields Street, especially during construction
  - Thornton would need to acquire private property for a pump station under this option (Note: This impact was identified by a Working Group member via email on November 27 and was confirmed by Thornton as an impact under its version of this concept.)
FINAL THOUGHTS
Working Group members provided some concluding comments at the end of the meeting. Their comments are summarized below.

- There were questions about why Larimer County did not have a water quality consultant of its own. Larimer County staff stated that the County did not want to dictate what appropriate water quality should be for another community because the County is not a municipal water provider.
- Water quality is not a concern of the Commissioners.
- Thornton should list its top barrier for each of the five options and provide more detail on what could be done to overcome each barrier.
- There has been variety in the numbers about how many homes and residents would be impacted. Those numbers should be clarified for each option and differentiated between traffic and property impacts.
- There is a need to know what Thornton plans to do with its application. Save the Poudre's team of scientists and lawyers are examining this project and they need to know if Thornton plans to submit a different application. If not, this process will have been a waste of time.
- The benefits and negative impacts that apply to Thornton or Larimer County should be written separately.
- Everything in the Douglas Road option is projected to be built in the right-of-way, and everything in the County Road 56 option is projected to be built on someone's property.
- Thornton should be forthright in providing answers to the community on November 15 and should specify what it plans to do with the work of this Working Group.
- There is a need for more information on the difference between an easement and eminent domain. There were inaccurate statements in the 1041 application based on those two items.
- There is frustration about the fact that Thornton and Northern are not talking about the two 48-inch parallel pipelines and 72-inch return pipelines. Larimer County residents need to know what will happen to their homes, property, and quality of life. Segmenting the project is wrong because it only delays impacts. At the Planning Commission hearing, Thornton said it could not agree to not build a second pipeline. Thornton needs to provide its long-term plan in as much detail as possible.

NEXT STEPS
- The summaries of community benefits and negative impacts will be the materials for the November 15 open house. The consultants will be present at that meeting to answer questions.
- A revised version of the questions/information needs document will be posted on the project website.
Public Comment Card Input

Observers at the meeting had the opportunity to provide comments or questions on cards. Submitted questions and comments are included below, transcribed verbatim from comment cards.

Public Comment Card Questions

- Why aren't people allowed to ask questions to more than one person? We have many people here with different expertise and perspectives. Why can't more than of them answer any given question by people in the Working Group?
- Regulating water flow and storing water when Thornton needs it is Thornton's problem. They should have thought about these things when they bought the water. Larimer County shouldn't have to feel responsible for Thornton's inability to think ahead of potential difficulties transporting its water to use so far south. Why does Larimer County seem to feel so obligated to sacrifice so much for Thornton's lack of foresight?
- Can we combine NISP and Thornton in Poudre River- not have NISP in Douglas Road at all either?
- Douglas Road option is severely abbreviated. We really don't know how the water gets to Thornton after Douglas Road...is that the whole intention? To have limited follow-through on how it really gets to Thornton?

Public Comment Card Comments

- Working with engineers who cannot think outside the box...or rather outside the pipe. Old style “thinking” see attached article [“Denver accelerates “daylighting” of lost waterways, “undoing history” with decades-long re-engineering effort”] of how Denver is starting to think about water...in natural form.
- Re: “Denver accelerates “daylighting” of lost waterways, “undoing history” with decades-long re-engineering effort” article: “New” engineering exposing lines and waterways...as improvements...as they should be considered.
- Please no pipelines unless north of Eagle Lake or down the Poudre. Option E appears to not have been presented to the Working Group in the public forum but was instead presented in an email by a group member.
- Option E should have been presented to the group to be a legitimate option and should not be presented to the public as an option considered by the working group as the other options were. Very concerning that E is being presented to the public as a Working Group option-delegitimizes the efforts of the Working Group.
- “Fires in the watershed” by Mark K: Fires are being caused by the reduction of open waterways that allow water over the land-hydrating the area, rather than drying the land up with piping
- With regard to Army Corps of Engineers: I filed for an Army Corps of Engineers for permission to go through a small amount of wetlands on my dad’s property. It took about one or two months.
- Possibility of “hybridizing” Poudre River route and canal route. Bring water down the Poudre and back up, bring backup water through ditches/canals. Create water storage on properties north of Windsor...nice lake, etc.
- Eminent domain is now very limited, but it does not allow for road and water projects. By using the Poudre River Route, there is minimal need for eminent domain by Thornton.
OVERVIEW
On November 15, 2018, the community was invited to an open house to provide input on five conveyance options or project configurations for the Thornton Water Project (TWP). The open house was from 6 pm to 8 pm at Block One in Fort Collins. Ninety-eight people signed in for the meeting; a small number of additional participants declined to sign in. In addition to these participants, several members of the Larimer Water Projects Working Group also attended the meeting, as did representatives from the City of Thornton and Northern Water, as well as County staff, independent consultants hired by the County, and the LWPWG facilitator.

The meeting space was set up with stations around the room. There was a station for each of the five conveyance options: A-Canal Conveyance, B-Douglas Road, C-County Road 56, D-Poudre River, and E-Shields Street & Poudre River. Additionally, Thornton and Northern Water each had a station, as did the traffic consultant hired by the County. The constructability consultant hired by the County moved throughout the room answering questions, as did the facilitator. There was one County staff person at each option station, and Working Group members either stayed at a specific option station or circulated throughout the room.

Upon arrival, participants were given packets containing the following:

- **Handouts summarizing each option**, including potential benefits and potential impacts. Some potential benefits and potential impacts had been reviewed by the County prior to the Working Group meeting on November 13; others were added as part of the Working Group meeting on November 13.
- **The analysis provided by the County's traffic consultant.**
- **The list of community interests** identified by the Working Group at their first meeting.
- **A worksheet** to evaluate the options against the interests, provide input on the importance of co-location of the Thornton and Northern pipelines if both are approved, and to share any additional thoughts with the Working Group.
- **10 dots** to use to indicate the highest-priority potential benefit and the potential impact that concerned them most for each of five options.

PROCESS
The open house began with a presentation of the five conveyance options for TWP. Following this presentation, participants were invited to provide feedback in the following ways:

- Using their dots:
Indicate which of the potential community benefits for each option is most important to them.
Indicate which of the potential impacts for each option concerns them most.

- **On their worksheets:**
  - Indicate on a scale of 1 to 5 how well they thought each option addressed each category of interests. 1 indicated that the option did not meet the interest well; 5 indicated that the option met the interest very well.
  - Provide additional comments on each option.
  - Indicate how important they thought it was to co-locate a Thornton pipeline and a Northern Water pipeline if both are approved.
  - Provide any additional thoughts and input to the Working Group

- **On the maps:**
  - Write any specific suggestions for improvement or ways to mitigate the impacts
  - Share any additional thoughts or ideas using sticky notes.

Participants were also invited to talk with County staff at each station, with the County's traffic and constructability consultants, with Working Group members (who were wearing white name tags), with Thornton staff, with Northern Water staff, and with each other.

The subsequent pages of this summary capture the feedback that received via dots, worksheets, and on maps.
## OPTION A: Canal Conveyance
### Community Input Summary

#### DOT INPUT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What are potential community benefits?</th>
<th>Dots</th>
<th>What are potential negative impacts in Larimer County (and mitigation measures?)</th>
<th>Dots</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Minimizes pipeline construction in Larimer County versus other options and therefore may be less disruptive to residences.</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>Potential seepage or flooding near ditches could affect neighboring properties.</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May create fewer traffic disruptions to homes than on-street pipeline options and little impact on transportation network.</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Necessitates construction of a pipeline to the canal system. Existing ditches run at capacity during irrigation season, so system may need to be expanded. (More study would be needed.)</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potentially preserves trees or environmental features because of minimized construction</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Treatment facility to address water quality may create local impacts and need for waste disposal of toxins removed from water.</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**November 13 Working Group ideas below (not confirmed by County staff)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Idea</th>
<th>Dots</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Could build reservoir and pumphouse on Thornton’s property east of I-25 and pipeline from there.</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beginning of pipeline tears up street in Braidwood. Potential loss of water in ditch during winter.</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No eminent domain, private property impacts.</td>
<td>Potential loss of water in ditch during winter.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No pipelines/minimum pipelines.</td>
<td>Zero impacts to Larimer County residents.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historical path/use of the water.</td>
<td>Treat water for municipal use (e.g., Mississippi River).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No traffic impacts.</td>
<td>Build reservoir in Thornton for year-round use.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No construction impacts.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No environmental impacts.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No utility impacts.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No new crossings on Hwy. 1/25, canals, ditches.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Like idea of putting pipeline in canal.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
OPTIONS/INTERESTS EVALUATION WORKSHEET

Directions: Please write the number that represents how you think each option meets the interests below.

1 = Does not meet the interests at all, 2 = Does not meet the interests well, 3 = Neutral, 4 = Meets the interests well, 5 = Meets the interests very well

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Average Score</th>
<th>Median Score</th>
<th>Number of Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conveyance and Alignment Alternatives</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environment</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of Life</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Supply</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Process</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

MAP COMMENTS

- Plan A does not address Poudre flow through Fort Collins.
- Combine Poudre River option with Canal option.

GENERAL COMMENTS

Combine Poudre River and canal options:
## OPTION B: Douglas Road Pipeline

### Community Input Summary

#### DOT INPUT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What are potential community benefits?</th>
<th>Dots</th>
<th>What are potential negative impacts in Larimer County (and mitigation measures)?</th>
<th>Dots</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>If in right of way, may minimize disruptions to private properties.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Likely has the highest traffic impact of the pipeline options because of construction duration, number of properties and homes affected, and full closures to through traffic.</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal or better pavement conditions on Douglas Road, water line replacements, and possibly other infrastructure (e.g., bike lane or intersection improvement at Turnberry).</td>
<td></td>
<td>Impacts to neighboring properties could be improved by detour routes and all-times access for properties.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thornton’s participation in Poudre River instream flow (i.e., 3,000 acre-feet/year or approx. 20% of Thornton’s water) would augment river flows. Alternatively, Thornton provides long term fund to acquire senior water rights to improve base flows in river.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Construction time and impacts are affected by whether one or two pipelines are built concurrently (may be addressed by hours of construction, night work, monetary incentives to speed construction).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Possible land conservation or dedication of Thornton owned properties at Douglas Rd/Cr 11 and 56 and Cr 56 and I-25 west of Cobb Lake near CSU properties- for recreation or natural areas. Or, Thornton buys land (e.g., 80 acres at southwest Turnberry and Douglas Road).

Emergency response plan and access would need to be addressed (e.g., staging vehicles).

### November 13 Working Group ideas below (not confirmed by County staff)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Idea</th>
<th>Impact Description</th>
<th>Confirmation Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rebuild Douglas-cost savings.</td>
<td>12-4 years construction impact. Like a war zone.*</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rebuild ELCO waterlines- cost savings.</td>
<td>Utility shuts off (water, sewer, power, cable)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extend Turnberry (traffic relief).</td>
<td>Not NISP preferred option.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wetlands impact- wildlife</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction coordination- impact of failure- what recourse?</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is right of way really wide enough for 2?</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No need to improve/rebuild Douglas.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: this impact was erroneously originally recorded as “2-4 years.” It was described as approximately four years in the November 5 constructability webinar and corrected on 12/3/2018. The statement was left as written because that is the form in which Working Group members and the community assessed it.*
COMMENTS APPENDED TO DOT EXERCISE SHEET (INTEREST TO WHICH COMMENT WAS APPENDED IN PARENTHESES WHERE APPLICABLE)

- Lake taps mean more light and
- What if Thornton went down Douglas 2 years and NISP went around Eagle Lake Pos. 3 and open space. Share the burdens and the benefits
- Taking my farm isn’t private property? (“If in right of way, may minimize disruptions to private properties.”)
- In the right of way. Not on private property. Improve road and line lanes. ("Equal or better pavement conditions on Douglas Road, water line replacements, and possibly other infrastructure (e.g., bike lane or intersection improvement at Turnberry)"
- Take break from eminent domain (“Construction time and impacts are affected by whether one or two pipelines are built concurrently (may be addressed by hours of construction, night work, monetary incentives to speed construction”)
- Please remember that there are 3 pipelines in the Thornton project. The first is all that is currently being discussed but yet there is a second 48” and third 72” in future.(Q8)
- Co-locating pipelines just makes sense. Minimizes construction impacts/time
- Why is this statement on this side? (Q10)

OPTIONS/INTERESTS EVALUATION WORKSHEET

Directions: Please write the number that represents how you think each option meetings the interests below.

1 = Does not the interests at all 2= Does not meet the interests well 3 = Neutral 4 = Meets the interests well 5 = Meets the interests very well

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Average Score</th>
<th>Median Score</th>
<th>Number of Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conveyance and Alignment Alternatives</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environment</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of Life</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Supply</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Process</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

MAP COMMENTS

- 28 properties impacted [near Elder Reservoir].
- 8 properties impacted [near Elder Reservoir].
- Impacts river flow through Fort Collins more than Option D.
- NISP south on east side on east side of Reservoir #4-meet Thornton at Pelican Drive, east across open land to Turnberry.
- No open land.
- Re: center of WSSC Reservoir #3: Drain.
• We still don’t know WHY Douglas was selected!!
• Pipelines should be together not two separate pipelines!
• Negative with construction (4 years!)-delayed response time for medically fragile people.
• CR 54 improvements cause it to become de facto bypass route.
• Douglas Road is SO busy now-use a different route!
• Douglas Road is most impacted with over 300 homes affected! Why was this selected?
• Douglas Road is most impacted and has over 300 homes who needs its access.

GENERAL COMMENTS


• In considering the placement of these pipelines, we all need to share the burden and the benefits. No one area should have to deal with the construction of these pipelines in their area. There are proposals that would make this possible and this is what should happen.

• Since it has been determined that it will take 4 years to build the two pipelines down Douglas Road, it is important to reconsider separate locations for these pipelines:
  1. Thornton on Douglas Road in 2 years with road and area improvements. It would be understood there would always be through traffic for residents.
  2. NISP would be built above Kluver Reservoir going through the open space north of Reservoir 4. Has there been a study of running it north on the west side of Reservoir 3 to CR-56? If it is run north on the east side of Reservoir 2, they should agree to help improve the eastern shore of Reservoir 3. Also, NISP should, for the sake of the wetlands and wildlife habitat, agree to bore under the open space below the dam.
## OPTION C: County Road 56 Pipeline

### Community Input Summary

**DOT INPUT**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What are potential community benefits?</th>
<th>Dots</th>
<th>What are potential negative impacts (and mitigation measures)?</th>
<th>Dots</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Potentially most feasible to co-locate Thornton and Northern pipelines while minimizing area and duration of construction in the County.</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>Lake taps and tunneling could minimize disruption in neighborhood open space areas or along lake shores.</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If in right of way, minimizes disruption to private properties</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Lowest traffic impact of the pipeline options because of construction duration and number or properties and homes affected.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thornton’s participation in Poudre River instream flow (i.e., 3,000-acre feet/year) would augment river flows. Other acquisition of water rights could occur as noted in &quot;B - Douglas Road&quot;.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Construction time is less than Douglas Road (CR 54) option if pipeline is constructed concurrently with Northern’s; however, work could be separated.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential land conservation or dedication of Thornton owned properties at Douglas Rd/CR11 and 56 and CR 56 and I-25 west of Cobb lake near CSU properties, or other options as noted in &quot;B - Douglas Rd&quot;.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Possible paving improvement on CR 56 or other infrastructure improvement.</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### November 13 Working Group ideas below (not confirmed by County staff)

| Better from standpoint of traffic impacts versus Douglas Road. | Impacts of properties on east side of Reservoirs 3 & 4 (36 properties). | 12 |
| No taking of private property. | Impacts private property (Eagle Lake and CR 56) but CR 54 is all in right of way. | 3 |
| 100-foot buffer on east side of reservoir #4 (cannot be built on). | CR 56: 1-25 to county line - 1/4 miles corridor. Amend the application to keep the pipe in the right of way. | 1 |
| East side of #4 keeps it out of Braidwood. | General- need to clarify terms of property acquisition (fee simple versus easement and eminent domain). | 1 |
| Does not bisect properties. | Construct pipe in winter so rattlesnakes are not driven adjacent to subdivisions and boat access is not interrupted. | 1 |
| Pave CR 56 east of I-25 county line. | Potential impacts to trees along east side of reservoir #4. | 0 |
| Easement - use is the same as before. | 0 |
COMMENTS APPENDED TO DOT EXERCISE SHEET (INTEREST TO WHICH COMMENT WAS APPENDED IN PARENTHESES WHERE APPLICABLE)

- Benefit: Conservation easement on Thornton property at NE corner of Douglas xCR11
- Preserve as much wildlife as possible- Rd 56 best for pipeline
- This is the best alternative ("If in right of way, minimizes disruption to private properties")
- Best alternative: To localize NISP and Thornton pipeline on east side of WSS #3- NISP tunnels under #3 and put Thornton pipeline on east side of #4 ("If in right of way, minimizes disruption to private properties")
- 2 pipelines on 56 ("Possible paving improvement on CR 56 or other infrastructure improvement")
- Good time to improve CR 56 ("Thornton’s participation in Poudre River instream flow(i.e., 3,000-acre feet/year) would augment river flows. Other acquisition of water rights could occur as noted in “B – Douglas Road”)
- Make 56 a better road with pipeline and improvement ("Thornton’s participation in Poudre River instream flow (i.e., 3,000-acre feet/year) would augment river flows. Other acquisition of water rights could occur as noted in “B – Douglas Road”)"
- Put 2 pipelines on Rd 56 ("Pave CR 56 east of I-25 to county line")
- Improve route 56 with pipeline ("Pave CR 56 east of I-25 to Countyline")
- Don’t take private property ("East side of #4 keeps it out of Braidwood”)
- Wrong ("No taking of private property")
- Wrong ("Easement – use is the same as before")
- The reason 56 is an “alternative” because opponents want it in someone else’s backyard ("Construction time is less than Douglas Road (CR 54) option if pipeline is constructed concurrently with Northern’s; however, work could be separated")

OPTIONS/INTERESTS EVALUATION WORKSHEET

Directions: Please write the number that represents how you think each option meets the interests below.

1 = Does not meet the interests at all, 2 = Does not meet the interests well, 3 = Neutral, 4 = Meets the interests well, 5 = Meets the interests very well

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interest</th>
<th>Average Score</th>
<th>Median Score</th>
<th>Number of Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conveyance and Alignment Alternatives</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environment</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of Life</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Supply</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Process</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
MAP COMMENTS

- Re: area north of WSSC Reservoir 34: Protect the wetlands, both should travel under the wetlands. Take time and do it for the good of all.
- Re: eastern edge of WSSC Reservoir #4: This is protected by Colorado Wildlife and our plots.
- 1. Best to go on east side of WSSC Reservoir #4 2. Tunnel NISP through middle of WSSC Reservoir #3. 3. Both pipelines use same route from east side of WSSC Reservoir #3.
- East route would impact more houses [than the west route]. This is counterproductive to some of the goals. Please drop it.
- Impacts water flow through Fort Collins more than Option D.

