

South Boulder Creek process advisory group meeting notes
Thursday, Aug. 20 2-4 p.m. (Continued from Aug. 5 meeting)

NOTES

1. **Welcome Back Sam Weaver as co-chair** (*Bob Yates sat in for Sam last meeting*)
2. **Review of meeting guidelines & ground rules**
3. **Review of agreements reached under agenda item 4**
 - Purpose of group (*advise staff on the development of a process for responding to council's June 16th motion—full purpose statement can be found on the agenda*)
 - Scope of work under agenda item 5 necessitates looking at some content along with process. Council request is that this remain at a high level. Confines of the motion indicate:
 - i. Not deep on technical details
 - ii. Evaluate and be clear about what staff has already done
 - iii. Scope incremental work needed beyond that
 1. In the low \$10ks not \$100Ks
 2. Not to delay work on variant 1 100-yr model
 3. Not to go beyond the end of the year (3 months)
 4. Not have increased negative impacts
 - Wrap these meetings by 8/28/2020
 - Report out from staff agreed to:
 - i. Staff back to OSBT (not a council dictate, but a recommendation from staff), and then staff to council
 - ii. Staff will do a formal presentation for OSBT and update PB and WRAB under Matters from Staff
 - iii. PB not a decider on the current topic, not central decision point
 - iv. Staff will develop a proposal for the way forward
4. **Council representative summary of purpose of the group**
 - Hear what OSBT has asked about upstream options
 - Understand what OSBT wants to look at, what's been done before and identify any gaps in a previous analysis
 - If the group determines it advisable, staff will move forward with additional analysis
5. **Joe Taddeucci Review of Materials for Committee Review**
 - New summary level document that reviews and provides links to previous reports and compiles everything in one place. Left as draft for this meeting to allow for feedback and adjustment
 - Intent to be responsive to council's June request for a summary and OSBT request. Highlighted parallels.
 - Clarification of past focus, Bandon working with consultant to finish variant 2 report (2018 report) because it is relevant to OSBT interest. Report was posted 8/19/20. Other reports were presented in February to council (1973, 2001, 2015, 2020)

6. **Brandon walked through Figure B1**

- Asking committee to help clarify questions and how best to respond to the request in a way that is digestible (see transcripts for details)
- Staff stated that the modeling shows that it is not possible to direct enough water upstream into CU South property to avoid a floodwall at US36. Board members questioned the evidence for that statement given the data presented in Map B-1 and the 2018 Report.
- Staff (Joe Taddeucci) noted that Utility scope now is to slow down and present the information in a way that the public can see the backup and the math and understand the mechanics of flow split, etc. if levee is removed.
- With construction of project as outlined on drawing, floodwall would still be required. Length of flood wall would be very similar, height would drop by a foot or two, but based on slope of US36—has to tie into the US36 grade and that elevation doesn't exist in many places along the highway.
- Agreed together that getting into the weeds on this is important to identify the gaps—questions are intended to develop a common understanding. It's really important to get the additional requested information.

7. **Staff Scope of Work**

- Show how accounting of volumes of water and where it goes, plus timing and peak flows at US36 bridge. Show WHY the flood wall is still needed.
- How can it be that more water doesn't go into the depression if you remove the levee and remove the banks on the ditch (*i.e.*, change the topography into the former gravel pit and redirect the westerly flow into it)?
- How can it be that if you do this upstream storage concept there is still enough water along US36 overtopping US36 (going into the West Valley)? Point to the source materials that show it works out this way.
- Once everyone understands the answers to these questions outlined by Joe T., then it is up to OSBT to say whether there is a gap, or in other words whether their June 3 questions have been satisfied.

8. **Homework for those intrigued by upstream option**

- a. Any more questions?
- b. Other design OSBT would like to see run? Possibility to see a less impactful set of structures that protects downstream and is less impactful? Reminder that it cannot be too much more expensive.
- c. Can staff put together something that shows capture of all the split flow upstream so we have the ability to see how close we are to capturing the remaining flood flow through the US36 bridge (versus overtopping into West Valley)?

9. **Dan Burke (OSMP) reminded everyone** it may not be okay to have a whole lot of impact in other places on the open space system in order to avoid impact on open space along Highway 36.

10. **Additional Notes**

- An upstream option located at the south end of the CU South property will not result in decoupling the flood project from the CU South annexation because the city would still

need to use the university's property. This was clarified in case public perception and appeal of this concept is based on any misperception that such a decoupling would occur. We have a disconnect on expectations. CU's annexation is not what we are trying to address.

- Need to crystalize into one or two concepts that OSBT feels has/have not been adequately looked at.
- Question by board member: if numbers reflect the conclusions, are there other areas we want to look at?

11. Next Meeting:

- Will determine 3rd advisory group meeting during PSC 8/28 meeting. Will not meet on 8/25.