



**TO:** Members of Council  
**FROM:** Dianne Marshall, City Clerk's Office  
**DATE:** March 5, 2014  
**SUBJECT:** Information Packet

---

**1. Call Ups**

None.

**2. Information Items**

- A. 2013 Food Tax Rebate Program
- B. 2014 Housing and Community Development Program Funding Allocations
- C. Notification of Temporary Judge Appointments

**3. Boards and Commissions**

- A. Environmental Advisory Board – October 2, 2013
- B. Library Commission – January 8, 2014
- C. Open Space Board of Trustees – January 29, 2014
- D. Open Space Board of Trustees – February 19, 2014
- E. Transportation Advisory Board – December 9, 2013
- F. Water Resources Advisory Board – November 18, 2013

**4. Declarations**

None



## INFORMATION PACKET MEMORANDUM

To: Members of City Council

From: Jane S. Brautigam, City Manager  
Paul J. Fetherston, Deputy City Manager  
Karen Rahn, Director, Human Services  
Betty Kilsdonk, Senior Services Division Manager  
Jason Allen, Food Tax Rebate Administrator

Date: March 4, 2014

**Subject: Information Item: 2013 Food Tax Rebate Program**

---

### EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This item presents a summary of the 2013 Food Tax Rebate Program (FTRP). The FTRP provides cash rebates to help compensate qualified residents for sales tax paid on food items. Those eligible for rebates include low-income families, seniors and persons with disabilities.

In 2013, 925 applications were received. Thirty-two (32) applications were denied because the applications were incomplete or those applying did not meet the qualifications; 893 were approved. Rebate amounts were \$227 per qualified family and \$74 per qualified individual. Since 2001, rebates have been indexed for inflation.

In 2013:

- 166 rebates were issued to families for a total of \$37,682;
- 554 rebates were issued to seniors for a total of \$40,996; and
- 173 rebates were issued to persons with disabilities for a total of \$12,802.
- Total rebate disbursement was \$91,480.

### FISCAL IMPACT

Total cost of the 2013 program, including rebates (\$91,480) and administration (\$12,141), was \$103,621.

## **COMMUNITY SUSTAINABILITY ASSESSMENTS AND IMPACTS**

- Economic: There may be a small positive impact on local business, as a FTRP recipient may spend some or all of the rebate at businesses in the City of Boulder.
- Social: The rebate program helps low-income and disabled residents meet basic needs by providing a modest financial benefit.

## **BACKGROUND**

Since passage of a voter initiative in 1967, Boulder has operated the FTRP to help compensate lower-income residents for sales tax paid on food items.

To qualify for a rebate, an applicant must have been a resident of Boulder for the entire 2012 calendar year, meet the income guidelines, complete an Immigration Status Affidavit as required by state law, and be either:

- a) A family with at least one child under 18 living at home;
- b) A senior more than 62 years of age for the entire year; or
- c) An individual with disabilities.

Applications were accepted March 1 through June 29. All who applied for a tax refund in 2012 were mailed an application for 2013. Program information was also available online at <https://bouldercolorado.gov/seniors/food-tax-rebate-program>. There is ongoing outreach to community organizations to enroll their clients who qualify.

The FTRP is administered by the Department of Human Services, Senior Services Division. The West Senior Center, 909 Arapahoe Avenue, is the main distribution and processing point for applications.

## **ANALYSIS**

In 2013, there were 925 total applicants and 893 qualified applicants, the highest numbers in five years. Qualified applicants increased in all three categories from 2012, most notably with a 15% increase in qualified individuals with disabilities. As in each of the last five years, seniors comprised the largest category of qualified applicants. Of the 893 qualified applicants, 554 (62%) were seniors; 166 (18.6%) were families; and 173 (19.4%) were individuals with disabilities. The total number of unqualified applicants, 32, was the lowest in five years. The total rebate disbursement in 2013 (\$91,480) was the highest in five years, and was a 6.3% increase over the 2012 total (\$86,079).

Applicants by Category, 2009-2013

Year	Total Applicants	Total Unqualified Applicants	<b>Total Qualified Applicants</b>	Qualified Families	Qualified Seniors	Qualified Individuals with Disabilities
2013	925	32	<b>893</b>	166	554	173
2012	871	33	<b>838</b>	162	526	150
2011	826	46	<b>780</b>	155	475	150
2010	847	40	<b>807</b>	175	465	167
2009	864	57	<b>807</b>	176	462	169
<b>TOTAL</b>	4333	208	<b>4125</b>	834	2482	809

**NEXT STEPS**

The FTRP accepts and processes applications from March through June each year. The program is anticipated to operate in 2014 as it did in 2013.