GENERAL COMMENTS

- In considering the northern route for the Thornton pipeline and NISP pipeline, the wildlife habitat and wetlands must be preserved. We who live here see how important this area is to Colorado wildlife. It must remain intact.
- In considering the placement of these pipelines, we all need to share the burden and the benefits. No one area should have to deal with the construction of these pipelines in their area. There are proposals that would make this possible and this is what should happen.
- Since it has been determined that it will take 4 years to build the two pipelines down Douglas Road, it is important to reconsider separate locations for these pipelines.
  1. Thornton on Douglas Road in 2 years with road and area improvements. It would be understood there would always be through traffic for residents.
  2. NISP would be built above Kluver Reservoir going through the open space north of Reservoir 4. Has there been a study of running it north on the west side of Reservoir 3 to CR-56? If it is run north on the east side of Reservoir 2, they should agree to help improve the eastern shore of Reservoir 3. Also, NISP should, for the sake of the wetlands and wildlife habitat, agree to bore under the open space below the dam.
### OPTION D: Poudre River

#### Community Input Summary

##### DOT INPUT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What are potential community benefits?</th>
<th>Dots</th>
<th>What are potential negative impacts (and mitigation measures)?</th>
<th>Dots</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Extended peak flows benefit native fish, sediment flushing, less algae, natural beauty, etc.</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Water could get removed from Poudre River and/or exchanged by other parties (may need legal mechanisms to prevent).</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased and extended peak flows to provide for seasonal flooding to benefit riparian habitat.</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Treatment to address water quality may create local impacts and need for waste disposal of toxins removed from water.</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location of water entering river benefits the part of the river in greatest need according to Fort Collins Poudre River Report Card.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Possible construction of new storage as substitute to WSSC #4 to operate pumping station near Windsor.</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extend the flow for recreation use and water park in Fort Collins.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Potential new structures in river at Ted’s Place for return diversions and construction of pipeline to river from WSSC #4.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**November 13 Working Group ideas below (not confirmed by County staff)**

<p>| Ecological health with river through city as a result of increased flows. | 32   | Why the standard for the level of water quality that Thornton has proposed? | 2    |
| Eliminates 20 miles of pipeline to get proposed pipeline and Poudre River crossing. | 28   | What are impacts to neighborhood at diversion point? How their voice heard? | 0    |
| Everyone wins. | 9    | Uncertainty or concern about negative effect on water levels in the WSSC lake system (and recreational activities of neighborhoods and property values). | 2    |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No impacts to private and public properties.</td>
<td>How about storage? Where will it be (in Windsor)?</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Downtown economy and water park.</td>
<td>What is implication of river quality through Windsor?</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meets Commissioner's directives.</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wetland, forest, wildlife habitat enhancement.</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental enhancement (no air quality impact).</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open lands, parks, and trails benefits.</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community assists Thornton in federal permitting.</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No eminent domain issues.</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reasonable alternative.</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No traffic impacts.</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
OPTIONS/INTERESTS EVALUATION WORKSHEET

Directions: Please write the number that represents how you think each option meets the interests below.

1 = Does not meet the interests at all, 2= Does not meet the interests well, 3 = Neutral, 4 = Meets the interests well, 5 = Meets the interests very well

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Average Score</th>
<th>Median Score</th>
<th>Number of Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conveyance and Alignment Alternatives</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environment</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of Life</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Supply</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Process</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

MAP COMMENTS

- Go for the river!
- We should not worry about reservoir levels; more important issues!
- Reservoir levels are not the important issue!
- Take it down further [than Windsor].
- [Re: Larimer County Canal] Auxiliary to use canals with new storage lake...into Weld: Thornton already owns lots of property in Weld County.
- Re: treatment of sewer water to drinking water: West Basin water company serves El Segundo, Manhattan Beach, etc. in Southern California.
- According to Water Supply and Storage Company (WSSC) and Poudre River Commissioner this option will not work...take off the table.
- Will this alternative be faster than others?
- Please provide better explanation as to why water quality cannot be better addressed.
- With this proposal: i.e., how does it work on the Mississippi [to safely supply drinking water from a polluted river]

GENERAL COMMENTS:

- Regarding the question of “Will Thornton’s water going down the Poudre River create flooding?” Gary Wockner from Save the Poudre Responds: “The flood in 2013 was around 10,000 cubic feet per second (CFS), and it cause minimal damage in Fort Collins because the City has bought so much of the floodplain as Natural Areas and Storm Water Retention projects. Thornton’s water would add about 150 CFS, just 1.5% of what came down the river in 2013. Adding Thornton’s water to the river would have no impact on flooding. However, during more normal flows in the spring/summer when the river is running at 500 or 1000 CFS, adding Thornton’s water would increase the flow 30% and 15% respectively, dramatically improving river health through Fort Collins.”
Re: “Treatment to address water quality may create local impacts and need for waste disposal of toxins removed from water:” It would require 560 acre-feet to treat sewer water.

Combine Poudre River and canal options:
**OPTION E: Shields Street to Poudre River**

**Community Input Summary**

**DOT INPUT**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What are potential community benefits?</th>
<th>Dots</th>
<th>What are potential negative impacts (and mitigation measures)?</th>
<th>Dots</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Increased stream flow for recreation use in Fort Collins downtown area and water park, fish and wildlife habitat, etc.</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Pipeline construction impacts may be similar to either Douglas Road (CR 54) or North (CR 56) alignment (see B and C).</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased peak flows to provide for seasonal flooding to benefit riparian areas and habitat.</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Traffic impacts on Shields Street are less than CR 54 but more than CR 56. Approximately 125 homes may be disrupted as well as potential impacts to commuter travel on Shields.</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At 40 million galls per day, river flow options may create larger fluctuations in the Poudre River and possible flooding.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Reverse osmosis treatment, if needed in Windsor, generates a waste byproduct.</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pipelines North and East- unnecessary negative impacts.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
November 13 Working Group ideas below (not confirmed by County staff)

| All water down river- no pump station. Same diversion point at reservoirs. Pipeline only down Shields. | Shields alignment would need more study regarding impacts to adjacent properties and construction impacts of outtake at Mulberry | 23 |
| How can the issue of water quality (all in Poudre) be addressed? | 0 |
| Traffic impacts on Shields (especially) construction | 0 |

COMMENTS APPENDED TO DOT EXERCISE SHEET

Why is this view different than originally proposed?

OPTIONS/INTERESTS EVALUATION WORKSHEET

Directions: Please write the number that represents how you think each option meets the interests below.

1 = Does not meet the interests at all, 2= Does not meet the interests well, 3 = Neutral, 4 = Meets the interests well, 5 = Meets the interests very well

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Average Score</th>
<th>Median Score</th>
<th>Number of Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conveyance and Alignment Alternatives</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environment</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of Life</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Supply</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Process</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

MAP COMMENTS

- Why isn't the Army Corps of Engineers here to help solve the problem?
- Year round for Poudre River use
- Pipeline is NOT part of “community” proposal
- A good possible alternative route
GENERAL COMMENTS

- In considering the placement of these pipelines, we all need to share the burden and the benefits. No one area should have to deal with the construction of these pipelines in their area. There are proposals that would make this possible and this is what should happen.
Summary of Options/Interest Worksheet

WORKSHEET DIRECTIONS: Please write the number that represents how you think each option meets the interests below.

1 = Does not meet the interests at all, 2 = Does not meet the interests well, 3 = Neutral, 4 = Meets the interests well, 5 = Meets the interests very well

INTERESTS

Agriculture
- Protect agriculture and personally-owned farms
- Help the City of Thornton find an alternative conveyance route that addresses the interests listed so far, particularly the health of the Poudre River
- Use objective, fact-based criteria to determine the conveyance route
- Determine if leaving water in the Poudre River is feasible or not

Conveyance and Alignment Alternatives
- Help the City of Thornton find an alternative conveyance route that addresses the interests listed so far, particularly the health of the Poudre River
- Use objective, fact-based criteria to determine the conveyance route
- Determine if leaving water in the Poudre River is feasible or not

Construction
- Minimize the use of private lands for these projects
- Minimize or eliminate construction impacts to Larimer County road users and residents
- Minimize traffic disruptions

Environment
- Protect and restore the Poudre River
- Protect reservoirs near northern Larimer County neighborhoods
- Protect habitat and wildlife, including special designation areas that protect and support them

Process
- Assess the impacts of the project on Windsor residents
- Do no harm and ensure that any project provides benefits to Larimer County
- Be a good neighbor to the City of Thornton
- Find a solution in 2018
- Find a solution that makes sense within current conditions, not past conditions
- Find a win-win for Larimer County and the City of Thornton
- Provide a recommendation to the County Commissioners that maximizes benefits for Larimer County and its citizens, minimizes or mitigates negative impacts, respects the environment and Poudre River, and sets the standard for how counties should conduct the 1041 process
- Prioritize, respect, and preserve the rights of Larimer County citizens
- Ensure that information about the project is accurate
Quality of Life
- Minimize overall impacts on neighborhoods (including construction)
- Maintain the overall quality of life
- Maintain the current feel of the community and better understand what the community values
- Maintain the current aesthetics of the construction area (tree type, size, ground cover, etc.)
- Protect property values
- Avoid creating significant adverse effects on public health and safety (including those created by rattlesnakes)
- Use the shortest pipeline possible to get the water out of Larimer County

Water Supply
- Ensure that WSSC users and shareholders can receive the quality and quantity of water that they have historically
- Prioritize the future water supply via river health

OPTION SUMMARIES

Option A (Canal Conveyance)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Agriculture</th>
<th>Conveyance/Alignment</th>
<th>Construction</th>
<th>Environment</th>
<th>Process</th>
<th>Quality of Life</th>
<th>Water Supply</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average Score</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median Score</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Responses</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:
- I do worry about some canal flooding of homes
- Canal system staying full helps agriculture

Option B (Douglas Road)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Agriculture</th>
<th>Conveyance/Alignment</th>
<th>Construction</th>
<th>Environment</th>
<th>Process</th>
<th>Quality of Life</th>
<th>Water Supply</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average Score</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median Score</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Responses</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Comments:

- Douglas Road is best, most practical option
- Don’t need 4 lanes/Douglas! Lots of loss of personal property
- Options C, D, B, E, and A all do this to some degree, but B has the largest construction impact
- Douglas has the biggest impact on quality of life during the construction process but the lowest impact long-term. Please think about the future, not the inconvenience now. What will happen to land permanently damaged?
- If Douglas Road is used it will impact Hearthfire Neighborhood very negatively. Cars will go north on Turnberry and turn west on Morningside to avoid going on Douglas Road. Morningside is the only entrance to Hearthfire other than Douglas Road. Cars will go through Hearthfire and exit on Bateleur (presently a cul de sac) to bypass Douglas Road, thus creating a constant traffic flow from Turnberry through Hearthfire. NOT GOOD FOR US!

Option C (County Road 56)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Agriculture</th>
<th>Conveyance /Alignment</th>
<th>Construction</th>
<th>Environment</th>
<th>Process</th>
<th>Quality of Life</th>
<th>Water Supply</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average Score</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median Score</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Responses</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:

- East side of Reservoir #4
- Take the pipeline east of Reservoir 4 and then north. This affects fewest homeowners
- East side of reservoir
- Option C, with possibly Option E, is feasible, and is the only one that will likely do this well
- Option C is the clear front runner for most of these criteria!
- Option C should NOT go west of Reservoir 4 but EAST (dotted line)
- Option C does indeed affect private land (contrary to poster)

Option D (Poudre River Conveyance)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Agriculture</th>
<th>Conveyance /Alignment</th>
<th>Construction</th>
<th>Environment</th>
<th>Process</th>
<th>Quality of Life</th>
<th>Water Supply</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average Score</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median Score</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Responses</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Comments:

- The best way to protect River is the Poudre River Trust option
- The ONLY option that benefits Larimer County residents is the Poudre Option. Pipelines have no benefits to Larimer County residents!
- Option D is not reasonable or feasible. I'm a Larimer Resident and a town board member in Windsor. I've been following this. #1 if its acceptable on Douglas Road, it's not acceptable in my neighborhood for the same reason. Thornton bought quality water and have the right to transport it. Windsor will partner with Thornton on the pipeline. Leaving water in the river and removing at Windsor is not reasonable or feasible
- Global warming is a reality. A situation created by Man's overuse of oil based products that give off too much carbon dioxide/monoxide, agriculture, fertilizers, and destruction of forests. The Poudre River via its water moving vertically-horizontally and toward the sea via other rivers creates the water table along the river’s edges and beyond to create, forest, replenish the trees and vegetation for miles away, horizontally from the main channel of the Poudre. The trees are the lungs of the world. They take carbon dioxide out of the air and through the process of photosynthesis give off oxygen. To survive in the global warming eta, the water must be left in the river as far as possible to make sure the trees located in water table created by the river remain alive. Rain follows the green- if the river is allowed to keep our lungs operating it will rain due to the enhanced dew point created by the trees and river, giving off humidity to lubricate willing storm clouds laden with rain. To kill the trees by putting its water in pipes is ludicrous-shortsighted. Greedy ignorance tilled native green grasses into brown fields to grow wheat. The choice is obvious: Take the water down the river for the HEALTH and WELFARE of the citizens of Larimer County

Option E (Shields Street to Poudre River)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Agriculture</th>
<th>Conveyance /Alignment</th>
<th>Construction</th>
<th>Environment</th>
<th>Process</th>
<th>Quality of Life</th>
<th>Water Supply</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average Score</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median Score</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Responses</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:

- Re: process: First interest; very little verbiage here. Option E doesn't seem vetted out
- The "Shields and River" proposal is not the original proposal. Having Thornton "edit" citizen proposals without presenting the original is deceptive and not a valid way to engage in public discourse
COLOCATION QUESTION

Larimer County is currently processing two applications for two different water conveyance projects. One is the Thornton Water Project. The other is the Northern Integrated Supply Project proposed by Northern Water. If there are two pipelines, how important is it for them to be co-located / constructed in the same alignment?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very Important</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Important</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Particularly Important</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not At All Important</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

COMMENTS THAT APPLY TO MULTIPLE OPTIONS

**Conveyance and Alignment Options**

- TWP is three pipelines not just one. That needs to be considered strongly. They have the right to call for those extra pipelines at any time and don’t have to wait until 2065. Definitely don’t want Douglas. River route (Option D) is #1 choice!
- Between NISP's and Thornton's 3 pipelines (I know, they say they only are applying for one,) there isn't room on Douglas Road. 56 may be a problem, too. River Route is best, then canal
- I am interested in the idea of one on Douglas and one north on 56. It is not particularly important that they are worked on at the same time or place
- Note: B, C, E meet Thornton's interests. A, D meet Fort Collins, Larimer County resident's interests (including wildlife residing here) Many people have been expressing concerns about increasing numbers and intensity of wildfires regionally and beyond-yet few seem to make the connections between humans diverting water via pipelines and the fire behaviors. There are important connections which need to be addressed (as a former wildfire fighter, I’m very aware of these). PLEASE think beyond a pipeline option!
- Option B: horrible. Option C: best option for a sad situation. Option E: Not a good idea
- These five choices are all "lesser of evils", I don't care for any of them.
- C or D would be less disruptive
- Go Poudre River or tunnel under Reservoir #3 and put all pipelines on all of that VACANT land outside of all private neighborhoods
- Please do not impact Dick's tree farm. Please do not destroy Douglas Road in anyway, shape, or form. Please keep the water in the Poudre River. Thankyou
- Douglas Road is the best alternative, CR 56 and canal worst, river and Shields nonstarters.
- Thornton would need to acquire private property for a pump station under Options A, C, and E ((Note: This impact was identified by a Working Group member via email on November 27 and was confirmed by Thornton as an impact under its version of this concept. This impact was not added to the summary of the November 15 community meeting))

**Traffic and Construction**

- Option C is in my opinion by far the least damaging to Larimer County and its citizens, the preferred option of the City of Thornton, the best and preferred option for NISP, and has the best likelihood of colocation of the two pipelines, which is best for all parties concerned.
- Thornton's offer of running up to 3,000 acre-feet of its water in the river, via Shields Street
(Option E) should be carefully considered and may be beneficial

- The road closure next to the venue tonight is a preview and omen on what the Douglas Road option would be like. Ugly. The CR 56 option, assuming pipeline(s) are necessary, is the overall less disruptive option and provides opportunity for both NISP and Thornton’s pipes
- No neighborhood wants this pipeline; it is very intrusive. The river route cannot be accomplished. Northern route (one of them) MUST BE USED. Douglas Road is the most impacted route; 329 homes and residents have to count on one driveway to get out. Thank you for all your work for us!

**Worksheet and Project Process**

- The colocation question is misleading. If answer very important or important—then only options B and C are possible. Douglas Road (B) is by far the worst option particularly if it includes both pipelines
- Thornton has not been a good neighbor to Larimer County. They have proven to be deceitful and untrustworthy. Make them take the water down the Poudre or go home through Weld County.

**ADDITIONAL COMMENTS**

**Agriculture**

- Re: agriculture: Farms and HORSE properties
- Farmers rely on the aquifers the Poudre creates—no water, no food
- None really "protect" agriculture!

**Conveyance and Alignment Options**

- I really don’t want to see NISP happen either. I would to see water conservation (I know there is lots of potential for this!)
- Why not take up Rocky Ridge on their offer of an easement? Do both at once
- Let engineers decide if they should be co-located
- Colocation is important if it is out of the neighborhood
- Thornton needs to gather their water where they bought it and not impact Fort Collins. They have no right to dig up my backyard because they bought water 70 miles east of me!
- Colocation: It just makes sense. Efficiency and cost-sharing advantages. Minimizes overall impacts over time
- “Minimize use of private lands for these projects”: Critical as it is long-term.
- Using the shortest possible pipeline is absolutely necessary.
- How does the length of the pipeline impact quality of life? A community either is or is not impacted

**Environment, Water Quality, and Wildlife**

- Colocation is important if this happens. I’m still hoping for more environmentally friendly options.
- Please take into consideration the changes in climate; drought
- My primary concern is protecting Poudre River flow through Fort Collins; traffic and constructions impacts are temporary (even 4 years is temporary). River health is forever.
- The health of the Poudre must be the first criterion—all other concerns are temporary
- We must do what is best for the environment!
- Protecting the reservoirs is CRITICAL for wildlife especially with all the growth.
- Thornton is donating/leasing water to the Poudre River
The health of the river must come first. There are ways people can conserve water and use fewer chemicals that wind up in the water.

Re: rattlesnakes: What?!!! What about other wildlife?
Re: rattlesnakes- unclear. Are rattlesnakes the biggest safety impact?
Irrigation water is what they bought
They deserve the same quality of water that we have
Re" Find a solution in 2018": Let’s take a little more time, if necessary, for a good, environmentally-friendly solution

Traffic and Construction

- Need to do more work on traffic, especially with lots of development planned for the northeast area. If this is not approached in a methodical manner (SLOWLY) neighborhoods (older) will be isolated. Already a problem. Neighbors feel angry and helpless
- Roads are used as easements all over the country. Please do the same!!
- Thornton needs to put a MORATORIUM on new construction until there is water and infrastructure-including I-25 expansion! Many other cities have used the moratorium to slow down "progress" in order to save the quality of life for current county residents!
- Colocation: why "mess up" 2 areas?
- Minimizing or eliminate construction impacts or traffic disruptions is not critical because they are temporary.

