

CU South Process Subcommittee Meeting Notes

Friday, January 10, 2019

2:00 to 3:30 p.m.

Municipal Building Room W-100 (1777 Broadway)

Facilitator: Jean Gatza **Note-taker:** Holly Opansky

Committee Members: Council member, Rachel Friend and Council member and mayor, Sam Weaver

Staff: Margo Aldrich, Dan Burke, Brandon Coleman, Sarah Huntley, Philip Kleisler, John Potter, Jim Robertson, Doug Sullivan, and Joe Taddeucci

Other attendees from the public: Ben Binder, Joanna Bloom, Raymon Bridge, Curt Brown, Jon Carroll, Don Cote, Francis Draper, Gary George, Karen Hollweg, Kathie Joyner, Dave Kuntz, Marki LaCompte, Gordon McCurry, Jim McMillan, Danica Powell, Lynn Segal, and Bill Williams

Introductions from committee members

- This was the first meeting that Council members Rachel Friend and Sam Weaver, mayor, served on this committee and they introduced themselves (S. Weaver joined via conference call) and thanked Bob Yates and Cindy Carlisle for their preceding service on the committee.
-

Process Committee Logistics

- Phil Kleisler, Senior Planner, confirmed the committee's work per the accepted charter and the scope of public comments.
 - The group agreed to meet on Fridays before the next relevant and forthcoming Council Agenda Committee and or Council meetings.
 - The committee recommended that the Council Agenda Committee:
 - Increase the time for this topic at the February 21, 2020 Council meeting from 20 minutes to 45 minutes;
 - Include two items: The Process Subcommittee appointment and a process check-in; and
 - A staff presentation highlighting the process including:
 - A brief update and orientation about the project for new council members; and
 - High-level schedule of events through the spring leading to a council decision on the SBC
-

Status Updates

- The group discussed South Boulder Creek Flood Mitigation and CU South Annexation.
- In response to S. Weaver enquiry about the Colorado University's status, Francis Draper, senior strategic advisor for Public Policy and Community Relations, mentioned that with the dam across, CU would take variant one into consideration if housing is appropriate on the site. R. Friend requested that the CU's response be followed up in writing.

Brief Review of Community Engagement Plan

- The group discussed the community engagement plan and recommended that the materials and information shared includes:
 - CU's housing plan and commitment be apparent (S. Weaver);
 - Where the alignments and non-alignments exist with CU and the City on all topics like, costs, impacts around the various scenarios and housing;
 - The impacts of selecting the 200 or the 500-year plan (S. Weaver);
 - Answering R. Friend's question about tying this back to the guiding principles, P. Kleisler mentioned this did not specifically circle back.
 - R. Friend supported the project sequencing the work with the correlating approval and/or permitting bodies / agencies like CDOT as well as CU, the City. J. Taddeucci, Director of Public Works for Utilities, reinforced this idea by sharing that his group plans to ask for approvals and/or permitting later in the May once a specific plan is ready for submission. He continued at that point, they would have greater understanding of which agencies will need the approvals / permits and the critical path.
-

Near-term Schedule

- The group discussed if committee agreed with near-term schedule highlighting concerns about proceeding:
 - Having enough information (S. Weaver). J. Taddeucci mentioned that variant 1, (included land use impacts, design and modeling) doesn't have anything new, that he knows of as it is in draft form. He stated that the final findings would be shared at the February Council study session, and if possible, the final findings could be shared earlier.
 - Identifying the ground water with respect to the damn (R. Friend).
- What type of input would be most valuable to council?
- S. Huntley, Engagement Manager, supported the group giving direction on level, intensity (Inform, consult, collaborate, empower) and types of questions for public engagement. The group offered these suggestions:
 - Inform and consult level of engagement
 - Online experiences
 - Individual opportunities to weigh in
 - Outreach similar to the Alpine-Balsam project 2018 (S. Weaver)
 - The public is asked about flood mitigation concerning type of development, scale of development, level of protection – constraints of development, and costs
 - Trade-offs regarding costs, number of people protected, level of protection, constraints on land development
 - Site visit that addressed amount of acreage CU planned to develop, footprint of the project, impact on the guiding principles, with F. Draper's assistance.
 - Provide the realm of possibilities (R. Friend)
 - Identify known roadblocks (CDOT, OSMP) (S. Weaver)
 - Dan Burke, Director of Open Space & Mountain Parks, requested detailed questions be targeted to specific boards.

Public Comment

- Ben Binder supported a detailed comprehensive transportation plan.
- Don Cote, supported the project bringing forward new and effective information.
- Francis Draper, supported facilitating tour and working with the city.
- Kathie Joyner, supported engagement that was not duplicative and the schedule is advertised as soon as possible.
- Dave Kuntz, ?
- Raymond Bridge, supported engagement regarding annexation.
- Jim McMillan, expressed concern around developing the floodplain.
- Gary George, supported a dedicated person and team to look over the process as a whole.
- Marki LaCompte, Save South, supported a thorough engagement process, and not the typical open house. She also supported OSMP having more information.
- Gordon McCurry, expressed concern about the how the sequencing of information will be shared with the boards and the public.
- Bill Williams expressed concern about an information style engagement and not taking into consideration the public's input.
- ?, supported an idea of an embankment designed by CU students.