An update to council on the 2014 program is planned for September.



## INFORMATION PACKET MEMORANDUM

To: Members of City Council

From: Jane S. Brautigam, City Manager  
Paul J. Fetherston, Deputy City Manager  
Jeff Yegian, Division of Housing Manager  
Kristin Hyser, Community Investment Program Manager  
Kelly Stapleton, Funding Program Administrator

Date: March 4, 2014

**Subject: 2014 Housing and Community Development Program Funding Allocations,** including 2014 Affordable Housing Fund, Community Housing Assistance Program, Community Development Block Grant and HOME Investment Partnership funds for the City of Boulder and the Boulder County/Broomfield County Regional HOME Consortium

---

### EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The purpose of this Information Item is to inform City Council of the 2014 funding allocations using approximately \$6 million in city Affordable Housing Fund and Community Housing Assistance Program funds, federal HOME Investment Partnership Program funds, and federal Community Development Block Grant funds. Funding allocations were recommended by the city-appointed Technical Review Group (TRG) and Community Development Advisory Committee (CDAC) and approved by the city manager. In 2014, the city will provide \$5.4 million for housing activities resulting in the construction of 99 new permanently affordable units and the rehabilitation and improvement of 40 permanently affordable rental units as well as \$366,000 for community development activities. These awards represent significant City of Boulder investments in housing and community development activities serving low- and moderate-income residents of the city.

## **FISCAL IMPACT**

The funding awards described in this Information Item are made from the approved budget for the four dedicated funds.

## **COMMUNITY SUSTAINABILITY ASSESSMENTS AND IMPACTS**

- **Economic:** Investing capital in affordable housing development and rehabilitation stimulates the economy by creating and supporting jobs in the construction field and supporting businesses that supply the construction trade, attracting and retaining employers and a skilled workforce, and increasing revenues for local communities through sales, income and property taxes and fees.
- **Environmental:** An environmental review process is required of all affordable housing fund-assisted projects to ensure that the proposed project does not negatively impact the surrounding environment and that the property site itself will not have an adverse environmental or health effect on end users. Furthermore, providing opportunities for people to live where they work reduces traffic and air pollution.
- **Social:** Affordable housing programs and community development activities positively impact the lives of many low- and moderate-income Boulder residents. Providing affordable housing choices to low- and moderate-income households builds stability and an opportunity to work towards self-sufficiency. Capital investments in local nonprofit organizations and agencies allows for heightened service provision. Housing and community development investments provide housing and services to people with special needs and the otherwise underserved.

## **BACKGROUND**

The Division of Housing works to provide housing opportunities that promote an economically diverse and environmentally sustainable community. The division collaborates with nonprofit organizations, for-profit developers and other departments in the city to develop and maintain affordable housing opportunities and support the capital needs of non-profit service providers. Making federal and city funds available is one of the city's primary strategies to provide affordable housing in the community.

The 2014 funds available include federal Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) funds, federal HOME Investment Partnership Program (HOME) funds, and local Affordable Housing Funds (AHF) and Community Housing Assistance Program (CHAP) funds. To further its commitment and support for the creation and retention of affordable housing the City of Boulder created the Affordable Housing Fund (AHF) and Community Housing Assistance Program (CHAP). These funds are generated and capitalized locally. As a member and lead agency of the Boulder Broomfield Regional Consortium, the City of Boulder receives HOME funds from HUD. HOME funds are exclusively used to create affordable housing for low-income households. The City of Boulder receives 50% of the HOME allocation with the balance of

funds allocated to projects throughout the region. The City of Boulder annually receives a CDBG grant from the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD). The primary objective of the CDBG program is to develop viable communities by providing decent housing, a suitable living environment, and opportunities to expand economic opportunities, principally for low- and moderate-income persons.

All funds are managed by the Division of Housing and are primarily allocated through a competitive Request for Proposal (RFP) process described below. Allocations are used to address local priorities and are guided by priorities identified in several documents: 2005 Housing and Human Services Master Plan; 2010-2014 Housing and Community Development Consolidated Plan; Housing Implementation and Funding Task Force report accepted by City Council in 2000; the Boulder County 10-Year Plan to Address Homelessness approved in 2010.