Worksheet and Project Process

- Larimer County will not benefit at all. Thornton is not a good neighbor
- "Process: Be a good neighbor to Thornton" Why?
- Too confusing
- The colocation question is misleading. If answer very important or important-then only options B and C are possible. Douglas Road (B) is by far the worst option particularly if it includes both pipelines
- Thank you-competing opinions are passionate-this is the role of politics and requires courage! Cost is always an issue...and is NOT our problem!
- "Do no harm and ensure that any project provides benefits to Larimer County"- top priority.
- "Be a good neighbor to the City of Thornton"-not a priority; they have been duplicitous and high-handed
- "Provide a recommendation to the County Commissioners that maximizes benefits for Larimer County and its citizens, minimizes or mitigates negative impacts, respects the environment and Poudre River, and sets the standard for how counties should conduct the 1041 process."- Absolutely
- Bad survey design. Too many bullets
- I also had members of the Working Group on my property on their 4 wheeler! Lost, attempting to get back to the reservoir and tearing up my property as they spun around. They would not give their names. However, while I was here, I recognized one.
- I am concerned that the larger population in Fort Collins is pushing to have the negative impact placed on Windsor because it is less populated. Windsor already has to deal with the pipeline along CR 13. Is it necessary to decrease the property values of Windsor even more???
- Thornton's timeline (2025), water quality, reservoir space are not the problems of Larimer County Citizens. Thornton has had since 1980s/90s to work those out
- Thank you for your work
- Opponents of Douglas Road alignment want to shove it into someone else’s backyard.
- I appreciate the opportunity to give feedback. Unfortunately, I actually witnessed someone take my post-it note off of the map. You need to be aware that there are individuals compromising the accuracy of the feedback!
- As much as possible, Thornton AND NISP should draw water in such a way to minimize...
adverse effects to the Poudre River, the wildlife of the area, and respect the residents of Larimer County

- After attending several Planning Commissioner and County Commissioner meetings on this, I noticed disconnection with the understanding of the data across the Planning Department, Planning Commission, Building Department, and the County Commissioners. At times it was clear there were individual Larimer County teams
- I’m having trouble assessing these interests on an option by option basis
- I am most interested in what is best for Larimer County, not Thornton’s interests
- Re: “Use objective, fact-base criteria to determine the conveyance route” Critical to use facts
- Biased questions, NOT GOOD!
- Thornton has deceived the County with B.S and has not verified the “facts” they spew. They want clean water for them in exchange for Larimer County getting dirty water from the Platte
  - Re: “use the shortest pipeline to get water out of Larimer County”: Or no pipeline
- Re: community values. There are many values in community. The mob does not speak for all. TERRIBLE QUESTIONS
- Can’t rate the Water Supply and Process interests together. No matter the route, let’s get creative and make sure the reservoirs stay full in the summer
- How can [the two water supply interest] statements be addressed together?
- Re: water supply interests: LOADED question
- Re: water supply interests: Not sure what you are getting at
- These two [water supply] interests do not go together
- Too many questions. Bad survey design
- Re: “Be a good neighbor to the City of Thornton”: Why? They don’t want to be good neighbors to others (including Larimer County).
- Re: “prioritize, respect, and preserve the rights of Larimer County citizens.” Yes! This actually can help Thornton citizens, even if they don’t understand this yet
- Re "find a win-win solution for Larimer County and the City of Thornton" Is this possible in just one more month?
- Re: process: There are too many contradictory bullet points to fill this one out
- N/A
- "Be a good neighbor to Thornton”-Must be reciprocal!
- "Provide a recommendation to the County Commissioners that maximizes benefits for Larimer County and its citizens."-DONE
- Re: process: The first, second, third, and sixth interests are unimportant
- Re: process: The second, seventh, and ninths interests are very necessary. The eighth interest is the priority
Option A: Canal Conveyance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What are potential community benefits?</th>
<th>Dots</th>
<th>What are potential negative impacts in Larimer County (and mitigation measures?)</th>
<th>Dots</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Minimizes pipeline construction in Larimer County versus other options and therefore may be less disruptive to residences.</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>Potential seepage or flooding near ditches could affect neighboring properties.</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May create fewer traffic disruptions to homes than on-street pipeline options and little impact on transportation network.</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Necessitates construction of a pipeline to the canal system. Existing ditches run at capacity during irrigation season, so system may need to be expanded. (More study would be needed.)</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potentially preserves trees or environmental features because of minimized construction</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Treatment facility to address water quality may create local impacts and need for waste disposal of toxins removed from water.</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**November 13 Working Group ideas below (not confirmed by County staff)**

<p>| Could build reservoir and pumphouse on Thornton's property east of I-25 and pipeline from there. | 5    | Beginning of pipeline tears up street in Braidwood. Potential loss of water in ditch during winter. | 4    |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No eminent domain, private property impacts.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Potential loss of water in ditch during winter.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No pipelines/minimum pipelines.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Zero impacts to Larimer County residents.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historical path/use of the water.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Treat water for municipal use (e.g., Mississippi River).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No traffic impacts.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Build reservoir in Thornton for year-round use.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No construction impacts.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No environmental impacts.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No utility impacts.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No new crossings on Hwy. 1/25, canals, ditches.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Like idea of putting pipeline in canal.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Option B: Douglas Road Pipeline(s)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What are potential community benefits?</th>
<th>Dots</th>
<th>What are potential negative impacts in Larimer County (and mitigation measures)?</th>
<th>Dots</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>If in right of way, may minimize disruptions to private properties.</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Likely has the highest traffic impact of the pipeline options because of construction duration, number of properties and homes affected, and full closures to through traffic.</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal or better pavement conditions on Douglas Road, water line replacements, and possibly other infrastructure (e.g., bike lane or intersection improvement at Turnberry).</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Impacts to neighboring properties could be improved by detour routes and all-times access for properties.</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thornton's participation in Poudre River instream flow (i.e., 3,000 acre-feet/year or approx. 20% of Thornton's water) would augment river flows. Alternatively, Thornton provides long term fund to acquire senior water rights to improve base flows in river.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Construction time and impacts are affected by whether one or two pipelines are built concurrently (may be addressed by hours of construction, night work, monetary incentives to speed construction).</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Possible land conservation or dedication of Thornton owned properties at Douglas Rd/CR 11 and 56 and CR 56 and I-25 west of Cobb Lake near CSU properties- for recreation or natural areas. Or, Thornton buys land (e.g., 80 acres at southwest Turnberry and Douglas Road).

Emergency response plan and access would need to be addressed (e.g., staging vehicles).

### November 13 Working Group ideas below (not confirmed by County staff)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Idea</th>
<th>Impact Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rebuild Douglas-cost savings.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rebuild ELCO waterlines- cost savings.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extend Turnberry (traffic relief).</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction coordination- impact of failure- what recourse?</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wetlands impact- wildlife</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is right of way really wide enough for 2?</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No need to improve/rebuild Douglas.</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*(Note: this impact was erroneously originally recorded as “2-4 years.” It was described as approximately four years in the November 5 constructability webinar and corrected on 12/3/2018. The statement was left as written here because that is the form in which Working Group members and the community assessed it.)*
## Option C: County Road 56 Pipeline(s)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>What are potential community benefits?</strong></th>
<th><strong>Dots</strong></th>
<th><strong>What are potential negative impacts (and mitigation measures)?</strong></th>
<th><strong>Dots</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Potentially most feasible to co-locate Thornton and Northern pipelines while minimizing area and duration of construction in the County.</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>Lake taps and tunneling could minimize disruption in neighborhood open space areas or along lake shores.</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thornton's participation in Poudre River instream flow (i.e., 3,000-acre feet/year) would augment river flows. Other acquisition of water rights could occur as noted in &quot;B - Douglas Road&quot;.</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Lowest traffic impact of the pipeline options because of construction duration and number or properties and homes affected.</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If in right of way, minimizes disruption to private properties</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Construction time is less than Douglas Road (CR 54) option if pipeline is constructed concurrently with Northern's; however, work could be separated.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential land conservation or dedication of Thornton owned properties at Douglas Rd/CR11 and 56 and CR 56 and I-25 west of Cobb lake near CSU properties, or other options as noted in &quot;B - Douglas Rd&quot;.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Possible paving improvement on CR 56 or other infrastructure improvement.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### November 13 Working Group ideas below (not confirmed by County staff)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Idea</th>
<th>Impacts of properties on east side of Reservoirs 3 &amp; 4 (36 properties)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Better from standpoint of traffic impacts versus Douglas Road.</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No taking of private property.</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impacts of properties on east side of Reservoirs 3 &amp; 4 (36 properties).</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100-foot buffer on east side of reservoir #4 (cannot be built on).</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CR 56: 1-25 to county line - 1/4 miles corridor. Amend the application to keep the pipe in the right of way.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East side of #4 keeps it out of Braidwood.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General- need to clarify terms of property acquisition (fee simple versus easement and eminent domain).</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does not bisect properties.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construct pipe in winter so rattlesnakes are not driven adjacent to subdivisions and boat access is not interrupted.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pave CR 56 east of I-25 county line.</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential impacts to trees along east side of reservoir #4.</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Easement - use is the same as before.</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Option D: Poudre River

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>What are potential community benefits?</strong></th>
<th>Dots</th>
<th><strong>What are potential negative impacts (and mitigation measures)?</strong></th>
<th>Dots</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Extended peak flows benefit native fish, sediment flushing, less algae, natural beauty, etc.</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Water could get removed from Poudre River and/or exchanged by other parties (may need legal mechanisms to prevent).</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased and extended peak flows to provide for seasonal flooding to benefit riparian habitat.</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Treatment to address water quality may create local impacts and need for waste disposal of toxins removed from water.</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location of water entering river benefits the part of the river in greatest need according to Fort Collins Poudre River Report Card.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Possible construction of new storage as substitute to WSSC #4 to operate pumping station near Windsor.</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extend the flow for recreation use and water park in Fort Collins.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Potential new structures in river at Ted's Place for return diversions and construction of pipeline to river from WSSC #4.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### November 13 Working Group ideas below (not confirmed by County staff)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What are potential community benefits?</th>
<th>Dots</th>
<th>What are potential negative impacts (and mitigation measures)?</th>
<th>Dots</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ecological health with river through city as result of increased flows</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>Why the standard for the level of water quality that Thornton has proposed?</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eliminates 20 miles of pipeline to get proposed pipeline and Poudre River crossing.</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>What are impacts to neighborhood at diversion point? How is their voice heard?</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Everyone wins.</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Uncertainty or concern about negative effect on water levels in the WSSC lake system (and recreational activities of neighborhoods and property values).</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No impacts to private and public properties.</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>How about storage? Where will it be (in Windsor)?</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Downtown economy and water park.</td>
<td>What is implication of river quality through Windsor?</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meets Commissioner's directives.</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wetland, forest, wildlife habitat enhancement.</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental enhancement (no air quality impact).</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open lands, parks, and trails benefits.</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community assists Thornton in federal permitting.</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No eminent domain issues.</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reasonable alternative.</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No traffic impacts.</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Option E: Shields Street to Poudre River

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>What are potential community benefits?</strong></th>
<th>Dots</th>
<th><strong>What are potential negative impacts (and mitigation measures)?</strong></th>
<th>Dots</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Increased stream flow for recreation use in Fort Collins downtown area and water park, fish and wildlife habitat, etc.</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Pipeline construction impacts may be similar to either Douglas Road (CR 54) or North (CR 56) alignment (see B and C).</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased peak flows to provide for seasonal flooding to benefit riparian areas and habitat.</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Traffic impacts on Shields Street are less than CR 54 but more than CR 56. Approximately 125 homes may be disrupted as well as potential impacts to commuter travel on Shields.</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At 40 million galls per day, river flow options may create larger fluctuations in the Poudre River and possible flooding.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Reverse osmosis treatment, if needed in Windsor, generates a waste byproduct.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shields alignment would need more study regarding impacts to adjacent properties and construction impacts of outtake at Mulberry</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>How can the issue of water quality (all in Poudre) be addressed?</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic impacts on Shields (especially) construction</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**November 13 Working Group ideas below (not confirmed by County staff)**

- All water down river- no pump station. Same diversion point at reservoirs. Pipeline only down Shields. **23**
- Pipelines North and East- unnecessary negative impacts. **0**
- How can the issue of water quality (all in Poudre) be addressed? **0**
- Traffic impacts on Shields (especially) construction **0**
Larimer Water Projects Working Group Meeting #5
Hearing Room, Larimer County Building
Tuesday, Nov. 27, 2018, 6:00 PM - 9:00 PM
Meeting Summary – FINAL

Notes about this document:

- This is a summary of the meeting only. It is not a comprehensive list of all the statements made during the meeting.
- Inclusion in this document is not an endorsement of the truth or accuracy of the statements made during this meeting.
- In the interest of brevity, some statements have been combined into one or two sentences. Some nuance may have been lost in the process. This was unintentional.
- Any mistakes in summarizing the meeting were unintentional and do not negate the value or impact of the statements made during the meeting.

ATTENDANCE


(*Alternate)

Larimer County Staff: Todd Blomstrom, Lesli Ellis, Rob Helmick, and Rusty McDaniel

Facilitation: Heather Bergman and Dan Myers

Observers:
City of Thornton: Joanne Herlihy, Emily Hunt, Mark Koleber, and Gerald Simpson

Larimer County Consultants: Robin Dornfest, and Rich Follmer

Northern Water: Stephanie Cecil and Christie Coleman

Public Observers: Approximately 25 members of the public observed the meeting.

ACTION ITEMS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Larimer County Staff</th>
<th>Ask the County Attorney for written legal opinions on the following topics:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o Citing the relevant code or law that led the County to decide that if a topic was discussed at the July or August hearings that Thornton would be able to include it in a supplement rather than in a new application</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o If Thornton can choose among the alternatives discussed in the process without starting a new 1041 permit, then the County could, by the same token, pick an option and tell Thornton that it can take it or leave it.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Attachment M: November 27 LWPWG Meeting

| Working Group members | • Email Heather Bergman with any additional responses about the project process, alignment options, etc. by Friday, November 30, at noon.  
• Send suggested changes to the draft summary of the November 13 meeting to Peak Facilitation by 5:00 pm on December 3. |

THE PROCESS AHEAD
Lesli Ellis of Larimer County provided an overview of the next steps in the Larimer Water Projects process. Her comments are summarized below.

• The Larimer County Attorney has guided County staff that anything discussed as part of the Working Group process or hearings on Thornton’s 1041 permit application as options or alternatives can be submitted by Thornton as a supplement or addendum to its existing 1041 application.
• Thornton has until December 10 to submit a proposed supplement to its application to the County. County staff will share that supplement with the County Commissioners, the Working Group, and the public via the project webpage.
• There will not be adequate time for County staff to review the supplement between December 10 and the County Commissioners hearing on December 17, so staff will pass the supplement and other materials directly to the Commissioners. On December 10, the Commissioners will receive Thornton’s proposed supplement, a brief cover memo from County staff, and Peak Facilitation’s report on the Working Group process.
• The Commissioners have confirmed that they plan to use the December 17 meeting to hear presentations from County staff, Heather Bergman, and Thornton, but not public testimony. The Commissioners may ask questions.
• After the December 17 meeting, County staff will analyze the supplement and send out a report to referral agencies to prepare a report by January 14 to be sent to the Commissioners and made publicly available.
• The December 17 hearing will be continued to January 28. At that hearing, County staff will present on their analysis of the supplement. Thornton will have a brief chance to answer questions that arise in that analysis or before the hearing. The remainder of the meeting will feature public testimony, which will be allotted as much time as needed. That could mean additional hearings in February.
• Once public testimony is complete, Thornton will have a chance to give a rebuttal. The Commissioners will then deliberate and make their decision on the application.

Clarifying Questions
Working Group members asked several clarifying questions about the future of the Larimer Water Projects process. Questions are indicated in italics with responses below in plain text.

*What does “addendum” mean? If Thornton wanted to use County Road 56 rather than Douglas Road for its conveyance route, would it need to use an addendum?*
This a supplement to the application, not a new application. The application that Thornton originally submitted would still stand along with additional, supplement materials.

*So, the Planning Commission will not be part of this process?*
Correct.
Is it true that anything that the Working Group has proposed is fair game to include in the supplement, but only if Thornton decides to include it?
Thornton is listening to this process, and it is Thornton's application. However, County staff were informed by the Larimer County Attorney that anything discussed as part of the hearing process can be included. County staff will analyze the supplement, and the Commissioners will determine if the available information is adequate. If it is not, that will play out in the process.

Is there anything to prevent Thornton from returning with the same application for a pipeline down Douglas Road with no addendum?
Legally, there is nothing to prevent that. It is likely that Thornton plans to update its application based on what it has heard during this process.

Will the public have a chance to review the supplement before the public comment period at the Commissioners' hearing?
Yes. County staff will post the supplement on the Working Group project website as soon as they receive it (www.larimerwaterprojects.org). Peak Facilitation will also email the Working Group with a link to the supplement, which Working Group members are free to distribute. Larimer County residents can find the supplement on the Working Group project website or on the County's Citizen Access Portal (https://onlineportal.larimer.org/EnerGov_Prod/CitizenAccess/Site/Public/Main).

If Thornton's supplement proposes using Douglas Road or County Road 56, can the Commissioners indicate that they want Thornton to use another alternative or a variant on one of those options?
It is difficult to predict what the Commissioners would do. It would be unusual for the Commissioners to impose something on the applicant for which the applicant has not applied. It is expected that Thornton will consider the options discussed in creating its supplement, but County staff have not discussed this with Thornton. It would not be unusual for the County to put conditions on an application, and staff needs more time to provide an informed recommendation of denial of the application, approval, or approval with conditions. Additionally, the County will determine whether or not Thornton's December 10 submission qualifies as a supplemental or not.

What will the Commissioners hear from this Working Group at the December hearing? It seems odd that the Commissioners would not want to hear from the Working Group at that hearing.
The Commissioners have not mentioned or asked for that, but County staff will follow up with the Commissioners on that question. County staff anticipate that the Commissioners may not want to take input at the December 17 hearing because people would not have adequate time to review the facilitator's report and Thornton's submission between December 10 and December 17 and there will not be analysis.

Would the Commissioners be free and capable of acting on this matter on December 17? Or have they committed themselves to continue the process until January?
There will be no staff report or recommendations prepared by December 17, so it seems unlikely that the Commissioners will act on that date.

Who will be presenting at the December 17 meeting?
County staff will give a brief recap of the process, Heather Bergman will present on the engagement process and Working Group, and Thornton will present its proposal. The Commissioners may ask questions of County staff, Heather Bergman, or Thornton.
What is the County’s plan for transferring knowledge between Commissioners when a new Commissioner takes office in January?

It is not unusual for new commissioners to assume such a role, and the County has had Commissioners step in mid stream. The new Commissioner can watch recordings of hearings and presentations to prepare for the public engagement process. The Commissioner-elect has been following this process (and was observing this meeting early in the evening).

County staff stated that they did not have time to review Thornton’s supplement between December 10 and 17. Why hold a hearing on December 17 that gives Thornton a chance to talk to the Commissioners again without staff or public analysis? Why not delay the hearing until January 28? December 10 is the first time that the Working Group and County staff will see Thornton’s proposal. The idea was for the public and staff to have sufficient time to analyze that proposal for the conversation on January 28. The County must convene a meeting for December 17 as part of its continuation process from the last hearing on Thornton’s 1041 application, so the alternative would be to convene the meeting and immediately table it. The County decided that it might as well use that meeting time to see a presentation on what Thornton’s supplement includes.

Can the Working Group see Heather Bergman’s report to the Commissioners and provide input? Working Group members do not have to agree with the report, but they can review it before it is finalized.

Group Discussion

Working Group participants discussed the future of the Larimer Water Projects process. Their comments are summarized below.

- The level of rigor for the analysis of other topics discussed during the hearing process is not near what it is for the Douglas Road option. In theory, Thornton can decide that it is using County Road 56 and leave it at that.
- If Thornton can choose among the alternatives discussed in the process without starting a new 1041 permit, then the County could, by the same token, pick an option and tell Thornton that it can take it or leave it. Larimer County should get an answer from its attorney on that possibility.
- The Larimer County Attorney should provide a written legal opinion citing the relevant code or law that led the County to decide that if a topic was discussed at the July or August hearings that Thornton would be able to include in a supplement rather than in a new application.
- The task of the Working Group was to examine opportunities to maximize community benefits and minimize negative impacts.

REVIEW OF COMMUNITY INPUT FROM THE NOVEMBER 15 MEETING

Heather Bergman of Peak Facilitation provided an overview of the community input provided at the November 15 open house. Her comments are summarized below.

- The community meeting was held at Block One Events in Fort Collins on November 15 from 6:00 pm to 8:00 pm. 98 people (besides Working Group members, Thornton staff, Northern staff, or County staff) signed in at the meeting, and several attended but did not sign in, so there were probably around 105 to 110 people in attendance. Approximately half of the members of the Working Group attended the meeting.
- Copies of the summary of the November 15 community meeting were provided to members of the Working Group. The community meeting summary is attached to this document.
Facilitation noted that the version of the community meeting summary sent to Working Group members on the evening of November 26 contained errors stemming from an incomplete count of dot input and software issues. The version provided at this meeting is correct and will be posted to the project website. Peak Facilitation apologizes for the errors.

