



**Minutes  
Strategic Planning Committee  
July 18, 2023**

**Committee members present in the Rosemont Conference Room or online:** Committee Chair Brian Risley, Mike O'Malley, Dave Donelson, Michelle Talarico and David Leinweber

**Utilities Board members present in the Rosemont Conference Room or online:** Lynette Crowlerson and Nancy Henjum

**Staff members present in the Rosemont Conference Room or online:** Alex Baird, Andie Buhl, Natalie Watts, Lisa Barbato, Mike Francolino, Abby Ortega, Justin Fecteau, Renee Adams, Travas Deal, Tristan Gearhart, Bryan English, Joseph Rasmussen and Somer Mese

**City of Colorado Springs staff members present in the Rosemont Conference Room or online:** Renee Congdon, Chris Bidlack, David Beckett and Sally Barber

**Citizens present in the Rosemont Conference Room or online:** Lindsey Samelson

**Call to Order**

Committee Chair Risley called the meeting to order at 4:00 p.m.

**Review Minutes**

The minutes from the June 20, 2023 Strategic Planning Committee meeting were reviewed and accepted for posting.

**Compliance Reports**

- I-6 Infrastructure (Semi-annual)

Ms. Lisa Barbato, Chief Systems Planning and Projects Officer, reviewed the (I-6) which states:

*The Chief Executive Officer shall direct that annual, five-year and 20-year infrastructure plans are developed for each utility service. Accordingly, the CEO shall:*

- 1. Use a reasonable planning period to meet obligation to serve requirements for current and future customers.*
- 2. Base plans on operational and regulatory requirements to provide safety, system reliability and security.*
- 3. Maintain an organization-wide long-range infrastructure plan that considers the annual impact to the typical customer bill, maintains strong financial metrics, and sequences infrastructure projects to the extent operationally and financially practical.*
- 4. Plan for replacement of aging infrastructure, information and operational technology upgrades, utility relocations for public works and road projects, life extension of existing systems and services to approved contract customers.*

5. *Coordinate infrastructure planning with the Municipal Government's Strategic Plan, Comprehensive Plan and Annexation Policy and other governmental agency plans.*

*G-12 Guideline: Urban Planning Area Utility Infrastructure Master Plan*

1. *Develop and maintain an Urban Planning Area Utility Infrastructure Master Plan which identifies objectives, strategies, and principles for urban planning area redevelopment.*
2. *The Master Plan will align with Colorado Springs Utilities' Strategic Plan, Integrated Resource Plans, PlanCOS and other City master plans.*

Committee Member O'Malley expressed interest in revisiting the integrated resource plans. Ms. Barbato and Mr. Travas Deal, Chief Executive Officer, and Ms. Abby Ortega, Infrastructure & Resource Planning General Manager, explained the process and reasoning for creating Integrated Resource Plans (IRPs) (every 5-6 years) and true-ups (annually).

**Wastewater Long-Range Planning Studies and Alternatives Analysis**

Mr. Justin Fecteau, Engineer IV, provided background information about the wastewater long range plan. He said flow projections include Banning Lewis Ranch (BLR) and the Southeast Annexation area, which is 17.5 million gallons per day (MGD) and Springs Utilities currently treats 40 MGD. He said the study includes alternatives for long-term planning (50 years out).

Mr. Fecteau reviewed the BLR north and south limitations such that zig-zag interceptor will be at capacity by 2029. He also said BLR south's purchase capacity in the lower Fountain area will reach capacity around 2028. Mr. Fecteau said there are five alternatives to consider to support load for the next 50 years, and reviewed each one:

1. Alternative 1 – North to Las Vegas Water Recovery Facility (LVWRRF) – Central and South to new water recovery facility (WRRF)
2. Alternative 2 – North to LVWRRF – Central and South to Harold D. Thompson Water Recovery Facility (HDT WRRF)
3. Alternative 3 – North, Central and South to LVWRRF
4. Alternative 6 – North, Central and South to HDT WRRF
5. Alternative 7 – North, Central and South to new WRRF

Mr. Fecteau reviewed the criteria and definitions for scoring each of the five alternatives and their results (relative benefit score):