Annually, the Division of Housing solicits applications through two competitive requests for proposals: the Affordable Housing Fund Round and the Community Development Fund Round. Between annual fund rounds, applications for time-sensitive projects are considered as well when uncommitted funds are available. Two advisory groups (Attachment A) appointed by the City Manager develop funding recommendations: the Technical Review Group (TRG) considers affordable housing applications and the Community Development Advisory Committee (CDAC) reviews applications for the capital needs of non-profits. Applications are reviewed by the Division of Housing staff who evaluate for eligibility, feasibility, community benefit, organizational capacity, and long-term sustainability. Staff presents an analysis to the reviewing committee which further evaluates the proposals and develops recommendations for the City Manager.

Outside of the annual RFP process, in order to respond to mid-year, time-sensitive funding requests, funds may be allocated following the same process of staff analysis, committee review and recommendation and city manager approval. This past year, the city supported the following projects outside of the fund rounds:

**Affordable Housing**

Element Communities	New Construction – 41 units	\$1,845,000
Boulder Housing Partners	New Construction – 31 units	\$1,380,000
Boulder Housing Coalition	Rental Rehabilitation	\$74,000
	<b>Total</b>	<b>\$3,299,000</b>

**Community Development**

Dental Aid	Capital Improvement	\$65,000
Bridge House	Capital Improvement	\$16,000
	<b>Total</b>	<b>\$81,000</b>
	<b>Total Combined</b>	<b>\$3,380,000</b>

The two new construction applications were considered in order to enhance the projects' ability to secure Low Income Housing Tax Credit funding, the applications for which were due prior to the city's fund round.

The Request for Affordable Housing Proposals was released in June 2013 and the proposals received were reviewed by the TRG in September 2013. The 2014 Community Development proposals were solicited in August 2013 and were reviewed by the CDAC in October 2013. Recommendations by both groups were made to and approved by the City Manager on November 20, 2013.

**ANALYSIS**

The 2014 funding awards will result in continued progress toward the city's affordable housing goal and support the city's non-profit infrastructure.

**2014 City of Boulder Affordable Housing Funding Allocations**

Element Communities	New Construction – 16 Units	\$1,120,000
Thistle – Sage Court	Rental Rehabilitation	\$762,500
Boulder Housing Coalition	Rehabilitation	\$74,000
Boulder County Housing Authority	Homeownership Counseling	\$50,000
Boulder Shelter	Special Assessment	\$45,100
EFAA	New Construction – 4 Units	\$45,000
Habitat for Humanity	New construction – 7 units	\$12,000
	<b>Total</b>	<b>\$2,108,600</b>

**2014 HOME Consortium Funding Allocation**

The City of Boulder receives and administers HOME funding for the entire region. City staff worked with member communities to allocate 2014 HOME funds throughout the region in compliance with program regulations and the Consolidated Plan. Longmont and Broomfield administer separate funding allocation processes. The HOME-funded projects outside the city are:

City of Longmont	Rental Rehab (Senior)	\$180,000
Boulder County Housing Authority	Sunnyside - Rehabilitation	\$160,000
City and County of Broomfield	Tenant-Based Rental Assistance	\$60,000

**2014 Community Development Funding Allocation Process**

CDBG allocations are provided to agencies serving low- and moderate-income residents and are the primary source of city funding available to support capital improvements.

Family Resource Schools	Public Service	\$115,000
Family Learning Center	Capital Improvements	\$51,000
Colorado Enterprise Fund	Microloan Program	\$50,000
Growing Gardens	Capital Improvements	\$47,700
YWCA	Capital Improvements	\$21,084
	<b>Total</b>	<b>\$284,784</b>

Following the September floods, staff evaluated the potential to use CDBG funds for flood recovery activities. As CDBG is the principal source of support for the city's non-profit infrastructure, the services provided by non-profits are critical for flood affected households, the relatively delayed mid-2014 availability of funds, and the existence of other much greater resources to meet community needs created by the flood, the decision was to complete the 2014 fund round.

### **NEXT STEPS**

Division of Housing staff will work with fund recipients to develop and execute funding agreements and affordable housing covenants. It is anticipated that the city will receive the federal funds in the second quarter of 2014. Once the federal funds are received and agreements are executed, projects awarded federal dollars will be able to expend.