- Each of the five conveyance options had a station at the meeting similar to those used at the Working Group meeting on November 13. There were also stations for Northern Water, Thornton, and Larimer County traffic consultant Rich Follmer (who provided an updated analysis of traffic impacts). Working Group members, Heather Bergman, Larimer County staff, and Larimer County constructability consultant John Bambei circulated between one or more of these stations.

- Meeting participants provided input at the stations by marking or placing sticky notes on maps of the options and the lists of community benefits and negative impacts.

- Community members were given the same summary handouts of each of the conveyance options that Working Group members used at the November 13 meeting, with some minor changes. The summary handouts included a map of the option, a summary of how the option would work, and a list of potential community benefits and impacts associated with the option.

- Community members also received the Working Group’s list of interests. Community members were given worksheets that asked them to evaluate each of the five options based on the degree to which it met the different interests. Approximately 65 to 70 meeting participants completed the worksheet. Some respondents completed the worksheet for all of the options and interests, and other commented on a portion of them.

- Each community member was given ten dots in five colors and was asked to use two dots of the same color at each station to mark the community benefit and negative impact that was most important them. There was some confusion surrounding this exercise, but it went well overall.

- Peak Facilitation and County staff received a great deal of feedback on the meeting from both Working Group members and members of the public. Most people appreciated the meeting and found it helpful. Several had concerns about the large option/interest evaluation worksheet, including the complicated nature and length of the worksheet, confusion surrounding the interest list, and disagreement with the interests on the list.

- Some meeting participants took other participants’ sticky note comments down, and some meeting participants reported being pressured to have a certain opinion on an option.

- Parking at the venue was very difficult because of the venue’s lack of parking spaces and construction on the street. Peak Facilitation gave people a few extra minutes to make their way into the meeting, but parking was extremely challenging.

- Peak Facilitation tallied the five community benefits and five negative impacts that received the most dots for each option. Some of the community benefits and negative impacts were listed on the original worksheets provided at the November 13 Working Group meeting, and others were added to the list by Working Group members at that meeting. County staff and Peak Facilitation copied the exact language of these Working Group additions to the best of their ability.

- At this meeting, Peak Facilitation presented five community benefits and five negative impacts that received the most dots for each option. Peak Facilitation also presented the average, median, and number of responses provided on the option/interest evaluation worksheet for each option. Detailed community input can be found in the November 15 community meeting summary, which includes comments sorted by the option they apply to, comments that apply to multiple options, and additional comments (some of which discuss process concerns).
Clarifying Questions and Answers about the November 15 Event and Community Input
Working Group members asked several clarifying questions regarding the community input from
the November 15 meeting. Questions are indicated in italics with corresponding responses below in
plain text.

Questions for the Facilitator

Has Peak produced a summary of the five options ranked highest to lowest by scores?
No.

If Working Group members were confused by the input gathering exercises at the community meeting, how will the Commissioners not be confused with a limited time frame to review these materials?
The Working Group's job is to evaluate options, maximize community benefits, and minimize negative impacts; its job is not to rank the options for the Commissioners. The data from the community meeting and tonight's exercise will tell the Commissioners and Thornton what the community and Working Group thought.

Who wrote these negative impacts?
Mostly Working Group members at their stations at the November 13 meeting. County staff provided summaries of the options, and then Working Group members added their thoughts on additional community benefits and negative impacts.

How will the Working Group address eastern Larimer County neighborhoods and the impacts on those residents, who are underrepresented here? If the Working Group's recommendation moves the impact and benefits to those neighborhoods, how will that be addressed in the facilitator's report?
There will not be a recommendation from the Working Group in the facilitator's report, but rather a summary of the Working Group's thoughts. When topics like the eastern Larimer County neighborhoods are discussed, Working Group members are encouraged to express their concerns for the record.

How will the Commissioners be informed of the variation placed on Option E (Shields Street)? The data at the November 15 meeting was gathered on a version of the option that includes pipelines that the originally presented option did not feature. How will the Commissioners be made aware of how that change came about?
This will be summarized in the facilitator's report.

Who made the maps with the altered concepts? Why was the applicant allowed to alter the presentations and what-if ideas for the Shields Street and canal options? Who wrote the text to accompany the altered concept maps?
Thornton responded that it made the maps of the five options and decided that if the Shields Street and canal options were to work for Thornton, that would be how they need to work. County staff wrote the text on the concept sheets.

Questions for Thornton

Are there contractual constraints on when any of Thornton's multiple municipal water sources can be pulled during the year?
Thornton can pull the water anytime it chooses to from all of its sources.
Northern Water has said that it would be a tight fit to include both its and Thornton’s pipeline in Douglas Road. If Thornton needs a second pipeline after 2065, does it make sense to place it where it can fit? It does not seem like it would fit in Douglas Road.

If Thornton needs an additional pipeline in 2065, it would be best to locate it where it fits best with existing regulations, the situation, the environment, etc. At present, Thornton needs to get one pipeline permitted.

What could the Larimer County Commissioners or the community do to help Thornton better consider alternative routes like the Poudre River?

Thornton will make a proposal based on the information it has heard from the Working Group. It has not examined specific potential actions for any individual or county. Thornton will consider that between now and December 10.

Is Thornton even considering the canal or Poudre River options?

Thornton examined a number of perspectives including water quality and flows for those options and identified issues. Those concerns and would need to be addressed for Thornton to use one of those options. Thornton has not heard anything that addresses those issues.

What are the obstacles to using the Poudre River option?

Water quality, loss of water, public health (providing water that does not cause disease), etc.

Thornton’s stated obstacles to using the Poudre River option are not the concerns put forth by the County Commissioners. What prohibits Thornton from treating the Poudre River like other water providers are doing with water from the more-polluted South Platte?

Thornton examined that and provided information about it in the water quality webinar.

The public made clear at the November 15 community meeting that its two favorite options are the Poudre River and canal options. What is the most difficult issue for each of those two options and what could be done to address it?

Thornton cannot answer that because each issue is so intertwined with the others. Even if one issue were solved, others could still be deal breakers.

What issues would Thornton address first for the Poudre River and canal options?

There is a full list of issues, including Thornton’s water court decree and its agreements with the Water Supply and Storage Company (WSSC), that would all need to be addressed before Thornton could proceed.

Questions for County Staff

The Shields Street option appeared at the Commissioners meeting. Some Working Group members think that this option should have never been considered, but it was brought up at that hearing. Is that option now considered part of Thornton’s packet going forward? It was proposed before the Working Group and then to the Working Group, but never by Thornton.

The Shields Street option was carried forward by the County because a community member brought it up. Topics mentioned in the packet and during the hearing are fair game for Thornton’s supplement.
How will the County hold Thornton and Northern accountable for damage to private property and Larimer County outbuildings during construction? Should Thornton and Northern be required to post a bond to fix damage to property?

Once an alignment is selected and the design process begins, County staff will consider the applicant’s proposal and identify the mitigation measures that are most important to protecting property. Bonds can be considered. Another option would be to monitor whether or not vibrations from construction are damaging utilities or the foundations of homes.

If a property owner suffers damage, would they need to contest the damage with Thornton or Northern or would the County tell Thornton or Northern to make the situation right?

If it were one property, the County would probably look to Thornton or Northern to make the situation right. If multiple issues were occurring, the County would stop construction until Thornton or Northern provided an adequate solution.

How much deviation from the proposed routes will be permitted? For example, the County Road 56 route has changed substantially in part to help Thornton avoid tunneling under wetlands. Can property owners tell Thornton or Northern to build within the road?

County staff is considering conditions for all five options which will depend on what Thornton applies for on December 10. If County Road 56 were selected and a property owner along the route did not want to sell an easement, the County could require Thornton to run its pipeline in the road if that is at all possible.

If people have concerns about Thornton’s presentation on December 17, can they share those at the January hearing?

Yes.

Northern initially said that it could fit a pipeline in County Road 56, but then said it would not be sure about this until it does a detailed study. If the Thornton and Northern pipelines are collocated, and Thornton installs its pipeline first, what would happen if Northern found that it could not fit in that corridor? Would that be determined before construction began?

In the hypothetical scenario where the application was approved for that route, the conveyance design (including utility identification) would be approved by County staff before construction began. County staff’s cautious opinion is that relocating some utilities in the event of colocation would not be insurmountable. However, an obstruction like a dam or reservoir would be immovable.

If the Douglas Road route is chosen and construction closes the entrance to Hearthfire on that road, the Water’s Edge development could start at the same time and close Hearthfire’s other entrance via Morningstar way. How will the County coordinate so that those closures do not happen at the same time?

If the Douglas Road route were chosen and approved, Thornton would need to go through the design process to obtain a right-of-way permit from Larimer County. Larimer County would place a condition on that permit that both access points to Hearthfire cannot be closed at once. If that condition were violated, construction would be stopped, and the road would be opened.

County staff did not adequately analyze Thornton’s previous 1041 application. How will the community know that staff adequately reviewed the December 10 application, with or without supplements?

County staff accepts criticism. Larimer County could not control the public engagement process before the Commissioners’ hearings began on the application, at which point it became the County’s process. County staff realized that the Thornton application was challenging and became concerned.
that it would be shortsighted for the County to not consider the Northern Integrated Supply Project (NISP) with Thornton’s proposal. County staff placed a number of conditions upon Thornton’s proposal in an attempt to account for the possibility of those projects merging, in order to ensure that County staff did not make a bad decision.

Group Discussion
Working Group participants discussed the community input from the November 15 meeting. Their comments are summarized below.

- The listed negative impact of treatment for water quality is misleading because that is not an impact for Larimer County.
- Some of the potential negative impacts (such as “zero impacts to Larimer County”) do not look like negative impacts at all. These impacts and benefits were from Working Group input at each option station at the November 13 meeting. County staff did not rewrite or parse that input.
- Some of the community benefits and negative impacts began with “if” Thornton did something, which places those “if” benefits and impacts on the same footing as those that are known even though they have not happened yet.
- Many of the County Road 56 area’s residents were turned away because of parking and access difficulties at the (Block One) event venue. The County should never hold another event at Block One Events.
- The facilitator’s report will be clear that the benefits and impacts are not analysis, but rather “gut-check” information from the Working Group.
- The Town of Windsor has not commented on impacts and benefits so far because there are few details on what those would entail.
- Landowners will not sell easements along County Road 56.
- Northern Water does not want to place its pipeline in the road along County Road 56, but Thornton does.
- The Poudre River option received the most “5s” in its option/interest evaluation, and the canal option received the second-most.
- The Working Group should pay attention to the intent of the Commissioners’ instructions to them, not the fine wording. Coming up with options is neutral if there is no message to the Commissioners about the most important options for the residents of Larimer County. The facilitator’s summary will include a section that rewords the benefits and impacts that resonated the most with people.
- The Shields Street option was debased from its original concept of using a gravity feed without a pump station or pipelines. The changes to the Shields Street option were unfair and a blindside surprise. The facilitator will include those concerns in the report.
- Many Working Group members did an excellent job of providing information at the community meeting.
- The premise of the community meeting was to inform the public of all of the options, but attendees were immediately confronted with Thornton and Northern trying to sell their ideas upon entering the venue, which conflicts with the Working Group’s charge from the Commissioners. Several of the option stations were placed far away in a back corner. The setup of the room was a disservice to the public and the Working Group.
- Putting the Shields Street option forward in its modified form was a disservice.
- It seems that Thornton and Northern’s minds are made up, and their stations at the meeting suggested they had no interest in anything but the same old ideas.
- If possible, the parties responsible for placing pipelines on the original version of the Shields Street option should be identified.
It is unclear why Thornton has not dealt with its impacts on eastern Larimer County. Its application will not be complete until it has dealt with that.

Thornton and Northern will be building two 48-inch parallel pipelines and a 72-inch return pipeline on the eastern side of Larimer County. It is a shame that people are pretending that those additional pipelines will not be built until 2065. Larimer County residents need to know what will happen to their properties and homes. It is known that Thornton needs three pipelines and its water court decree says it needs a return pipeline. At its Planning Commission hearing, Thornton declined to agree to wait to construct a second pipeline until 2065 if it needs one.

Thornton’s water has gone down the Larimer County Canal for 100 years, so it is difficult to see the problem with that option. Degrading water quality is not Larimer County’s concern, and the South Platte River’s quality is far worse than that of the Poudre. An attendee of the November 15 meeting noted that sewage water is made into drinking water in California’s West Basin. The Working Group should move beyond this question of water quality.

The Working Group has seen no application or detailed route alignments from Northern.

Figures shown in the water quality webinar show both of NISP’s proposed pipeline alignments for Douglas Road and County Road 56. NISP’s proposed in conveyances are publicly available in its Environmental Impact Statement (EIS). Larimer County staff asked Northern to make one variation to its County Road 56 alignment to avoid running that potential pipeline between houses.

There was disagreement as to whether there were other large variations from the original County Road 56 proposed alignment, especially east of Highway 1.

While Thornton seems to be assuming that a pipeline will be selected, the Commissioners may want Thornton to use the Poudre River or canal options. It is not a given that Thornton will build a pipeline in Larimer County, so the County should deal with NISP separately.

The NISP project was not a proper concern for this Working Group. It was not the charge that the group received from the Commissioners.

Save the Poudre did not ask anyone to attend the November 15 community meeting and the Poudre River option still won.

WORKING GROUP EVALUATION OF BENEFITS, IMPACTS, AND INTERESTS
Heather Bergman of Peak Facilitation led the group in an exercise designed to evaluate community benefits, negative impacts, and the degree to which categories of interests are met by each concept. The parameters for the exercise are summarized below.

- Each group member was given a clicker to answer multiple choice questions projected onto a large screen at the front of the meeting room.
- Bergman displayed the live results for each question after giving the group a notice that she was closing the poll for each item.
- Working Group members were presented with a list of the top five community benefits and negative impacts identified by community members at the November 15 open house. Working Group members were asked to use their clickers to identify which of the five benefits and impacts (respectively) for each option was most important to them.
- At the end of polling on each option, Bergman provided the group with an opportunity to discuss which benefits or impacts should or should not be listed.
- Working Group members were also asked to use their printed lists of Working Group interests to identify the two interests that each option meets best and not as well, respectively.
• The value of the exercise was to compare the thoughts of the Working Group to those of the community in an effort to determine if the community and Working Group were on the same page about these options or if there was a wider variety of perspectives.

• 26 Working Group members were present.

Option A Polling Responses
Based on the dots exercise at the November 15 community meeting, the following 5 potential community benefits of Option A (Canal Conveyance) are the most important to the community. Of these, which is the highest priority to you? (Select one.) Percentages of responses are indicated in bold.

A. 61% Minimize pipeline construction in Larimer County versus other options and therefore may be less disruptive to residences.
B. 17% May create fewer traffic disruptions to homes than on-street pipeline options and little impact on transportation network.
C. 4% Potentially preserves trees or environmental features because of minimized construction.
D. 4% Could build reservoir and pumphouse on Thornton’s property east of I-25 and pipeline from there.
E. 13% No eminent domain, private property impacts.

Number of Responses: 23

Based on the dots exercise at the November 15 community meeting, the following 5 potential negative impacts Option A (Canal Conveyance) are of most concern to the community. Of these, which is of most concern to you? (Select one.) Percentages of responses are indicated in bold.

A. 0% Potential seepage or flooding near ditches could affect neighboring properties.
B. 50% Necessitates construction of a pipeline to the canal system. Existing ditches run at capacity during irrigation season, so system may need to be expanded. (More study would be needed.)
C. 21% Treatment facility to address water quality may create local impacts and need for waste disposal of toxins removed from water.
D. 21% Beginning of pipeline tears up street in Braidwood. Potential loss of water in ditch during winter.
E. 7% Potential loss of water in ditch during winter.

Number of Responses: 14

Which TWO of the following interests identified by the Working Group do you think Option A (Canal Conveyance) addresses BEST? (Select two.)
Please reference interest handout for complete list of interests included in each category below. Percentages of responses are indicated in bold.

A. 6% Agriculture
B. 33% Conveyance and Alignment Alternatives
C. 28% Construction
D. 14% Environment
E. 17% Quality of Life
F. 3% Water Supply
G. 0% Process
Number of Responses: 18

*Which TWO of the following interests identified by the Working Group do you think Option A (Canal Conveyance) DOES NOT address well? (Select two.) Please reference interest handout for complete list of interests included in each category below. Percentages of responses are indicated in bold.*

A. **24%** Agriculture  
B. **5%** Conveyance and Alignment Alternatives  
C. **14%** Construction  
D. **14%** Environment  
E. **5%** Quality of Life  
F. **14%** Water Supply  
G. **24%** Process  

Number of Responses: 14

*Group Discussion:*

- There was confusion as to why the Working Group was being asked to choose among benefits. The facilitator suggested that doing so might tell Thornton which benefits would be the most important to maximize.
- The negative impact “Necessitates construction of a pipeline to the canal system. Existing ditches run at capacity during irrigation season, so system may need to be expanded. (More study would be needed.)” was added to a Working Group member’s what-if presentation by Thornton. Thornton’s 17% of the Jackson Ditch shares could be water exchanged to travel down the Larimer County Canal, so no physical pipeline would be needed from Reservoir #4 to the Larimer County Canal. This pipeline was not in the original canal conveyance route proposal, so it is concerning that this proposal changed to include this pipeline.
- The streets of Braidwood would not need to be torn up, because water exchanges (not pipelines) are all that would be necessary. Thornton’s changes were intended to debase the canal option.
- It was never intended that a treatment facility be built in Larimer County.
- There were questions as to whether abstaining from identifying the most important negative impact would indicate that those abstaining did not think that those impacts were concerns for Larimer County. The facilitator expressed willingness to list the reasons provided for abstaining (changes to the list of top negative impacts or community benefits, unreasonable negative impacts or benefits being listed, etc.).
- Concern about potential seepage from the ditch is misleading because the ditch has been there for over 100 years.
- There were concerns that it was misleading for one of the Working Group’s interest categories to be (Thornton’s) “Water Supply.”
- While several people at the community meeting pointed out that some of the interests listed in the same category are contradictory, the facilitator opted to provide the Working Group with the same categories for purposes of comparison.
- One of the interests (“Use the shortest pipeline possible to get the water out of Larimer County”) listed by a Working Group member was originally listed under the “Quality of Life” category but should have been listed under the “Conveyance and Alignment Alternatives.” The facilitator made this change.
There was disagreement and confusion about the value of the polling exercise. The Working Group decided to skip the questions on interests for the other four options and to focus on questions on benefits, impacts, and possible pipeline colocation.

Several Working Group members asked if not answering a particular question would signify general disagreement with the question. The facilitator clarified that she would report reasons provided for abstaining from some of the questions.

**Option B Polling Responses**

Based on the dots exercise at the November 15 community meeting, the following 5 potential community benefits of Option B (Douglas Road Pipeline(s)) are the most important to the community. Of these, which is the highest priority to you? (Select one.) Percentages of responses are indicated in **bold**.

A. **56%** If in the right of way, may minimize disruptions to private properties.
B. **11%** Equal or better pavement conditions on Douglas Road, water line replacements, and possibly other infrastructure (e.g., bike lane or intersection improvement at Turnberry).
C. **11%** Thornton’s participation in Poudre River instream flow (i.e., 3,000 acre-feet/year or approx. 20% of Thornton’s water) would augment river flows. Alternatively, Thornton provides long-term fund to acquire senior water rights to improve base flows in river.
D. **22%** Possible land conservation or dedication of Thornton owned properties at Douglas Rd/Cr 11 and 56 and Cr 56 and I-25 west of Cobb Lake near CSU properties – for recreation or natural areas. Or, Thornton buys land (e.g., 80 acres at southwest Turnberry and Douglas Road).
E. **0%** Rebuild Douglas - cost savings (Tied for 5th).
F. **0%** Rebuild ELCO waterlines – cost savings (Tied for 5th).