- Potential criteria: Regulatory
  - Qualitative
  - Scoring differentiator: Plant discharge permit category (e.g. based on nutrients, etc.) - we have to meet this requirement.
- Potential criteria: Political considerations
  - Qualitative
  - Scoring differentiator: alternative expected to be supported, neutrally supported, or not supported based on potential impacts to development timing and finances
- Potential criteria: Operations complexity, resiliency, redundancy
  - Qualitative
  - Scoring differentiator: hassle factor for the administration (e.g. reporting for two or three treatment plants)

- Potential criteria: Phasability
    - Qualitative
    - Scoring differentiator: modularity of the project based on percentage of project completed in early phases
  - Potential criteria: Legal
    - Qualitative
    - Scoring differentiator: is the alternative beneficial to, neutral to, or detriment to existing and future legal agreements
  - Potential criteria: Reuse and regionalization
    - Qualitative
    - Scoring differentiator: does the alternative enhance, benefit, not alter, or detract from water reuse and regionalization plans
  - Potential criteria: Constructability/ land aspects/ implementation schedule
    - Quantitative
    - Scoring differentiator: project timing (could be for Springs Utilities to decide the implications of the times)
  - Potential criteria: Impact to existing and future Springs Utilities facilities and projects outside of BLR
    - Qualitative
    - Scoring differentiator: Does alternative enhance, benefit, not alter, or detract from Springs Utilities projects already on the books
1. Alternative 1 – Relative benefit score: 0.26
  2. Alternative 2 – Relative benefit score: 0.49
  3. Alternative 3 – Relative benefit score: 0.75
  4. Alternative 6 – Relative benefit score: 0.52
  5. Alternative 7 – Relative benefit score: 0.10

Mr. Fecteau explained the 50-year life cycle cost to benefit ratio and said the costs are conceptual in nature and are in-line with the level of detail Springs Utilities has. He also explained the 50-year life cycle cost estimates, which represent the total costs over a 50-year period and includes multiple phases of capital projects.

Mr. Fecteau said Alternative 3 is leading as the best option right now because it beneficially utilizes existing treatment at LVWRRF, has the lowest operational complexity (no new WRRF) and highest value to benefit ratio. He reviewed the capital costs for Alternative 3 and concluded with next steps.

Ms. Barbato also reviewed Peak Innovation and said staff is meeting with stakeholders and engineers to review the City's master plan.

### **Water Ordinance Discussion**

Committee Chair Risley said the Utilities Board is not the appropriate board to review and approve City annexations. He also said the criteria for contiguity is a land use matter, not a utility matter and the Water Ordinance is in the wrong section of City Code and should be moved to Chapter 7 instead of Chapter 12. Chair Risley said he is in favor for removing the 125% contiguity. Committee Member Talarico agreed with Chair Risley's recommended changes.

Ms. Renee Congdon, City Attorney Division Chief – Utilities, said if the Strategic Planning Committee agrees to move forward with these changes, then the next steps are to bring the proposed updates of the Water Ordinance to a Utilities Board meeting for discussion, and then to City Council for an action/vote. She noted that if the Water Ordinance is changed to Chapter 7 instead of Chapter 12, the Utilities Board has to first make a recommendation and then it has to pass as an ordinance at City Council with two readings.

Committee Member O'Malley emphasized how Strategic Planning Committee needs to review what items belong at City Council versus Utilities Board meetings.

Ms. Barbato also said that Springs Utilities staff wants to change language in the ordinance because there is confusion with the development community and how they interpret the ordinance.

The committee agreed this item needs to be discussed further at future Strategic Planning Committee meetings before it is brought to a Utilities Board meeting. Chair Risley requested this item be on the agenda at next month's Strategic Planning Committee meeting.

**Purpose of Strategic Planning Committee**

Chair Risley requested this item be moved to next month's Strategic Planning Committee meeting as the first agenda item.

**Plan for future meeting: Tuesday, Aug. 15, 2023**

Committee Member O'Malley proposed discussing mitigation of natural gas prices and exposure/attainability at the next meeting.

**Adjournment**

The meeting adjourned at 5:48 p.m.