**2013 Technical Review Group (TRG) Members:**

Kiva Stram, Commercial Lender  
Susan Weeks, Realtor  
Jeremy Syz, Real Estate Attorney  
Matt Schildt, Housing Developer  
Dan Rotner, Architect

**2013 Community Development Advisory Committee (CDAC) Members:**

Alexis Miles, Community Member  
Eric Johnson, Contractor  
Eric Rutherford, Commercial Realtor  
Sherry Richards, Realtor  
Shari Leach, non-profit Executive Director  
Ben Doyle, Attorney



## INFORMATION PACKET MEMORANDUM

To: Members of City Council

From: Linda Cooke, Presiding Judge  
Lynne Reynolds, Court Administrator

Date: March 4, 2014

**Subject: Information Item: Notification of Temporary Judge Appointments**

---

### **EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

The purpose of this information item is to notify City Council that Judge Cooke intends to renew and appoint, through contract, the following temporary judges: Bruce Joss, Dennis Wanebo, and Thomas Reed – all of whom have served as temporary judges under earlier contracts. Trained and experienced temporary judges permit the efficient coverage of the court's docket when conflicts in scheduling, such as leave requests or a required recusal of the presiding or associate judge, occur.

### **FISCAL IMPACT**

The funding necessary to meet the terms of the contracts associated with the appointments of temporary judges is contained within the department's budget.

### **BACKGROUND**

Boulder Revised Code §2-6-4 (b)(3) provides that the presiding judge shall appoint temporary judges for terms of up to one year, after notification to the City Council of each such appointment.

**CITY OF BOULDER, COLORADO  
BOARDS AND COMMISSIONS MEETING SUMMARY**

**NAME OF BOARD/COMMISSION:** Environmental Advisory Board

**DATE OF MEETING:** October 2, 2013

**NAME/TELEPHONE OF PERSON PREPARING SUMMARY:** Juliet Bonnell,  
303-441-1931

**NAMES OF MEMBERS, STAFF AND INVITED GUESTS PRESENT:**

**Environmental Advisory Board Members Present:** Mara Abbott, Tim Hillman, Larissa Read, Stephen Morgan, and Morgan Lommele.

**Staff Members Present:** Molly Winter, Juliet Bonnell

**1. CALL TO ORDER**

The Environmental Advisory Board temporary Chair **T. Hillman** declared a quorum and the meeting was called to order at 6:14 p.m.

**2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

On a motion by **M. Abbott**, seconded by **L. Read**, the Environmental Advisory Board approved (5-0) the September 11, 2013 meeting minutes.

**3. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION**

**4. DISCUSSION ITEMS**

**A. Access Management and Parking Strategies (AMPS) guiding principles and areas of focus (Molly Winter, Director of Downtown and University Hill Management Division and Parking Services)**

**M. Winter** informed the board that she would discuss the guiding principles and areas of focus of Access Management and Parking Strategies and asked the board for their feedback. She provided the board with background information about the development of parking management in Boulder while discussing the importance of access to different locations and accessible parking. Access management looks at all areas and strategizes to fit them together nicely. AMPS looks beyond the existing management areas.

Parking meters were installed in the 1940s and in the 1970s parking districts were created. It is better to have consolidated parking than individual parking in these districts and enhances urban design. It is economical for property owners to share parking spaces and a good way to integrate with other multi-modal strategies. When there is a parking district it is important to determine future use needs and demands and plan for them. In order to plan for future needs, they use SUMP principles- the idea of shared, unbundled, managed, and paid parking. On street parking is good short-term and convenient parking, while garages provide long and short-term, unbundled and shared parking. Enforcement is the key element that makes the system work efficiently and ensures compliance and turnover.

Neighborhood permit parking is a way to preserve the neighborhood quality of life near large traffic generators like CU and downtown. Multi-modal access emerged in the 1990s with the creation of Ecopasses which have limited the number of parking spaces needed in the downtown area. Ecopasses, B-Cycles, bike parking, car shares, and streetscape improvements that make destinations pedestrian-friendly provide multi-modal access. Travel Demand Management programs and streetscape improvements are funded by parking funds. Parking revenues are used to help support economic vitality initiatives including downtown improvements and Ecopasses. Boulder Junction is transit-oriented development and is a great example of integrated parking and travel demand management. There are parking maximums in this location and increased development is tied to district participation.