Number of Responses: 9

Based on the dots exercise at the November 15 community meeting, the following 5 potential negative impacts of Option B (Douglas Road Pipeline(s)) are of most concern to the community. Of these, which is of the most concern to you? (Select one.) Percentages of responses are indicated in **bold**.

A. **33%** Likely has the highest traffic impact of the pipeline options because of construction duration, number of properties and homes affected, and full closures through traffic.
B. **62%** 2-4 years construction impact. Like a war zone. *(Note: this impact was erroneously originally recorded as “2-4 years.” It was described as approximately four years in the November 5 constructability webinar and corrected on 12/3/2018. The statement was left as written here because that is the form in which Working Group members and the community assessed it.)*
C. **0%** Construction time and impacts are affected by whether one or two pipelines are built concurrently (may be addressed by hours of construction, night work, monetary incentives to speed construction).
D. **0%** Wetlands-impact wildlife.
E. **0%** Not NISP preferred option (Tied for 5th).
F. **5%** Utility shuts off (water, power, cable) (Tied for 5th).

Number of Responses: 21
Group Discussion:
- It was noted for the record that the construction timeline is now 4-6 years, not 2-4, according to the constructability webinar.
- Thornton’s participation in the Poudre in-stream flow program is not contingent upon it building a pipeline along Douglas Road.
- Option B would affect Dick Brauch’s farm no matter what.

Option C Polling Responses
Based on the dots exercise at the November 15 community meeting, the following 5 potential community benefits of Option C (North Route (CR 56) Pipeline(s)) are the most important to the community. Of these, which is the highest priority to you? (Select one.) Percentages of responses are indicated in bold.

A. 58% Potentially most feasible to co-locate Thornton and Northern pipelines while minimizing area and duration of construction in the County.
B. 8% Better from standpoint of traffic impacts versus Douglas Road.
C. 8% If in right of way, minimizes disruption to private properties.
D. 8% Thornton’s participation in Poudre River instream flow (i.e., 3,000-acre-feet/year) would augment river flows. Other acquisition of water rights could occur as noted in “B – Douglas Road.”
E. 17% No taking of private property.

Number of Responses: 12

Based on the dots exercise at the November 15 community meeting, the following 5 potential negative impacts of Option C (North Route (CR 56) Pipeline(s)) are of most concern to the community. Of these, which is of the most concern to you? (Select one.) Percentages of responses are indicated in bold.

A. 0% Lake taps and tunneling could minimize disruption in neighborhood open space areas or along lake shores.
B. 10% Impacts of properties on east side of Reservoirs 3 and 4 (36 properties).
C. 20% Lowest traffic impact of the pipeline options because of construction duration and number of properties and homes affected.
D. 40% Impacts private property (Eagle Lake and CR 56), but CR 54 is all in right of way (Tied for 4th).
E. 20% CR 56: I-25 to county line - 1/4 miles corridor. Amend the application to keep the pipe in the right of way (Tied for 4th).
F. 10% General-need to clarify terms of property acquisition (fee simple versus easement and eminent domain) (Tied for 4th).

Number of Responses: 10

Group Discussion:
- “Potentially most feasible to co-locate Thornton and Northern pipelines while minimizing area and duration of construction in the County” and “No taking of private property” are both false. It is not known whether or not it is feasible to put both pipelines in County Road 56 because of the dams and reservoirs along the route. Additionally, everything that would be displaced on the route would involve the taking of private property.
- Easements would be taken, not private property.
- All Working Group members probably have pipelines running through their yards or under their houses, and they probably do not worry about them.
Potential negative impact A does not seem like a negative impact.

If a 4-6 year construction impact is a negative for Douglas Road, it should be a negative for County Road 56.

There are inconsistencies in the printouts of the polling slides in terms of dots and the listed construction timelines for Options B and C.

Northern Water stated that it would take less time to construct a pipeline along County Road 56 than it would along Douglas Road because there would be less work necessary to relocate existing utilities.

“Lowest traffic impact of the pipeline options because of construction duration and number of properties and homes affected” is not a negative impact.

At the community meeting on November 15, almost no one understood “Lake taps and tunneling could minimize disruption in neighborhood open space areas or along lake shores” or “Lowest traffic impact of the pipeline options because of construction duration and number of properties and homes affected” as negative impacts.

It seems dishonest to weigh the Eagle Lake and County Road 56 neighborhoods against each other.

**Option D Polling Responses**

*Based on the dots exercise at the November 15 community meeting, the following 5 potential community benefits of Option D (Poudre River) are the most important to the community. Of these, which is the highest priority to you? (Select one.) Percentages of responses are indicated in bold.*

A. 29% Ecological health with river through city as result of increased flows.
B. 41% Eliminates 20 miles of pipeline to get to proposed pipeline and river crossing.
C. 6% Extended peak flows benefit native fish, sediment flushing, less algae, natural beauty, etc.
D. 18% Everyone wins.
E. 6% No impacts to private and public properties (Tied for 5th).
F. 0% Increased and extended peak flows to provide for seasonal flooding to benefit riparian habitat (Tied for 5th).

**Number of Responses: 17**

*Based on the dots exercise at the November 15 community meeting, the following 5 potential negative impacts of Option D (Poudre River) are of most concern to the community. Of these, which is of the most concern to you? (Select one.) Percentages of responses are indicated in bold.*

A. 0% Water could get removed from Poudre River and/or exchanged by other parties (may need legal mechanisms to prevent).
B. 8% Treatment to address water quality may create local impacts and need for waste disposal of toxins removed from water.
C. 33% Possible construction of new storage as substitute to WSSC #4 to operate pumping station near Windsor.
D. 17% Potential new structures in river at Ted’s Place for return diversions and construction of pipeline from river to WSSC #4.
E. 8% Why the standard for the level of water quality that Thornton has proposed? (Tied for 5th).
F. 33% Uncertainty or concern about negative impacts on water levels in the WSSC lake system (and recreational activities of neighborhoods and property values) (Tied for 5th).

**Number of Responses: 12**
Group Discussion

- Again, the PowerPoint slides did not correspond to the handout slides.
- It is difficult to say that everyone wins under this option and it is difficult to say that there would be no impacts to private or public property under this option.
- Eliminating the 20 miles of pipeline from WSSC Reservoir #4 to where the pipeline crosses the river at Windsor would eliminate many of the negative impacts.
- There were questions about the meaning of community benefit D, which was added by a Working Group member.

Option E Polling Responses

Based on the dots exercise at the November 15 community meeting, the following 3 potential community benefits of Option E (Shields Street to Poudre River) are the most important to the community. Of these, which is the highest priority to you? (Select one.) Percentages of responses are indicated in bold.

A. **67%** All water down-river – no pump station. Same diversion point at reservoirs. Pipeline only down Shields.
B. **20%** Increased stream flow for recreation use in Fort Collins downtown area and water park, fish and wildlife habitat, etc.
C. **13%** Increased peak flows to provide for seasonal flooding to benefit riparian areas and habitat.

Number of Responses: 15

Based on the dots exercise at the November 15 community meeting, the following 5 potential negative impacts of Option E (Shields Street to Poudre River) are of most concern to the community. Of these, which is of the most concern to you? (Select one.) Percentages of responses are indicated in bold.

A. **45%** Pipeline construction impacts may be similar to either Douglas Road (CR 54) or North (CR 56) alignment (see B and C).
B. **36%** Traffic impacts on Shields are less than CR 54 but more than CR 56. Approximately 125 homes may be disrupted as well as potential impacts to commuter travel on Shields.
C. **0%** At 40 million gals per day, river flow options may create larger fluctuations in the Poudre River and possible flooding.
D. **18 %** Reverse osmosis treatment, if needed in Windsor, generates a waste byproduct.
E. **0%** Pipelines North and East – unnecessary negative impacts.

Number of Responses: 11

Group Discussion

- The changes made to the option map by Thornton should not be considered when reviewing this proposal. This proposal should stand on its own merits. Thornton refused to remove its changes from this map.
- The Shields Street option has the same diversion point, allows Thornton to use all of its storage, and has other benefits. It does feature the negative impact of a pipeline, but without Thornton’s changes, this has benefits.
- There was confusion about answering questions for this option when the original option was written differently. The Commissioners should be informed that this option is distinct from the original.
• This is a reasonable idea that gets water back into the river.
• There was a discussion of whether or not Working Group members should weigh in on this modified version of the Shield Street option.
• It is difficult to choose between community benefits B and C. These should be combined.
• The facilitator will note in her report that this option is a departure from the original concept.
• The original proposal also included the City of Fort Collins and Larimer County cleaning up wastewater plants.
• Negative impact C is incorrect and negative impact E is irrelevant to the original vision for this option.
• The original Thornton Poudre River option included treatment near Thornton, not in Windsor or Larimer County. Options D or E do not need to be in Larimer County, and it is Thornton’s waste product.

Colocation
If a pipeline option is selected, do you think that Thornton and Northern should coordinate construction and co-locate their respective pipelines?

A. 84% Yes, they should/they need to.
B. 5% I don’t feel strongly.
C. 11% No, they shouldn’t/don’t need to.

Number of Responses: 19

Group Discussion
• There were questions as to who requested that this question be asked in this exercise. It was clarified that Larimer County staff wanted to know this information.
• There were questions as to who would “select” a pipeline option. It was clarified that this would be approved by the Commissioners.
• If any hypothetical pipelines did not fit together, they would not be collocated.

NEXT STEPS
• Each Working Group member was invited to email Heather Bergman with any additional responses about the project process, alignment options, etc. by Friday, November 30, at noon.
• Suggested changes to the draft summary of the November 13 meeting are due at 5:00 pm on December 3.
• The facilitator’s report will be available on December 10.
• Larimer County staff thank the Working Group for all of their hard work.

Public Comment Card Input
Observers at the meeting had the opportunity to provide comments or questions on cards. Submitted questions and comments are included below, transcribed verbatim from comment cards.

Public Comment Card Questions
• Is NISP considering going through the Poudre River? It can go “green” just as much as Thornton.
• If it is going to disrupt Douglas Road for over five years, how is Thornton going to get its whole conveyance system taken care of by 2025?

• I’m very curious about how many agreements Thornton has already established with how many pipeline builders? Thornton seems determined to use pipelines- as Mark indicated when trying to answer questions about adding pipelines to proposals which originally never included any. I imagine I’m not alone in wondering about this, so I don’t want to limit this to only my contact information.

• Do they know what the rate of degradation of water over the distance to east is? Simple question. A study?

**Public Comment Card Comments**

• The pipeline has NO benefit to Larimer County residents, NONE. Stay out of private property.

• I was very concerned about shifting the pain from Douglas Road to East Larimer, including Larimer residents in Windsor (Douglas Road="Not in our backyard"). We could make all the same arguments as Douglas Road. Pipeline should be considered on merits, not location. Thank you.

• This was window dressing so that Thornton can say there was citizen participation-waste of time.

• Entire schematic of how NISP gets to its ultimate destination and how Thornton gets to its final destination needs to be illustrated and addressed; not just piece-mealed out in short stints through Fort Collins.

• Easements DO affect property: trees come own, grading gets altered, wildlife habitat is disrupted. Easements must be purchased at market rate divided by two or something similar.

• I’m very worried about how the clicker exercises will be interpreted. Too many people want to interpret meaningless charts/graphs as meaning things which they don’t. I’m thinking about a classic book called “How to Lie With Statistics,” which is used in universities to prevent this kind of thing from happening.
OVERVIEW

On November 15, 2018, the community was invited to an open house to provide input on five conveyance options or project configurations for the Thornton Water Project (TWP). The open house was from 6 pm to 8 pm at Block One in Fort Collins. Ninety-eight people signed in for the meeting; a small number of additional participants declined to sign in. In addition to these participants, several members of the Larimer Water Projects Working Group also attended the meeting, as did representatives from the City of Thornton and Northern Water, as well as County staff, independent consultants hired by the County, and the LWPWG facilitator.

The meeting space was set up with stations around the room. There was a station for each of the five conveyance options: A-Canal Conveyance, B-Douglas Road, C-County Road 56, D-Poudre River, and E-Shields Street & Poudre River. Additionally, Thornton and Northern Water each had a station, as did the traffic consultant hired by the County. The constructability consultant hired by the County moved throughout the room answering questions, as did the facilitator. There was one County staff person at each option station, and Working Group members either stayed at a specific option station or circulated throughout the room.

Upon arrival, participants were given packets containing the following:

- **Handouts summarizing each option**, including potential benefits and potential impacts. Some potential benefits and potential impacts had been reviewed by the County prior to the Working Group meeting on November 13; others were added as part of the Working Group meeting on November 13.
- **The analysis provided by the County's traffic consultant**.
- **The list of community interests** identified by the Working Group at their first meeting.
- **A worksheet** to evaluate the options against the interests, provide input on the importance of co-location of the Thornton and Northern pipelines if both are approved, and to share any additional thoughts with the Working Group.
- **10 dots** to use to indicate the highest-priority potential benefit and the potential impact that concerned them most for each of five options.

PROCESS

The open house began with a presentation of the five conveyance options for TWP. Following this presentation, participants were invited to provide feedback in the following ways:

- Using their dots:
o Indicate which of the potential community benefits for each option is most important to them.
o Indicate which of the potential impacts for each option concerns them most.

● On their worksheets:
o Indicate on a scale of 1 to 5 how well they thought each option addressed each category of interests. 1 indicated that the option did not meet the interest well; 5 indicated that the option met the interest very well.
o Provide additional comments on each option.
o Indicate how important they thought it was to co-locate a Thornton pipeline and a Northern Water pipeline if both are approved.
o Provide any additional thoughts and input to the Working Group

● On the maps:
o Write any specific suggestions for improvement or ways to mitigate the impacts
o Share any additional thoughts or ideas using sticky notes.

Participants were also invited to talk with County staff at each station, with the County’s traffic and constructability consultants, with Working Group members (who were wearing white name tags), with Thornton staff, with Northern Water staff, and with each other.

The subsequent pages of this summary capture the feedback that received via dots, worksheets, and on maps.
## OPTION A: Canal Conveyance
### Community Input Summary

#### DOT INPUT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What are potential community benefits?</th>
<th>Dots</th>
<th>What are potential negative impacts in Larimer County (and mitigation measures?)</th>
<th>Dots</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Minimizes pipeline construction in Larimer County versus other options and therefore may be less disruptive to residences.</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>Potential seepage or flooding near ditches could affect neighboring properties.</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May create fewer traffic disruptions to homes than on-street pipeline options and little impact on transportation network.</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Necessitates construction of a pipeline to the canal system. Existing ditches run at capacity during irrigation season, so system may need to be expanded. (More study would be needed.)</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potentially preserves trees or environmental features because of minimized construction</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Treatment facility to address water quality may create local impacts and need for waste disposal of toxins removed from water.</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**November 13 Working Group ideas below (not confirmed by County staff)**

<p>| Could build reservoir and pumphouse on Thornton’s property east of I-25 and pipeline from there. | 5    | Beginning of pipeline tears up street in Braidwood. Potential loss of water in ditch during winter. | 4    |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact Description</th>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Sub-Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No eminent domain, private property impacts.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Potential loss of water in ditch during winter.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No pipelines/minimum pipelines.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Zero impacts to Larimer County residents.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historical path/use of the water.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Treat water for municipal use (e.g., Mississippi River).</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No traffic impacts.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Build reservoir in Thornton for year-round use.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No construction impacts.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No environmental impacts.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No utility impacts.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No new crossings on Hwy. 1/25, canals, ditches.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Like idea of putting pipeline in canal.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
OPTIONS/INTERESTS EVALUATION WORKSHEET

Directions: Please write the number that represents how you think each option meets the interests below.

1 = Does not meet the interests at all, 2 = Does not meet the interests well, 3 = Neutral, 4 = Meets the interests well, 5 = Meets the interests very well

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Average Score</th>
<th>Median Score</th>
<th>Number of Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conveyance and Alignment Alternatives</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environment</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of Life</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Supply</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Process</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

MAP COMMENTS

- Plan A does not address Poudre flow through Fort Collins.
- Combine Poudre River option with Canal option.

GENERAL COMMENTS

Combine Poudre River and canal options:
Attachment M: November 27 LWPWG Meeting
**OPTION B: Douglas Road Pipeline**

**Community Input Summary**

**DOT INPUT**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What are potential community benefits?</th>
<th>Dots</th>
<th>What are potential negative impacts in Larimer County (and mitigation measures)?</th>
<th>Dots</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>If in right of way, may minimize disruptions to private properties.</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Likely has the highest traffic impact of the pipeline options because of construction duration, number of properties and homes affected, and full closures to through traffic.</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal or better pavement conditions on Douglas Road, water line replacements, and possibly other infrastructure (e.g., bike lane or intersection improvement at Turnberry).</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Impacts to neighboring properties could be improved by detour routes and all-times access for properties.</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thornton's participation in Poudre River instream flow (i.e., 3,000 acre-feet/year or approx. 20% of Thornton’s water) would augment river flows. Alternatively, Thornton provides long term fund to acquire senior water rights to improve base flows in river.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Construction time and impacts are affected by whether one or two pipelines are built concurrently (may be addressed by hours of construction, night work, monetary incentives to speed construction).</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Possible land conservation or dedication of Thornton owned properties at Douglas Rd/CR 11 and 56 and CR 56 and I-25 west of Cobb Lake near CSU properties— for recreation or natural areas. Or, Thornton buys land (e.g., 80 acres at southwest Turnberry and Douglas Road).

Emergency response plan and access would need to be addressed (e.g., staging vehicles).

### November 13 Working Group ideas below (not confirmed by County staff)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Idea</th>
<th>Impact Description</th>
<th>Priority</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rebuild Douglas-cost savings.</td>
<td>12-4 years construction impact. Like a war zone.*</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rebuild ELCO waterlines- cost savings.</td>
<td>Utility shuts off (water, sewer, power, cable)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extend Turnberry (traffic relief).</td>
<td>Not NISP preferred option.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wetlands impact- wildlife</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction coordination- impact of failure- what recourse?</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is right of way really wide enough for 2?</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No need to improve/rebuild Douglas.</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: this impact was erroneously originally recorded as “2-4 years.” It was described as approximately four years in the November 5 constructability webinar and corrected on 12/3/2018. The statement was left as written because that is the form in which Working Group members and the community assessed it.
COMMENTS APPENDED TO DOT EXERCISE SHEET (INTEREST TO WHICH COMMENT WAS APPENDED IN PARENTHESES WHERE APPLICABLE)

- Lake taps mean more light and
- What if Thornton went down Douglas 2 years and NISP went around Eagle Lake Pos. 3 and open space. Share the burdens and the benefits
- Taking my farm isn’t private property? (“If in right of way, may minimize disruptions to private properties.”)
- In the right of way. Not on private property. Improve road and line lanes. (“Equal or better pavement conditions on Douglas Road, water line replacements, and possibly other infrastructure (e.g., bike lane or intersection improvement at Tumberry)”
- Take break from eminent domain (“Construction time and impacts are affected by whether one or two pipelines are built concurrently (may be addressed by hours of construction, night work, monetary incentives to speed construction”)
- Please remember that there are 3 pipelines in the Thornton project. The first is all that is currently being discussed but yet there is a second 48” and third 72” in future. (Q8)
- Co-locating pipelines just makes sense. Minimizes construction impacts/time
- Why is this statement on this side? (Q10)

OPTIONS/INTERESTS EVALUATION WORKSHEET

Directions: Please write the number that represents how you think each option meetings the interests below.

