

## Appendix C Public Questions, Comments and Responses

This document contains a summary of public comments and questions made during the public release period from December 15, 2003 through February 9, 2004 regarding the Water Quality Management (208) Plan. Responses are provided beneath each of the questions listed below.

All comments were either made during the three public meetings, at PPACG's committee meetings, by phone, or by mail. The three public meetings held for comments were:

- January 12, 2004, Woodland Park Council Chambers, Number in Attendance: 6
- January 14, 2004, Fairplay Town Hall, Number in Attendance: 6
- January 21, 2004, Colorado Springs City Hall, Number in Attendance: 4

- 
1. Why does the 208 Plan contain some information that was discussed in the previous update of the 208 Plan?

Response: The 2004 update of the 208 Plan is a comprehensive Plan, which builds and enhances upon the previous update of the Plan that was completed in 1999. Because the format of the 2004 update of the 208 Plan is a little different than the 1999 Plan it was necessary to include some of the background information contained in the previous update. This new format will allow for easier updating of the Plan in the future.

2. Water supply systems for communities such as Highland Lake and Spring Creek need to be improved and more attention needs to be focused on the possible effects of septic systems. How will the 208 Plan address this concern?

Response: One of the recommendations contained in the 208 Plan is to evaluate the connection between septic systems and water supply wells for each of the three counties. In this study the following components would be addressed:

- Location of septic systems and monitoring wells.
- Need to collect more groundwater quality data.
- Location of failed septic systems
- Poor soils and high water tables
- Areas where the number of septic system inspections should increase.

Because the 208 Plan is a regional Plan it does not address problems unique to individual communities, but rather common problems that are shared and can be addressed at a regional level.

3. Florissant is located incorrectly on the maps and should be in Teller County and not Park County?

Response: This problem has been corrected.

## Appendix C Public Questions, Comments and Responses

4. Are peatlands a type of wetland and if so, the information in the peatlands section should be incorporated into the wetlands section?

Response: Wetlands can be classified into three general categories: marshes, swamps and peatlands. The peatlands section has been moved so it appears underneath the wetlands section.

5. How does the 208 Plan address transportation planning issues as they relate to water quality?

Response: In the Nonpoint source section of each watershed, the 208 Plan addresses stormwater and urban runoff concerns. The information contained in the 208 Plan is usually referenced and/or incorporated into an Environmental Assessment (EA) or Environmental Impact Statement (EIS).

6. A growing concern in Fairplay is protection of surface water supply sources, especially Beaver Creek?

Response: Recommendations are contained in the policy section of the 208 Plan that address issues regarding protection of surface water sources. The Source Water Assessment Report, which is to be completed by CDPHE and is expect to be available in March, 2004 also identifies available options to address potential contamination concerns to public water supply systems. The CDPHE report will also include the development and implementation of protection plans.

7. Some of the stream segments that are listed in the 2002 303(d) list in Section II, Regional Water Quality Assessment, have been de-listed by the Water Quality Control Commission (WQCC) and should be removed?

Response: This Report will include the information available from the Draft 2004 303(d) List and Draft 303(d) Monitoring & Evaluation List instead of the 2002 303(d) List. This list includes the corrections that were made by the WQCC after the 2002 303(d) List was approved and results of more data analysis that has been conducted. All information in the other sections of the Report that reference the 2002 303(d) List have also been changed.

8. More stringent phosphorous and nitrate limits will be difficult for the Fairplay Sanitation District and Alma Water and Sanitation District to meet?

Response: This concern and possible options will be discussed in the Future Needs Assessment for the South Platte Headwaters and Upper South Platte Watersheds.

9. The Plan should discuss the Union Park Pump Storage Alternative, as a method to meet future water supply needs for the region?

**Appendix C**  
**Public Questions, Comments and Responses**

Response: The primary focus of this plan is to look at water quality and not water supply sources in the future. This Plan does contain a discussion of factors that affect water quality such as water quantity, but a recommendation encouraging or promoting specific water supply sources to evaluate in the future is not in the purview of this plan.

10. On page 8-19 the second paragraph, the second sentence (Starting with “The alluvial aquifer in the Fountain Creek Valley is the primary municipal water supply for...”) is not correct. The Security Water District gets water from the Widefield Aquifer not the Fountain Creek Valley Aquifer.

Response: This has been corrected.

11. Are the creeks within the Fountain Creek Watershed complying with the current water quality standards?

Response: Section 3, Regional Water Quality Assessment, of the 208 Plan has a list of segments that are not currently meeting water quality standards for each of the five watersheds. Some segments in the Fountain Creek Watershed are listed as not currently being in compliance with selenium.

12. The table in the Fountain Creek Watershed that compares water quality trends needs to be made easier to compare and understand? Does the number of samples taken affect the trend?

Response: The percentage of exceedances listed in the water quality comparison table for Fountain Creek is used to make general and qualitative observations concerning temporal trends. In instances where the number of samples taken during that period of time was reduced, it is difficult to determine a trend. For water quality parameters not included on the list, a bulleted list is included in the water quality assessment section for the Fountain Creek Watershed that specifically list the trends.

13. What assurance does the average citizen have that mining operations are complying with water quality standards and not negatively affecting the water in our region and not discharging contaminants that are harmful to the environment?

Response: Most large scale mining operations require an individual National Pollution Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit that regulates the concentrations of specific pollutants that are being emitted. The types of pollutants vary, but are usually heavy metals, pH, and any chemicals that were used or are still being used in mining operations. Each stream segment has specific water quality standards associated with that stream segment that cannot be exceeded. If monitoring shows that water quality standards are being exceeded then steps are taken to bring that stream segment back into compliance.

**Appendix C**  
**Public Questions, Comments and Responses**

14. Information should be incorporated into the Plan regarding the water quality problems associated with Eagle Picher and the EPA enforcement action against them?

Response: Information will be incorporated into the water quality analysis section for Fountain Creek describing the water quality problems associated with Eagle Picher.

15. The Resource Extraction section under the Upper Arkansas Watershed should be updated?

Response: More information was added regarding existing activities at Cripple Creek and Victor Gold Mining and some of the existing information was updated.

16. There were inconsistencies in Section IV, Population Projections for El Paso and Teller Counties?

Response: Corrections to the population projections were made. The aggregated population projections for the Management Areas within El Paso and Teller County correspond to the population projections within each county.

17. Under Point Source Dischargers, the descriptions and information contained in the Major Point Source Inventory Data sheets for some of the dischargers needs to be updated?

Response: Each discharge facility was contacted to provide information regarding their facility. Some of the Major Point Source Data sheets and descriptions were updated with information that was not available or not provided before the Draft 208 Plan was released for public review and comment.