

South Boulder Creek process advisory group meeting notes

Aug. 5, 2020

1. GROUND RULES AND EXPECTATIONS

- Crisp and focused on deliverables
- Respectful communication
- Helpful collaboration
- We all come from different perspectives. Listen carefully to each other.
- Assume positive intent
- Stick to the Establish timelines (meet 2-3 times)
- Be honest and participate in good faith
- Clarify and understand the history, include knowledge of where we've been

3. PURPOSE STATEMENT REVIEW AND CLARIFICATION

- Scope of work will be determined in number five on the agenda.
- We need to understand the steps to obtain more information.
- If needed, may have smaller one on one discussions with staff and reflect on what might need to be done.
- We don't want to pause work on what's being done until we are clear about what has already been done.
- Intersection of council motion and OSBT motion: We have something close to complete (attachment to a Council Information Packet). Will list the studies that have been done in the past.

4. ROLE OF BOARD MEMBERS

- Board lens:
 - PB: ensure comp plan and guiding principals. If going astray, chime in
 - OSBT: Protecting open space and habitat
 - WRAB: Cost analysis and viability; citywide flood mitigation needs; high level pass at design; opportunity for technical members to participate with staff
- This group is about process. Item 5, scope of work we need to know, necessitates a 30K foot view of technical to understand process.
- Stay within the confines of the motion (clarified in agenda item 4)
- This group should not get into great depth on the technical details
- This group should evaluate what staff have already done and then scope out any incremental work that needs to be done beyond that.
- Provide clear communication between utilities staff and the boards about the path staff should go down.
- Continue to communicate with Dan and Board members as needed to make sure we are responsive
- Align on expectations (ex: what does it mean for Dan to "update the board?")

- As a Process Subcommittee, don't have the authority to look into anything beyond process. Council members/committee chairs clarified there can not be scope creep.

5. AGENDA ITEM 4

- i. **Advisory group timeline and analysis timeline:** pre-June 16 staff capacity is not sustainable. What's realistic? Do the work to form the committee, do the upstream analysis before the end of the year. There is support for doing the work, and coordinate with the board members, and still honor council's request to not impact the timeline on the Variant 1 -100.

Intentionally a parallel effort.

- "Within a few months" in case there were items that came out of the upstream analysis but didn't want to prescribe a timeframe because council wasn't sure how long it would take. The intent is to balance the staff capacity and the continuing work on the 100-year design work.
 - The group is on the same page.
 - Still a sense of urgency - if the 100-year design has any fatal flaws and desire for project to move forward for the flood benefit.
- ii. **Staff capacity and level of effort:** pre-June 2020 engagement level is not envisioned.
 - iii. **Budgetary constraints:** building consensus is money well spent.
 - Low tens of thousands is reasonable, not hundreds of thousands.
 - If staff report that the costs are becoming too high, the Process Subcommittee would have to take this back to council. (Particularly given the budget pressures that the city is currently facing.)
 - Committed to no additional work unless we were certain it would be beneficial.
 - iv. **OSBT and Council Report-outs:**
 - Staff will go back to OSBT before council because it was their motion. Council motion didn't specify that step, but that is staff recommendation.
 - Council representative agrees with this proposed approach. Staff can decide when and how that happens. (people agreed this sounded constructive and appropriate. What OSBT has found is it's helpful for the boards to be in the conversation.)
 - Staff can lay out what that report out looks like.
 - Agreed staff will do a formal memo and presentation for the OBST and do a "matters" update at WRAB and Planning Board.
 - Have a possible joint board meeting? Staff will develop a proposed way forward for the next group.
 - Planning Board will not decide on the current topic. Informing the Planning Board is good but the Planning Board doesn't need to be a central decision point in the analysis.

6. **AGENDA ITEM 5a: SCOPE OF WORK CONSIDERATIONS. AND OSBT 6/3 RECOMMENDATION:**

- Staff has existing model runs that can potentially answer numbers 1-3 and new model runs would be needed to answer numbers 4 & 5 of the OSBT questions.
- OSBT representative, if there is not a substantial amount of flow that can be captured in the gravel pits, then the further work doesn't need to be done. Staff might get through number 1 and stop.
- Spend more time and look at what happens when the levee is removed.
- Map B-1 has gotten us here. OSBT needs that iteration of information first and then figure out what's next.
- Variant 1-100 yr is not dependant upon the levee.
- Dam was moved from CDOT to OSMP property. Does half the flood go west?
- How many acre feet are we talking about and what did the model runs show?
- The OSBT members don't feel the need to cover the design history, but staff is trying to strike a balance between the council request and advisory board.

NEXT STEPS

- i. Have the memo that we're producing a week in advance of when this group is going to meet. Delineate which information answers which questions.
- ii. What will address the OSBT June 3 Motion's two basic questions and additional questions numbered 1-6??
- iii. Executive summary level narrative, what was looked at? What conclusions were reached? Agreement with this approach.
- iv. Send the technical packet to the group along with map B-1.