1 = Does not the interests at all 2= Does not meet the interests well 3 = Neutral 4 = Meets the interests well 5 = Meets the interests very well

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Average Score</th>
<th>Median Score</th>
<th>Number of Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conveyance and Alignment Alternatives</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environment</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of Life</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Supply</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Process</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

MAP COMMENTS

- 28 properties impacted [near Elder Reservoir].
- 8 properties impacted [near Elder Reservoir].
- Impacts river flow through Fort Collins more than Option D.
- NISP south on east side on east side of Reservoir #4-meet Thornton at Pelican Drive, east across open land to Turnberry.
- No open land.
- Re: center of WSSC Reservoir #3: Drain.
• We still don’t know WHY Douglas was selected!!
• Pipelines should be together not two separate pipelines!
• Negative with construction (4 years!)-delayed response time for medically fragile people.
• CR 54 improvements cause it to become de facto bypass route.
• Douglas Road is SO busy now-use a different route!
• Douglas Road is most impacted with over 300 homes affected! Why was this selected?
• Douglas Road is most impacted and has over 300 homes who needs its access.

GENERAL COMMENTS

• In considering the placement of these pipelines, we all need to share the burden and the benefits. No one area should have to deal with the construction of these pipelines in their area. There are proposals that would make this possible and this is what should happen.
• Since it has been determined that it will take 4 years to build the two pipelines down Douglas Road, it is important to reconsider separate locations for these pipelines:
  1. Thornton on Douglas Road in 2 years with road and area improvements. It would be understood there would always be through traffic for residents.
  2. NISP would be built above Kluver Reservoir going through the open space north of Reservoir 4. Has there been a study of running it north on the west side of Reservoir 3 to CR-56? If it is run north on the east side of Reservoir 2, they should agree to help improve the eastern shore of Reservoir 3. Also, NISP should, for the sake of the wetlands and wildlife habitat, agree to bore under the open space below the dam.
# OPTION C: County Road 56 Pipeline

## Community Input Summary

### DOT INPUT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What are potential community benefits?</th>
<th>Dots</th>
<th>What are potential negative impacts (and mitigation measures)?</th>
<th>Dots</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Potentially most feasible to co-locate Thornton and Northern pipelines while minimizing area and duration of construction in the County.</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>Lake taps and tunneling could minimize disruption in neighborhood open space areas or along lake shores.</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If in right of way, minimizes disruption to private properties</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Lowest traffic impact of the pipeline options because of construction duration and number or properties and homes affected.</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thornton’s participation in Poudre River instream flow (i.e., 3,000-acre feet/year) would augment river flows. Other acquisition of water rights could occur as noted in &quot;B - Douglas Road&quot;.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Construction time is less than Douglas Road (CR 54) option if pipeline is constructed concurrently with Northern’s; however, work could be separated.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential land conservation or dedication of Thornton owned properties at Douglas Rd/CR11 and 56 and CR 56 and I-25 west of Cobb lake near CSU properties, or other options as noted in &quot;B - Douglas Rd&quot;.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### November 13 Working Group ideas below (not confirmed by County staff)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Idea</th>
<th>Impacts of properties on east side of Reservoirs 3 &amp; 4 (36 properties).</th>
<th>Impacts private property (Eagle Lake and CR 56) but CR 54 is all in right of way.</th>
<th>CR 56: 1-25 to county line - 1/4 miles corridor. Amend the application to keep the pipe in the right of way.</th>
<th>East side of #4 keeps it out of Braidwood.</th>
<th>General- need to clarify terms of property acquisition (fee simple versus easement and eminent domain).</th>
<th>Construct pipe in winter so rattlesnakes are not driven adjacent to subdivisions and boat access is not interrupted.</th>
<th>Pave CR 56 east of I-25 county line.</th>
<th>Easement - use is the same as before.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Possible paving improvement on CR 56 or other infrastructure improvement.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
COMMENTS APPENDED TO DOT EXERCISE SHEET (INTEREST TO WHICH COMMENT WAS APPENDED IN PARENTHESES WHERE APPLICABLE)

- Benefit: Conservation easement on Thornton property at NE corner of Douglas xCR11
- Preserve as much wildlife as possible- Rd 56 best for pipeline
- This is the best alternative (“If in right of way, minimizes disruption to private properties”)
- Best alternative: To localize NISP and Thornton pipeline on east side of WSS #3- NISP tunnels under #3 and put Thornton pipeline on east side of #4 (“If in right of way, minimizes disruption to private properties”)
- 2 pipelines on 56 (“Possible paving improvement on CR 56 or other infrastructure improvement”)
- Good time to improve CR 56 (“Thornton’s participation in Poudre River instream flow (i.e., 3,000-acre feet/year) would augment river flows. Other acquisition of water rights could occur as noted in “B – Douglas Road”)
- Make 56 a better road with pipeline and improvement (“Thornton’s participation in Poudre River instream flow (i.e., 3,000-acre feet/year) would augment river flows. Other acquisition of water rights could occur as noted in “B – Douglas Road”)
- Put 2 pipelines on Rd 56 (“Pave CR 56 east of I-25 to county line”)
- Improve route 56 with pipeline (“Pave CR 56 east of I-25 to Countyline”)
- Don’t take private property (“East side of #4 keeps it out of Braidwood”)
- Wrong (“No taking of private property”)
- Wrong (“Easement – use is the same as before”)
- The reason 56 is an “alternative” because opponents want it in someone else’s backyard (“Construction time is less than Douglas Road (CR 54) option if pipeline is constructed concurrently with Northern’s; however, work could be separated”)

OPTIONS/INTERESTS EVALUATION WORKSHEET

Directions: Please write the number that represents how you think each option meets the interests below.

1 = Does not meet the interests at all, 2 = Does not meet the interests well, 3 = Neutral, 4 = Meets the interests well, 5 = Meets the interests very well

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interest Category</th>
<th>Average Score</th>
<th>Median Score</th>
<th>Number of Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conveyance and Alignment Alternatives</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environment</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of Life</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Supply</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Process</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
MAP COMMENTS

- Re: area north of WSSC Reservoir 34: Protect the wetlands, both should travel under the wetlands. Take time and do it for the good of all.
- Re: eastern edge of WSSC Reservoir #4: This is protected by Colorado Wildlife and our plots.
- 1. Best to go on east side of WSSC Reservoir #4 2. Tunnel NISP through middle of WSSC Reservoir #3. 3. Both pipelines use same route from east side of WSSC Reservoir #3.
- East route would impact more houses [than the west route]. This is counterproductive to some of the goals. Please drop it.
- Impacts water flow through Fort Collins more than Option D.

GENERAL COMMENTS

- In considering the northern route for the Thornton pipeline and NISP pipeline, the wildlife habitat and wetlands must be preserved. We who live here see how important this area is to Colorado wildlife. It must remain intact.
- In considering the placement of these pipelines, we all need to share the burden and the benefits. No one area should have to deal with the construction of these pipelines in their area. There are proposals that would make this possible and this is what should happen.
- Since it has been determined that it will take 4 years to build the two pipelines down Douglas Road, it is important to reconsider separate locations for these pipelines.

  1. Thornton on Douglas Road in 2 years with road and area improvements. It would be understood there would always be through traffic for residents.
  2. NISP would be built above Kluver Reservoir going through the open space north of Reservoir 4. Has there been a study of running it north on the west side of Reservoir 3 to CR-56? If it is run north on the east side of Reservoir 2, they should agree to help improve the eastern shore of Reservoir 3. Also, NISP should, for the sake of the wetlands and wildlife habitat, agree to bore under the open space below the dam.
## OPTION D: Poudre River

### Community Input Summary

**DOT INPUT**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What are potential community benefits?</th>
<th>Dots</th>
<th>What are potential negative impacts (and mitigation measures)?</th>
<th>Dots</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Extended peak flows benefit native fish, sediment flushing, less algae, natural beauty, etc.</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Water could get removed from Poudre River and/or exchanged by other parties (may need legal mechanisms to prevent).</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased and extended peak flows to provide for seasonal flooding to benefit riparian habitat.</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Treatment to address water quality may create local impacts and need for waste disposal of toxins removed from water.</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location of water entering river benefits the part of the river in greatest need according to Fort Collins Poudre River Report Card.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Possible construction of new storage as substitute to WSSC #4 to operate pumping station near Windsor.</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extend the flow for recreation use and water park in Fort Collins.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Potential new structures in river at Ted's Place for return diversions and construction of pipeline to river from WSSC #4.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*November 13 Working Group ideas below (not confirmed by County staff)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What are impacts to neighborhood at diversion point? How their voice heard?</th>
<th>Dots</th>
<th>Everyone wins.</th>
<th>Dots</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Why the standard for the level of water quality that Thornton has proposed?</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Uncertainty or concern about negative effect on water levels in the WSSC lake system (and recreational activities of neighborhoods and property values).</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eliminates 20 miles of pipeline to get proposed pipeline and Poudre River crossing.</td>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Everyone wins.</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No impacts to private and public properties.</td>
<td>How about storage? Where will it be (in Windsor)?</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Downtown economy and water park.</td>
<td>What is implication of river quality through Windsor?</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meets Commissioner’s directives.</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wetland, forest, wildlife habitat enhancement.</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental enhancement (no air quality impact).</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open lands, parks, and trails benefits.</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community assists Thornton in federal permitting.</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No eminent domain issues.</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reasonable alternative.</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No traffic impacts.</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
OPTIONS/INTERESTS EVALUATION WORKSHEET

Directions: Please write the number that represents how you think each option meets the interests below.

1 = Does not meet the interests at all, 2= Does not meet the interests well, 3 = Neutral, 4 = Meets the interests well, 5 = Meets the interests very well

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Average Score</th>
<th>Median Score</th>
<th>Number of Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conveyance and Alignment Alternatives</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environment</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of Life</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Supply</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Process</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

MAP COMMENTS

- Go for the river!
- We should not worry about reservoir levels; more important issues!
- Reservoir levels are not the important issue!
- Take it down further [than Windsor].
- [Re: Larimer County Canal] Auxiliary to use canals with new storage lake...into Weld: Thornton already owns lots of property in Weld County.
- Re: treatment of sewer water to drinking water: West Basin water company serves El Segundo, Manhattan Beach, etc. in Southern California.
- According to Water Supply and Storage Company (WSSC) and Poudre River Commissioner this option will not work...take off the table.
- Will this alternative be faster than others?
- Please provide better explanation as to why water quality cannot be better addressed.
- With this proposal: i.e., how does it work on the Mississippi [to safely supply drinking water from a polluted river]

GENERAL COMMENTS:

- Regarding the question of “Will Thornton’s water going down the Poudre River create flooding?” Gary Wockner from Save the Poudre Responds: “The flood in 2013 was around 10,000 cubic feet per second (CFS), and it cause minimal damage in Fort Collins because the City has bought so much of the floodplain as Natural Areas and Storm Water Retention projects. Thornton’s water would add about 150 CFS, just 1.5% of what came down the river in 2013. Adding Thornton’s water to the river would have no impact on flooding. However, during more normal flows in the spring/summer when the river is running at 500 or 1000 CFS, adding Thornton’s water would increase the flow 30% and 15% respectively, dramatically improving river health through Fort Collins.”
• Re: “Treatment to address water quality may create local impacts and need for waste disposal of toxins removed from water:” It would require 560 acre-feet to treat sewer water.

• Combine Poudre River and canal options:
# OPTION E: Shields Street to Poudre River

## Community Input Summary

### DOT INPUT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What are potential community benefits?</th>
<th>Dots</th>
<th>What are potential negative impacts (and mitigation measures)?</th>
<th>Dots</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Increased stream flow for recreation use in Fort Collins downtown area and water park, fish and wildlife habitat, etc.</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Pipeline construction impacts may be similar to either Douglas Road (CR 54) or North (CR 56) alignment (see B and C).</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased peak flows to provide for seasonal flooding to benefit riparian areas and habitat.</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Traffic impacts on Shields Street are less than CR 54 but more than CR 56. Approximately 125 homes may be disrupted as well as potential impacts to commuter travel on Shields.</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At 40 million galls per day, river flow options may create larger fluctuations in the Poudre River and possible flooding.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Reverse osmosis treatment, if needed in Windsor, generates a waste byproduct.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pipelines North and East- unnecessary negative impacts.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
November 13 Working Group ideas below (not confirmed by County staff)

All water down river- no pump station. Same diversion point at reservoirs. Pipeline only down Shields.

Shields alignment would need more study regarding impacts to adjacent properties and construction impacts of outtake at Mulberry

How can the issue of water quality (all in Poudre) be addressed?

Traffic impacts on Shields (especially) construction

COMMENTS APPENDED TO DOT EXERCISE SHEET

Why is this view different than originally proposed?

OPTIONS/INTERESTS EVALUATION WORKSHEET

Directions: Please write the number that represents how you think each option meets the interests below.

1 = Does not meet the interests at all, 2= Does not meet the interests well, 3 = Neutral, 4 = Meets the interests well, 5 = Meets the interests very well

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interest</th>
<th>Average Score</th>
<th>Median Score</th>
<th>Number of Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conveyance and Alignment Alternatives</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environment</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of Life</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Supply</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Process</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

MAP COMMENTS

- Why isn't the Army Corps of Engineers here to help solve the problem?
- Year round for Poudre River use
- Pipeline is NOT part of “community” proposal
- A good possible alternative route
GENERAL COMMENTS

- In considering the placement of these pipelines, we all need to share the burden and the benefits. No one area should have to deal with the construction of these pipelines in their area. There are proposals that would make this possible and this is what should happen.
Summary of Options/Interest Worksheet

WORKSHEET DIRECTIONS: Please write the number that represents how you think each option meets the interests below.

1 = Does not meet the interests at all, 2 = Does not meet the interests well, 3 = Neutral, 4 = Meets the interests well, 5 = Meets the interests very well

INTERESTS

Agriculture
- Protect agriculture and personally-owned farms
- Help the City of Thornton find an alternative conveyance route that addresses the interests listed so far, particularly the health of the Poudre River
- Use objective, fact-based criteria to determine the conveyance route
- Determine if leaving water in the Poudre River is feasible or not

Conveyance and Alignment Alternatives
- Help the City of Thornton find an alternative conveyance route that addresses the interests listed so far, particularly the health of the Poudre River
- Use objective, fact-based criteria to determine the conveyance route
- Determine if leaving water in the Poudre River is feasible or not

Construction
- Minimize the use of private lands for these projects
- Minimize or eliminate construction impacts to Larimer County road users and residents
- Minimize traffic disruptions

Environment
- Protect and restore the Poudre River
- Protect reservoirs near northern Larimer County neighborhoods
- Protect habitat and wildlife, including special designation areas that protect and support them

Process
- Assess the impacts of the project on Windsor residents
- Do no harm and ensure that any project provides benefits to Larimer County
- Be a good neighbor to the City of Thornton
- Find a solution in 2018
- Find a solution that makes sense within current conditions, not past conditions
- Find a win-win for Larimer County and the City of Thornton
- Provide a recommendation to the County Commissioners that maximizes benefits for Larimer County and its citizens, minimizes or mitigates negative impacts, respects the environment and Poudre River, and sets the standard for how counties should conduct the 1041 process
- Prioritize, respect, and preserve the rights of Larimer County citizens
- Ensure that information about the project is accurate
Quality of Life
- Minimize overall impacts on neighborhoods (including construction)
- Maintain the overall quality of life
- Maintain the current feel of the community and better understand what the community values
- Maintain the current aesthetics of the construction area (tree type, size, ground cover, etc.)
- Protect property values
- Avoid creating significant adverse effects on public health and safety (including those created by rattlesnakes)
- Use the shortest pipeline possible to get the water out of Larimer County

Water Supply
- Ensure that WSSC users and shareholders can receive the quality and quantity of water that they have historically
- Prioritize the future water supply via river health

---

OPTION SUMMARIES

Option A (Canal Conveyance)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Agriculture</th>
<th>Conveyance/Alignment</th>
<th>Construction</th>
<th>Environment</th>
<th>Process</th>
<th>Quality of Life</th>
<th>Water Supply</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average Score</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median Score</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Responses</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:
- I do worry about some canal flooding of homes
- Canal system staying full helps agriculture

Option B (Douglas Road)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Agriculture</th>
<th>Conveyance/Alignment</th>
<th>Construction</th>
<th>Environment</th>
<th>Process</th>
<th>Quality of Life</th>
<th>Water Supply</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average Score</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median Score</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Responses</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Comments:

- Douglas Road is best, most practical option
- Don’t need 4 lanes/Douglas! Lots of loss of personal property
- Options C, D, B, E, and A all do this to some degree, but B has the largest construction impact
- Douglas has the biggest impact on quality of life during the construction process but the lowest impact long-term. Please think about the future, not the inconvenience now. What will happen to land permanently damaged?
- If Douglas Road is used it will impact Hearthfire Neighborhood very negatively. Cars will go north on Turnberry and turn west on Morningside to avoid going on Douglas Road. Morningside is the only entrance to Hearthfire other than Douglas Road. Cars will go through Hearthfire and exit on Bateleur (presently a cul de sac) to bypass Douglas Road, thus creating a constant traffic flow from Turnberry through Hearthfire. NOT GOOD FOR US!

Option C (County Road 56)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Agriculture</th>
<th>Conveyance /Alignment</th>
<th>Construction</th>
<th>Environment</th>
<th>Process</th>
<th>Quality of Life</th>
<th>Water Supply</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average Score</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median Score</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Responses</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:

- East side of Reservoir #4
- Take the pipeline east of Reservoir 4 and then north. This affects fewest homeowners
- East side of reservoir
- Option C, with possibly Option E, is feasible, and is the only one that will likely do this well
- Option C is the clear front runner for most of these criteria!
- Option C should NOT go west of Reservoir 4 but EAST (dotted line)
- Option C does indeed affect private land (contrary to poster)

Option D (Poudre River Conveyance)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Agriculture</th>
<th>Conveyance /Alignment</th>
<th>Construction</th>
<th>Environment</th>
<th>Process</th>
<th>Quality of Life</th>
<th>Water Supply</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average Score</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median Score</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Responses</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Comments:

- The best way to protect River is the Poudre River Trust option
- The ONLY option that benefits Larimer County residents is the Poudre Option. Pipelines have no benefits to Larimer County residents!
- Option D is not reasonable or feasible. I'm a Larimer Resident and a town board member in Windsor. I've been following this. #1 if its acceptable on Douglas Road, it’s not acceptable in my neighborhood for the same reason. Thornton bought quality water and have the right to transport it. Windsor will partner with Thornton on the pipeline. Leaving water in the river and removing at Windsor is not reasonable or feasible
- Global warming is a reality. A situation created by Man’s overuse of oil based products that give off too much carbon dioxide/monoxide, agriculture, fertilizers, and destruction of forests. The Poudre River via its water moving vertically-horizontally and toward the sea via other rivers creates the water table along the river’s edges and beyond to create, forest, replenish the trees and vegetation for miles away, horizontally from the main channel of the Poudre. The trees are the lungs of the world. They take carbon dioxide out of the air and through the process of photosynthesis give off oxygen. To survive in the global warming era, the water must be left in the river as far as possible to make sure the trees located in water table created by the river remain alive. Rain follows the green- if the river is allowed to keep our lungs operating it will rain due to the enhanced dew point created by the trees and river, giving off humidity to lubricate willing storm clouds laden with rain. To kill the trees by putting its water in pipes is ludicrous-shortsighted. Rain does not follow the brown earth; remember the dust bowl. Greedy ignorance tilled native green grasses into brown fields to grow wheat. The choice is obvious: Take the water down the river for the HEALTH and WELFARE of the citizens of Larimer County

Option E (Shields Street to Poudre River)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Agriculture</th>
<th>Conveyance/Alignment</th>
<th>Construction</th>
<th>Environment</th>
<th>Process</th>
<th>Quality of Life</th>
<th>Water Supply</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average Score</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median Score</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Responses</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:

- Re: process: First interest; very little verbiage here. Option E doesn’t seem vetted out
- The "Shields and River" proposal is not the original proposal. Having Thornton "edit" citizen proposals without presenting the original is deceptive and not a valid way to engage in public discourse
COLOCATION QUESTION

Larimer County is currently processing two applications for two different water conveyance projects. One is the Thornton Water Project. The other is the Northern Integrated Supply Project proposed by Northern Water. If there are two pipelines, how important is it for them to be co-located / constructed in the same alignment?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Number of Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very Important</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Important</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Particularly Important</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not At All Important</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

COMMENTS THAT APPLY TO MULTIPLE OPTIONS

Conveyance and Alignment Options

- TWP is three pipelines not just one. That needs to be considered strongly. They have the right to call for those extra pipelines at any time and don’t have to wait until 2065. Definitely don’t want Douglas. River route (Option D) is #1 choice!
- Between NISP’s and Thornton’s 3 pipelines (I know, they say they only are applying for one,) there isn’t room on Douglas Road. 56 may be a problem, too. River Route is best, then canal
- I am interested in the idea of one on Douglas and one north on 56. It is not particularly important that they are worked on at the same time or place
- Note: B, C, E meet Thornton’s interests. A, D meet Fort Collins, Larimer County resident’s interests (including wildlife residing here) Many people have been expressing concerns about increasing numbers and intensity of wildfires regionally and beyond-yet few seem to make the connections between humans diverting water via pipelines and the fire behaviors. There are important connections which need to be addressed (as a former wildfire fighter, I’m very aware of these). PLEASE think beyond a pipeline option!
- Option B: horrible. Option C: best option for a sad situation. Option E: Not a good idea
- These five choices are all "lesser of evils", I don’t care for any of them.
- C or D would be less disruptive
- Go Poudre River or tunnel under Reservoir #3 and put all pipelines on all of that VACANT land outside of all private neighborhoods
- Please do not impact Dick’s tree farm. Please do not destroy Douglas Road in anyway, shape, or form. Please keep the water in the Poudre River. Thankyou
- Douglas Road is the best alternative, CR 56 and canal worst, river and Shields nonstarters.
- Thornton would need to acquire private property for a pump station under Options A, C, and E (Note: This impact was identified by a Working Group member via email on November 27 and was confirmed by Thornton as an impact under its version of this concept. This impact was not added to the summary of the November 15 community meeting)

Traffic and Construction

- Option C is in my opinion by far the least damaging to Larimer County and its citizens, the preferred option of the City of Thornton, the best and preferred option for NISP, and has the best likelihood of colocation of the two pipelines, which is best for all parties concerned. Thornton’s offer of running up to 3,000 acre-feet of its water in the river, via Shields Street
(Option E) should be carefully considered and may be beneficial

- The road closure next to the venue tonight is a preview and omen on what the Douglas Road option would be like. Ugly. The CR 56 option, assuming pipeline(s) are necessary, is the overall less disruptive option and provides opportunity for both NISP and Thornton’s pipes.
- No neighborhood wants this pipeline; it is very intrusive. The river route cannot be accomplished. Northern route (one of them) MUST BE USED. Douglas Road is the most impacted route; 329 homes and residents have to count on one driveway to get out. Thank you for all your work for us!

Worksheet and Project Process

- The colocation question is misleading. If answer very important or important-then only options B and C are possible. Douglas Road (B) is by far the worst option particularly if it includes both pipelines.
- Thornton has not been a good neighbor to Larimer County. They have proven to be deceitful and untrustworthy. Make them take the water down the Poudre or go home through Weld County.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS

Agriculture

- Re: agriculture: Farms and HORSE properties
- Farmers rely on the aquifers the Poudre creates-no water, no food
- None really "protect" agriculture!

Conveyance and Alignment Options

- I really don't want to see NISP happen either. I would to see water conservation (I know there is lots of potential for this!)
- Why not take up Rocky Ridge on their offer of an easement? Do both at once
- Let engineers decide if they should be co-located
- Colocation is important if it is out of the neighborhood
- Thornton needs to gather their water where they bought it and not impact Fort Collins. They have no right to dig up my backyard because they bought water 70 miles east of me!
- Colocation: It just makes sense. Efficiency and cost-sharing advantages. Minimizes overall impacts over time
- "Minimize use of private lands for these projects": Critical as it is long-term.
- Using the shortest possible pipeline is absolutely necessary.
- How does the length of the pipeline impact quality of life? A community either is or is not impacted

Environment, Water Quality, and Wildlife

- Colocation is important if this happens. I'm still hoping for more environmentally friendly options.
- Please take into consideration the changes in climate; drought
- My primary concern is protecting Poudre River flow through Fort Collins; traffic and constructions impacts are temporary (even 4 years is temporary). River health is forever.
- The health of the Poudre must be the first criterion-all other concerns are temporary
- We must do what is best for the environment!
- Protecting the reservoirs is CRITICAL for wildlife especially with all the growth.
- Thornton is donating/leasing water to the Poudre River
● The health of the river must come first. There are ways people can conserve water and use fewer chemicals that wind up in the water
● Re: rattlesnakes: What?!!! What about other wildlife?
● Re: rattlesnakes- unclear. Are rattlesnakes the biggest safety impact?
● Irrigation water is what they bought
● They deserve the same quality of water that we have
● Re” Find a solution in 2018”: Let’s take a little more time, if necessary, for a good, environmentally-friendly solution

Traffic and Construction
● Need to do more work on traffic, especially with lots of development planned for the northeast area. If this is not approached in a methodical manner (SLOWLY) neighborhoods (older) will be isolated. Already a problem. Neighbors feel angry and helpless
● Roads are used as easements all over the country. Please do the same!!
● Thornton needs to put a MORATORIUM on new construction until there is water and infrastructure-including I-25 expansion! Many other cities have used the moratorium to slow down "progress" in order to save the quality of life for current county residents!
● Colocation: why "mess up" 2 areas?
● Minimizing or eliminate construction impacts or traffic disruptions is not critical because they are temporary.

Worksheet and Project Process
● Larimer County will not benefit at all. Thornton is not a good neighbor
● "Process: Be a good neighbor to Thornton" Why?
● Too confusing
● The colocation question is misleading. If answer very important or important-then only options B and C are possible. Douglas Road (B) is by far the worst option particularly if it includes both pipelines
● Thank you-competing opinions are passionate-this is the role of politics and requires courage! Cost is always an issue...and is NOT our problem!
● "Do no harm and ensure that any project provides benefits to Larimer County"-top priority.
● "Be a good neighbor to the City of Thornton"-not a priority; they have been duplicitous and high-handed
● "Provide a recommendation to the County Commissioners that maximizes benefits for Larimer County and its citizens, minimizes or mitigates negative impacts, respects the environment and Poudre River, and sets the standard for how counties should conduct the 1041 process."- Absolutely
● Bad survey design. Too many bullets
● I also had members of the Working Group on my property on their 4 wheeler! Lost, attempting to get back to the reservoir and tearing up my property as they spun around. They would not give their names. However, while I was here, I recognized one.
● I am concerned that the larger population in Fort Collins is pushing to have the negative impact placed on Windsor because it is less populated. Windsor already has to deal with the pipeline along CR 13. Is it necessary to decrease the property values of Windsor even more??
● Thornton’s timeline (2025), water quality, reservoir space are not the problems of Larimer County Citizens. Thornton has had since 1980s/90s to work those out
● Thank you for your work
● Opponents of Douglas Road alignment want to shove it into someone else’s backyard.
● I appreciate the opportunity to give feedback. Unfortunately, I actually witnessed someone take my post-it note off of the map. You need to be aware that there are individuals compromising the accuracy of the feedback!
● As much as possible, Thornton AND NISP should draw water in such a way to minimize
adverse effects to the Poudre River, the wildlife of the area, and respect the residents of Larimer County

- After attending several Planning Commissioner and County Commissioner meetings on this, I noticed disconnection with the understanding of the data across the Planning Department, Planning Commission, Building Department, and the County Commissioners. At times it was clear there were individual Larimer County teams
- I'm having trouble assessing these interests on an option by option basis
- I am most interested in what is best for Larimer County, not Thornton’s interests
- Re: "Use objective, fact-base criteria to determine the conveyance route" Critical to use facts
- Biased questions, NOT GOOD!
- Thornton has deceived the County with B.S and has not verified the "facts" they spew. They want clean water for them in exchange for Larimer County getting dirty water from the Platte
- Re: "use the shortest pipeline to get water out of Larimer County": Or no pipeline
- Re: community values. There are many values in community. The mob does not speak for all. TERRIBLE QUESTIONS
- Can’t rate the Water Supply and Process interests together. No matter the route, let’s get creative and make sure the reservoirs stay full in the summer
- How can [the two water supply interest] statements be addressed together?
- Re: water supply interests: LOADED question
- Re: water supply interests: Not sure what you are getting at
- These two [water supply] interests do not go together
- Too many questions. Bad survey design
- Re: "Be a good neighbor to the City of Thornton": Why? They don’t want to be good neighbors to others (including Larimer County).
- Re: "prioritize, respect, and preserve the rights of Larimer County citizens." Yes! This actually can help Thornton citizens, even if they don’t understand this yet
- Re "find a win-win solution for Larimer County and the City of Thornton" Is this possible in just one more month?
- Re: process: There are too many contradictory bullet points to fill this one out
- N/A
- "Be a good neighbor to Thornton"-Must be reciprocal!
- "Provide a recommendation to the County Commissioners that maximizes benefits for Larimer County and its citizens."-DONE
- Re: process: The first, second, third, and sixth interests are unimportant
- Re: process: The second, seventh, and ninths interests are very necessary. The eighth interest is the priority
ATTACHMENT N
Subject: Why the working group was a waste of our time
From: [redacted] To: ellisk@co.larimer.co.us, heather@peakfacilitation.com - Cc: - Date: December 3, 2018 at 11:55 AM

I assume that by now you have read the letter from Mr. Ament, pres. of WSSC. If you will recall I practically begged you to contact them and also the river commissioner for their input. You obviously did not. Now it comes to light that the river option was never an option yet you sat by and said nothing. We were forced to allow these folks to spout their ideas while you should have known they were not feasible from the start.
This created a situation where the remaining options were not fully explored. Now we sit here with no decision to send to the commissioners from our findings. You ask for our input and then ignore it. I am sorry I wasted my time attending. The failure of the working group rests solely on your heads.
Dick Brauch
Subject: Thornton water 1041
From: Bill Spencer - To: heather@peakfacilitation.com - Cc: Gary Wockner, Patrick Crotzer, [REDACTED], R Warren Lemerich, Bill Spencer, Edwards, Gloria, Martha Conant, K.A. Wagner, Susan Marshall, edvojensky, Mark Korb, Tom French.

Heather, here are my comments to be incorporated in the final report to BOCC. I write them as the representative for the members of the Terry Acres HOA.

Our HOA members are strongly against the pumphouse/pipeline running down Douglas Road. The negative impacts include the 4 to 6-year period of construction. The other negatives include but are not limited to: the decrease in property values, construction noise, no access during emergencies and for school bus routes and pumphouse noise and vibrations. Many residents along Douglas Road who will have their lives changed for 4 to 6 years. It is the consensus of our members that the way the Thornton team pitted close neighboring communities against each other was unnecessary. We want Thornton to have their water— that is not the issue, however we don't want it to be to the detriment of Larimer County residents. We prefer the Poudre option as our first choice and the canal option as a second choice.

We ask the Commissioners to deny any 1041 application that requires unnecessary pipelines and does not support the health of the Poudre River nor a benefit to Larimer County.

Sincerely,
Bill Spencer

William P. Spencer, President Terry Acres HOA
On November 30, 2018 at 4:57:44 PM, K.A. Wagner wrote:

As requested, following are my observations as a participant in the Larimer County Water Projects Working Group.

First and foremost, I am grateful that the Board of Commissioners recognized the importance of an improved public process for Round 2 of the 3-phase Thornton Water Project (TWP) and chose to establish the Working Group as a vehicle to insure that next application allows the City of Thornton to get its water in a manner that benefits Larimer County and does not negatively impact any Larimer County residents or property owners.

As an At Large member of the Working Group, my hopes were high that we might positively influence the TWP. From the first meeting, we were understandably curious about: The Working Group process; the expected outcome/product; the extremely short timeline; our ability to grapple with NISP; and how Thornton would utilize our work.

Those (and many other) questions dogged participants throughout the 5 meetings. In response, we got confusing information, misleading statements and untruths (both obvious and frustrating to most members of the Working Group) which only gave credence to participants’ early statements that they found Thornton to be untrustworthy.

For example, Thornton was unwilling to discuss the full length of any conveyance alternative through Larimer County. They refused to discuss future phases, including the 72" return flow pipeline. They falsely claimed that the diversion point couldn't be changed. Despite evidence to the contrary, they maintained that the Poudre Alternative would result in flooding in the Fort Collins area. That’s just a small sample of the myriad questions that were never truthfully answered.

The Working Group spent part of every meeting trying to get factual data—even quoting from documents of public record—but with no success. The fact that the facilitator and county staff let untruths stand negatively affected the tenor and atmosphere of Working Group meetings. In my opinion, that was one of the chief failings of the Working Group process. Creative solutions seldom start with the type of faulty information that Thornton feed to the Working Group.

In other facilitation groups I've been part of, the goal has been to collaborate in order to reach a shared consensus at the end of the process. Apparently, that was not the pre-established objective of the Working Group. Although members tried to achieve consensus on the benefits of the possible alternatives, we were prevented from doing so by the facilitator and by Thornton's unwillingness to consider our ideas. No one was surprised when the final meeting ended with nothing to show for our 20 hours of commitment at (5) Working Group and (2) Community Meetings and the considerable
hours we put in outside meetings.

Facilitated chaos is the best descriptor of the process that left participants feeling used and manipulated. The lack of focus forced participants into NIMBY groups, who were glad to push the pipeline(s) impacts off on Larimer County residents elsewhere.

Had Thornton been honest and transparent in their association with the Working Group, the results could have benefitted both their project and Larimer County. Had Thornton seriously considered what the Board of Commissioners asked them to accomplish on August 1, the Working Group could have reached consensus. Instead, they refuted the Board’s direction as being "unreasonable."

Although the Board previous cited Thornton’s exclusionary tactics as being detrimental to the public process, that didn’t stop Thornton from colluding again--behind the scenes with HOA groups, to the exclusion of other Working Group members and the public. The Board’s directive for a much improved public process was, is and will continue to be ignored by Thornton, as they have scheduled additional private meetings before their next application is submitted for public review. Members of the Working Group, pledged to honesty and transparency, were deceived when the facilitator and staff deemed these private meetings acceptable to Working Group protocol.

The most positive aspect of the gamesmanship we experienced is that participants came together, did their homework and invested their creative energy to determine which alternative would offer the greatest benefits and fewest impacts to Larimer County and its residents. If we had been allowed to reach consensus on the top rated alternatives, the Poudre Alternative would have been the top recommendation. Members of the Working Group and participants at the last Community Meeting overwhelming rated the Poudre Alternative higher than any other alternatives, because it benefits Larimer County and has zero negative impacts.

When the Working Group report is presented on December 17, the report is likely to be a blow by blow account of organized Working Group chaos, with little credit to the hard work of the Working Group members who coalesced in support the Poudre Alternative.

As one of the At Large members of the Working Group, I request that members of the Working Group have an opportunity to make a short presentation on December 27 to the Board of Commissions (and the public) on the benefits of the Poudre Alternative.

Karen Wagner

At Large
Letter via email to Larimer County Commissioners Steve Johnson, Tom Donnelly, Sean Dougherty and Commissioner Elect John Kefalas, Larimer County Staff Lesli Ellis, Todd Blomstrom and Rob Helmick and Peak Facilitation personnel Heather Bergman and Dan Myers.

Dear Commissioners, County Staff and Peak Facilitation,

I wanted to thank the County Commissioners for their initiative and vision to establish a group of concerned and committed citizens, the Larimer Water Projects Working Group, and to allow them time to review the proposed Thornton Pipeline Project, including the evaluation and vetting of alternative routes. I would also like to thank the County Staff for asking me to be one of the 30 members in this important group of concerned neighbors. I am a retired Vice President of a top 10 national general contracting firm and have worked with all aspects of government from Counties, State and Federal on a wide variety of projects over the years. Of interest to you all may be that I was the General Contractor on the Larimer County building we have been meeting in at 200 West Oak Street, as well as the Justice Center Building down the street!

Our Working Group met for the fifth and final time this past Tuesday evening and at the end of the meeting, Heather Bergman, our facilitator, invited us to send in our comments about the process and its outcomes. My comments are provided below:

I. Five Options/Routes for Thornton to receive its water were reviewed and/or developed by the Working Group
   A. Canal Conveyance Route
   B. Douglas Road Pipeline(s)
   C. North Route (CR56) Pipeline(s)
   D. Poudre River Route
   E. Shields Street to Poudre River Route

   All of the above options were determined by the group to be viable.
II. Thornton did not prove to be a good partner in this process

It was observed from the beginning that Thornton was not willing to engage in any meaningful dialog about any of the options, other than the pipeline routes. Thornton largely ignored ground rules established by the facilitator to be positive and constructive, open to group interests and to avoid taking positions on issues. Thornton repeatedly stated and restated the same arguments, no matter what new ideas were presented or “what if” questions asked by the Working Group. As the meetings went on, it became clear that Thornton was attempting to mislead the group with inaccurate information and evasive maneuvers, with the singular purpose of advancing their position on the pipeline proposals. They refused to honestly answer many specific questions, for example;

**Question on Option A (Canal Conveyance)** – Why can’t Thornton take water from the existing canal system which has historically conveyed this water to eastern farmlands over the last 100 years and avoid a pipeline through Larimer County?

**Thorton Answer** – We need our water 12 months a year and we can not get water through the canal system in the winter due to freezing.

**Follow up Question** – Why can’t you take the water from the existing canal during the spring/summer time of year that it has historically flowed and build a reservoir in Thornton to store the water so you can access it year round when you need it?

**Thornton Answer** – We don’t have any land in Thornton for a reservoir.

**Follow up Question** – Why can’t Thornton build a reservoir out east on farmland that it owns, which was purchased to get this water?

**Thornton Answer/Rebuttal** – We purchased the water 30 years ago because we wanted to use the existing reservoir storage in Larimer County.

It was clear from this kind of exchange that Thornton could in fact viably take their water from the existing Canal Conveyance Route and they were deliberately trying to mislead the Group. When
pressed and they could no longer outrun the questioning from the Group, Thornton effectively changed the subject and restated their original position that a pipeline was the only viable solution. This is but one example, there were many more.

III. **NISP**

From the very first meeting of the Working Group the inclusion of NISP in the process was questioned. Most of us felt that the direction from the County Commissioners was clear in that we were to evaluate alternative routes for the Thornton Pipeline Project. Working Group members had very little, if any, information about NISP and the vast majority of us wanted to focus on Thornton with a singular focus. Heather and the County Staff spoke to the merits of including NISP in the process, since it was a future potential pipeline project and maybe it could be collocated with Thornton. There was no agreement on this, as the Working Group did not want to presuppose that the solution to Thornton’s water would in fact be a pipeline. Heather asked that we listen to a presentation from NISP and then decide whether to include it or not. We agreed and NISP presented a brief presentation in meeting number 2 and in meeting number 3 the Working Group discussed NISP again and requested a vote to remove it from our agenda. Heather did not allow this vote for reasons unknown to the Working Group. Thereafter, the Working Group largely minimized the discussion of NISP in the process and no constructive outcomes were developed relative to NISP.

IV. **Outcomes and Recommendations from the Working Group**

While the first four meetings of the Working Group were positive and productive, the last meeting on this past Tuesday was not. In what should have been an opportunity to build consensus of the Working Group and develop clear recommendations for the County Commissioners, we spent half of the meeting talking about a separate public meeting held on Thursday November 15th, which the majority of the members of the Working Group did not attend due to insufficient notice. The facilitator presented results of public opinion polled at this meeting and we were asked to “clicker” vote on the opinions from that public meeting? The information presented was confusing, contradictory and full of
errors and the results of this effort were meaningless ... and then the meeting ended!
Despite the fact that the Working Group was never given a chance to finalize our work and formulate our recommendations in a report for the Commissioners, I believe that it was more obvious than not the majority of the members would have agreed to the following recommendations and outcomes:

A. The Poudre River Route was the only route that produced a clear benefit to Larimer County and its citizens and minimized negative impacts by eliminating miles of pipelines. This was the preferred route by the Working Group by a significant margin.

B. Neither pipeline routes proposed, Douglas Road and the North Route (CR56), presented any significant benefit to Larimer County and its citizens, while they would both create significant and negative impacts. Larimer County has no obligation to Thornton to allow pipeline pathways thru our county without benefit to the county.

C. The Canal Conveyance route was endorsed by the Working Group second only to the Poudre River Option. This route produced no benefit to Larimer County, nor did it produce any negative impact. Thornton could elect this route and avoid the 1041 approval process with Larimer County altogether.

D. The Shields Street to the Poudre River Route was neither endorsed nor dismissed by the Working Group. One person introduced this option, which had some perceived benefits and impacts, but it never gained much traction. Insufficient time and information did not allow clarity for a final recommendation from the Working Group. I think the fact that this option involved another pipeline and down Shields Street was a deal killer for most.

V. The Process Ahead
The Working Group was told by Lesli Ellis that Thornton would be submitting an amendment to their 1041 application on Dec 10th which they were going to present at the Commissioners meeting scheduled for December 17. I understood that Heather Bergman
would be presenting on behalf of the Working Group, but neither County Staff or public comment would be scheduled. While I understand that County Staff would not have adequate time to review the Thornton amended 1041 and that public comment would be premature, I was disappointed that the County Commissioners would not want to take comments from the members of the Working Group at this meeting! It would seem that the entire purpose of tabling the 1041 decision and process to December 17th was to give Thornton and the Working Group time to re-evaluate the project and review alternate conveyance routes. Now that we have done this, why are the Commissioners asking only for Thornton to present their proposal without hearing from members of the Working Group?

As stated above, Thornton has proven to not having been a good partner in this process and the Commissioners should not trust them accurately present any information gained from the Working Group. The fact that they are submitting an amended proposal within two weeks from the conclusion of the Working Group meetings should suggest that they had their minds made up all along and will not include any meaningful change from our efforts. The Working Group has little idea of what the Peak Facilitation report will contain other than a description of the process. What good is a process description without the resultant recommendations and outcomes from our group; which clearly were not obtained in the final meeting? **On behalf of all of the members of the Working Group who have worked long and hard on this project, I am respectfully asking the Commissioners to reconsider and allow members of the Working group to present at the Dec 17 hearing with equal time as given to Thornton.**

Thank you again for inviting me to participate in the Working Group and I hope that our work will prove helpful in your decision making on this critical project with long range implications to Larimer County.

Respectfully submitted,

Jerrold Pault
President of The Hill Community and Cobb Lake Preservation & Recreation Association
Thank you for having me on the Working Group.
I enjoyed:
* Heather's energy and facilitating skills. She had a challenging task. It did feel, at times, like she was herding cats.
* The "What Ifs." There were several folks who were thinking outside the box, and tat is a good thing. The Canal Conveyance and Shields/Poudre River proposals, in their original forms, were new ideas for me.
* The availability of neutral specialists in traffic and geo technical construction. The webinars were also helpful in those 2 areas.
* The general feeling of good will during breaks. Lots of different groups talking to each other.
* The quick response from both of you when I had questions or information to give to you, generally within 24 hrs.

I had difficulties with:
* Being 1 out of only 6 women in a group of 28 participants.
* The amount of influence Thornton, NISP and WSSC had in the entire process. I felt at times like they should be discussing and problem solving while we observed. This lack of participation created an imbalance in the whole group, mistrust as it was never addressed, and started me down the road of "what's the point of us coming up with ideas?"
* Inaccuracies in data and miscommunication. The following are just 3 examples.
  1. We were sent an email saying, among other things, that the Planning Commissioners would be involved in Thornton's new application. During the meeting Heather announced that and then Lesli corrected her and said no, that wouldn't be happening. This created a sense of confusion and unease for me.
  2. The repetition, in print and spoken word, of the pipelines on Douglas taking up to 2 years of massive construction, rather than 4-6 years as John Bambe reported.
  3. Mark Kolebar saying there would be only 1 pipeline of Thornton's down Douglas Road before the entire room, only to tell me during the break that the second one wouldn't be until 2065. That is not the message he gave to the group. There was never any follow up on that misleading statement.
* Bringing in NISP and the Shields/Poudre River option. Both were announced to the Working Group, with little to no understanding for many of the members, in an impossibly tight time framework. I understand the value of discussing both of these, but it was poorly done, and I felt resentful for having yet another thing on my full plate.
* Physical set up of the room for the 2nd Open House. The main reason for the public attending was to see new ideas Thornton could consider in transporting their water. And the 5 proposals were not given center stage. Thornton and NISP were.
* The changing of the Canal Route and the Shields/Poudre River Route, apparently by Thornton. Another example of their extreme behind the scene influence in this process.
* Poorly designed feedback process at the Open House. Far too complicated and confusing.
* It was never clear to me exactly how the work we did would be utilized. Perhaps that will become clear after Heather's report. Other than the public's strong preference for the Poudre River and Canal Routes, you are left with no true guidelines for the Commissioners to consider. The lack of clarity and intention is enough to take the wind out of anyone's sails.
* I am left wondering if all of this effort was just so Thornton can check off Public Engagement and Feedback on their missing criteria in the 1041. Thornton's continued focus on a pipeline as the only solution, and their determination to not consider any of the other options that came out of the Working Group were never made more clear than during the last meeting. Mark Kolebar refused to give me an answer to "what is the biggest obstacle for Thornton regarding the 2 most popular systems, The Poudre River and Canal Route?" As a result, I was never able to get to my 2nd question, "what can we do to help Thornton with this obstacle?"
* I believe Thornton has the resources and knowledge to address any and all issues that arise with choosing the Poudre Alternative, the Canal Alternative or the Shields/Poudre Alternative. I do not believe Thornton is interested at all in what Larimer County citizens want. And after all the effort, this leaves me profoundly disappointed.
Subject: Working group Thornton pipeline
From: Ed Vojensky - To: heather@peakfacilitation.com, ellistik@larimer.org - Cc: - Date: November 29, 2018 at 9:29 AM

Heather & Leslie,

One of my complaints is that the residents along Douglas Road were not properly informed of the Thornton pipeline options from both Larimer County and the City of Thornton. I think the Commissioners did the right thing by setting up the working group and looking at all the options of the Thornton 1041 application. I feel the Working Group has met this complaint and I think that both Heather and her team and Leslie and the county representatives did a good job with the meetings we had.

I have been involved in this process over a year ago when I first learned of the Douglas Road option. I have learned a lot and met with all the representatives of Larimer County, Thornton, WSSC, and NISP and attended meetings with the Commissioners themselves. I have asked a lot of questions and I feel I am a lot more informed of all the information with regards to the 1041 application form Thornton.

I think it was a good idea to bring NISP into the discussions, as it is better to address both pipelines now verses making a bad decision now and then to having to deal with NISP in a few years and go through this whole process again.

I think the Poudre river option would be a good option for all the reasons Gary and Save the Poudre have come up with. Realistically I don't think this is a viable option for the following reasons:

1. Thornton signed a contract with WSSC that says that their board can vote against diverting their shares at the Main Gate from their reservoirs 3 & 4 directly down the Poudre river. I've talked to WSSC and they say there is no way their board will approve diverting the Thornton shares at the main gate directly down the Poudre as it will affect the service to their customers.
2. Diverting the water rights directly down the Poudre would also involve approval of the water court which could tie things up for a long time which could affect Thornton meeting their customers needs by the 2025 timeline.
3. If Thornton would go for the Poudre river option they would have to go through the Army Corps of Engineers which wouldn't fit their timeline for the 2025 approval as witnessed by the 15 year battle NISP has gone through with the courts and the Army Corps of Engineers.
4. I think NISP will eventually be approved and they will do a dual route down the river and CR 56 with a pipeline their preferred route.. Even if Thornton goes down the river we will still have to deal with a pipeline form NISP.
5. Due to the contamination of ash in the river from forest fires and other contaminants both Thornton and NISP need a pipeline to guarantee clean water to their customers as a backup to just going down the river.

Thornton bought the water rights in 1986 and they have a right to the water they purchased. I believe the Northern route county road 56 is the best option for the following reasons. If we deny them the right to clean water I think it will be litigated and could be tied up the courts for years to come with a high cost to both sides.

1. NISP has indicated that Douglas road is not their best option as they don't believe the road is wide enough to put 2 pipelines within the 85 foot corridor. Going outside this parameter could bring in eminent domain for the homeowners along Douglas Road.
2. NISP and Thornton have indicated that the utilities under and around Douglas Road would be a huge problem.
3. Due to the 4 year timeline for the construction of the pipeline on Douglas Road it would create a logistical nightmare for the 300 plus homeowners that use this roadway on a daily basis. Not to mention the problems that the diverted traffic would create to both Country Club road and Gregory road. I have already seen increased truck traffic along these roadways and closing Douglas Road would make matters even worse. Not to mention that Montava and Waters Edge may be starting up in the not to distant future, it could put Larimer County in the hot seat with its constituents.
4. Thornton has indicated that at some point that they may need another pipe to convey their water in 2065.
Thornton could not guarantee to the County Commissioners at the last hearing that they would guarantee to this date. This indicates that the second pipe may be needed sooner than anticipated. If it is questionable that 2 pipes along Douglas Road is not feasible then we know a 3rd is out of the question. Why not plan ahead and put the pipe in area that can accommodate the needs of Thornton and NISP in the years ahead.

5. Going down Douglas Road would require ELCO to put in 2 new pipes which would be avoided by going down CR 56.

Going down CR 56 would effect fewer residents, put both pipes in one location which is the preferred route for NISP, allow for more space for future pipeline needs, construction time would be much less as the utility issues on Douglas Road would be eliminated, and the closing or construction delays on the main artery of Douglas Road would be eliminated.

When I first learned about this Pipeline form Thornton I felt that the Commissioners and Larimer County had let us down and tried to push this through without public input. I felt a distrust for our government. However after meeting with the Commissioners, Gaitor, Johnson, Donnelly, Dougherty and Kafalas and the members of Larimer County my trust in our government has been restored.

I especially had the opportunity to get to know Lew Gaitor and I truly believe he wanted what is best for the residents of Larimer County in the work he did as County Commissioner. I wasn't aware of his health battle until it was mentioned in the Coloradoan. Even as his health deteriorated he continued to do his job and showed up for work every day. Because of this application I got to know him as a person and for that I feel fortunate.

Having lived on or near Douglas Road since 1986, it was an area I moved to because it was out in the country yet close to all the amenities of downtown Fort Collins. Growth has caught up with this area as others have discovered what a great place this is to live.

I feel good about where we were a year ago and where we are now and I trust that Larimer County and the Commissioners have reached out to their residents affected by this project and they will make the right decision come January 28th of 2019.
Subject: Larimer Water Projects Working Group Summation
From: Janet Carabello - To: heather@peakfacilitation.com - Cc: Dan Myers, ellisik@co.larimer.co.us, Calley Schubert, Todd Blomstrom, Linda Hoffmann, mpeterson@larimer.org, Steve Johnson, Tom Donnelly, john.kea@senate@state.co.us,

Heather,

I appreciate all your efforts and those of Peak Facilitation to keep us in line and the discussions moving. Here are my comments hopefully to be incorporated in the final report to BOCC:

As a representative for the Hearthfire community, I can state we are against any pipelines running down Douglas Road. The negative impacts far outweigh any perceived benefits to us. Our HOA Board sent off letters to the BOCC stating clearly that 90% of our residents surveyed are against the 1041 for Douglas Road, and by implication, against any future NISP pipelines.

What is shameful about the Thornton process is that it created suspicion, animosity and anger among close neighboring communities. Instead of standing together as “We All Larimer County Residents” the process fragmented into back biting and pushing pipeline proposals onto other communities. Specifically, I refer to Eagle Lake which for some reason (I suspect collusion with Thornton) would throw Douglas Road communities and interests under the bus. County Rd 56 constituents also feel betrayed by fellow communities with the emphasis put on that route.

What became clear through the working group process, and was reinforced by the public open houses, is that the unifying and preferred solution not harming Larimer County residents and in fact, benefitting them greatly, is the POUDRE ALTERNATIVE.

The price of Thornton’s mandate to grow is and will be the cost of water (among other resources). It’s a microcosm of what is happening throughout the arid and semi-arid parts of the US in conjunction with undeniable climate change threatening future water sources. Thornton wants “the best water at the least cost.” Larimer County has its own issues to solve with growth and should not be burdened directly by Thornton’s issues, any more than the reverse.

All of Thornton’s problems with the Poudre Alternative can be solved for a cost and with perhaps some assistance from Larimer County. I hope that comes across clearly to the BOCC and they support the best solution for their constituents by denying any 1041 application that requires unnecessary pipelines and does not support the health of the Poudre River.

Sincerely,

Janet Carabello
Ft. Collins, Co.
Subject: Wrap Up Of Working Group
From: Chuck - To: heather@peakfacilitation.com - Cc: - Date: November 28, 2018 at 11:16 AM

It was very enlightening to be on the working group. There were several people there that had one agenda and damn the rest. They never cared about giving any of the other routes a chance. The Poudre folks were one of these. Their two main people do not live on Douglas so have nothing to lose if it goes down Douglas. And of course Eagle Lake. I understand their stance, it was the same as mine, Not In My Backyard. The difference is I did take a serious look at the alternate convenience methods. I really liked the canal method, as well as the Poudre. But, I do not think either of these will be taken up by Thornton, they really want a pipeline for all the reasons they have stated.

I did look at all the potential solutions. After much thought and discussions with some other members I came to the following conclusions:

Thornton is NOT going to put the water into the Poudre. We felt that Thornton would go to court before using the Poudre. A million dollars for lawyers vs a state of the art water treatment plant and no usable water after fire or flood.

NISP prefers the Northern Route and really dislikes Douglas Road. I was on one of the East Slope water tours put on by my Northern Water and it came out in one of the presentations. It is not good to place pipelines under a major road. Thornton can reduce their costs by laying a NISP pipe at the same time, since NISP wants to co-locate with Thornton.

In discussions with Thornton during the breaks and at the community presentation they seem to be really favoring the Northern Route.

The more we learn about the number of pipelines and the sort of fuzzy schedule for them, Douglas looks less and less likely.

The traffic study and homes affected survey sure seem to favor the Northern Route. I know Eagle Lake will not like it, but "The needs of the many, outweigh the needs of the few" (Spock). Less then 10 vs 187.

I will be throwing my support behind the Northern Route and would be willing to work with Thornton and Eagle Lake to help mitigate the impact as much as possible.

Chuck Hull
Point Townhomes.
Hi Peak Facilitation, County Staff, Commissioners Johnson/Donnelly/Dougherty, and Commissioner-elect Kefalas,

The Larimer Water Projects Working Group had its last meeting last night. At the end of the meeting, the Group members were invited to send "additional comments" to Heather about the process. I've served on other local and statewide Working Groups over the years wrestling with highly contentious issues, and I've observed yet others. My comments are below.

1. **Thank you for appointing me to represent Save The Poudre and the Poudre River in this process.** I've been speaking for the Poudre River for 15 years now and it's the easiest and most fulfilling job in the world -- almost everyone in Fort Collins and the surrounding area loves the Poudre River and wants to protect it.

2. **The Group membership could have been improved by giving more thought to who was appointed.** The members of the Group seemed to be appointed willy-nilly -- with some members having limited participation or knowledge about the Thornton Pipeline or NISP -- and the Group did not have representation equal to addressing the issue at hand. Of the 29 seated members, only one (me) formally represented the "Poudre River" although the entire process was about if or how the Poudre River's water would continue to be diverted out of the river and then put in a pipeline or put back into the river. Further, at neither of the public meetings was Save The Poudre allowed to present information to the public although both Thornton and NISP were allowed to have front-facing infomercials at both.

3. **The Working Group process could have been improved if it was given more time.** The Group was not given enough time or resources to actually address the issue at hand. Five short meetings was not enough to flesh out the projects to be considered, nor to adequately address the questions and comments by the Group members.

4. **With more time, the Working Group process could have been improved by addressing the continual onslaught of "false information".** We were bombarded with propaganda from Thornton without the time or resources to investigate its veracity. Further, there were continual statements, emails, and documents from individual Group members that contained questionable information, but there was no attempt by the process organizers to actually evaluate what was true and what was not.

5. **The Working Group process could have been improved by trying to "bring people together".** The process avoided trying to 'bring people together' or build consensus around a mutually agreed outcome or alternative to the Thornton Pipeline as described in the original 1041 application. In fact, the Group members were not only allowed, but encouraged, to dig deeper into their silos and separate themselves from other Group members thereby pushing their own agenda and alternative forward. In my opinion, the entire process should have tried to build common ground and funnel the alternatives down into one or two that achieved some kind of consensus. Instead, the process allowed an ongoing "screw your neighbor" situation to occur whereby the neighborhoods in the proposed pipeline route were pitted against each other by Thornton and NISP.

6. **The last meeting could have been improved.** The last meeting last night -- at which there should have been an opportunity to pull it all together and build consensus -- was a mess. The "clicker voting" process was wasted because the options and statements being voted on were disorganized and somewhat meaningless. The end of the meeting seemed like a 'throw your hands up, we're out of here' ending by the facilitator, the County Staff, and the Group members.

I've been 'Saving the Poudre' for 15 years now, and I actually walked in the door of this Working Group process somewhat optimistically thinking this could be a process whereby the community could come together to address the acrimony and problems that Thornton and NISP have created. Maybe Thornton will magically "supplement" their application with an alternative that pulls it all together? Save The Poudre eagerly awaits Thornton's next step and will continue to be very engaged.
Thank you again for investing the resources in the Working Group process and for allowing Save The Poudre to be involved.

Gary

--

Gary Wockner, PhD, Director
Save The Poudre: Poudre Waterkeeper
Author: "River Warrior: Fighting to Protect the World's Rivers" (2016)
Subject: comments Heather requested at the conclusion of our meeting
From: Dennis Harmon - To: heather@peakfacilitation.com - Cc: Lesli Ellis - Date: November 28, 2018 at 7:54 AM

11/28/18

Heather:

At the conclusion of the meeting last evening, you asked for comments on the proceedings. Please pass along the following comments to the Working Group:

The Working Group should eliminate the Canal Conveyance as an option to be considered further as WSSC's Board would not approve it. For reasons that may not be obvious to most, operating the ditch outside its historical May through mid-September seasonal pattern would be detrimental to the canal and its appurtenant facilities.

Not only would cold winter operations be damaging to the canal itself because of low temperatures and icing concerns which have been mentioned before, those operations would interfere with WSSC's essential seasonal maintenance over the 58 mile length of the canal most of which can only be undertaken when the canal is empty.

Those activities include tree removal, sand and silt removal, canal bank maintenance, cleaning of head gates and measuring flumes, replacement and repair of head gates and check structures, weed control spraying and burning, dam outlet structure maintenance and so on. In addition, a potential ditch failure during the winter months could be extremely difficult and expensive to repair, a risk our shareholders should not and will not accept, in my judgement.

The lateral ditches fed from our main canal which are independently owned and operated by subsets of our shareholders would be similarly (negatively) impacted.

Dennis Harmon

Dennis J. Harmon, General Manager

Water Supply & Storage Co.
Tunnel Water Company
Jackson Ditch Company