The Access Management and Parking Strategy is a tool that is meant to coordinate and integrate with stand alone plans such as Climate Commitment and the Transportation Master Plan. Next steps for this project are up in the air due to the flood, but the city will be hiring a consultant to move this forward soon.

**M. Winter** noted that the reinvestment of money made through parking fees is beneficial to destinations. She noted that parking pricing will be investigated and that variable parking pricing, where spots closest to a destination cost more than spots further from a destination, may be considered. She stressed the importance of finding the sweet spot of charging enough to de incentivize parking, but not charging so much that people stop visiting destinations. She informed the board that parking ticket fines may be raised. **M. Winter** asked for the board's feedback on AMPS guiding principles and areas of focus.

**S. Morgan** noted that AMPS doesn't include long-term goals and suggested that it should. He felt that there was room to increase fees and that higher fees wouldn't deter people from visiting destinations. He suggested giving out more tickets through parking enforcement. He also suggested being aggressive and taking action. He noted that we talk about difficult issues, but aren't willing to make tough decisions and act to address them.

**M. Lommele** would like to see better flow going through the major districts. She commented that the hill district and downtown area get congested and would like to see this addressed. She also felt there wasn't enough bike infrastructure and parking near the downtown area and would like to see improved access and flow from the bike paths to these areas and bike parking. She suggested installing larger and more bike racks and noted that when streets are plowed in the winter, the bike racks often become covered with snow and inaccessible.

**M. Abbott** suggested having bike parking more visible.

**S. Morgan** suggested having a climate controlled, safe, indoor place for bike parking in exchange for a fee.

**L. Read** suggested making the public aware of the benefits that use of alternative modes of transportation and AMPS will provide. She thought that getting people out of their cars and taking modes of public transportation was a great opportunity to integrate information on community events, climate, and environmental benefits and programs, by posting information in buses, etc. She agreed with **S. Morgan** that some goals should be included in AMPS.

**M. Lommele** would like to see more research into effective ways to encourage people to use alternative modes of transportation as well as building better infrastructure as an additional area of focus.

**M. Winter** suggested coordinating with and having Randall Rutsch or Kathleen Bracke give EAB an update on the Transportation Master Plan and offered to come back and provide another update on AMPS as things progress.

**5. PUBLIC HEARING ITEMS**

A. None

**6. MATTERS FROM THE ENVIRONMENTAL ADVISORY BOARD, CITY MANAGER, AND CITY ATTORNEY**

The board expressed interest in receiving an update on any flood response and repair efforts. They wanted to hear about flood-related issues, such as environmental health hazards, sewage issues, impacts on food from local farms, debris removal, etc. that would fall in line with EAB's purview as soon as possible.

**S. Morgan** had questions about Boulder's Energy Future and expressed interest in getting an update on the status of discussions with Xcel.

**7. DEBRIEF MEETING/CALENDAR CHECK**

The EAB tentatively scheduled their retreat from 4-8 p.m. on Wed, Nov 6.

**8. ADJOURNMENT**

Environmental Advisory Board adjourned at 7:40 p.m.

Approved:

  
Chair

215/14  
Date

**CITY OF BOULDER  
BOULDER, COLORADO  
BOARDS AND COMMISSIONS MEETING  
MINUTES**

<b>Name of Board/ Commission:</b> Library Commission	
<b>Date of Meeting:</b> January 8, 2014 at the Meadows Branch Library	
<b>Contact Information Preparing Summary:</b> Leanne Slater, 303-441-3106	
<b>Commission Members Present:</b> Anne Sawyer, Celeste Landry, Donna O'Brien, Anna Lull, Paul Sutter <b>Commission Members Absent:</b> None	
<b>Library Staff Present:</b> Maureen Rait, Executive Director of Public Works and Interim Director of Library & Arts Jennifer Miles, Deputy Library Director Leanne Slater, Administrative Specialist II Hillary Dodge, Meadows Branch Manager	
<b>City Staff Present:</b> Glenn Magee, Facilities Design and Construction Manager Joe Castro, Facilities & Fleet Manager Jennifer Bray, Communication Specialist III	
<b>Public Present:</b> Peter Richards Bill Kellogg	
<b>Type of Meeting:</b> Regular	
<b>Agenda Item 1: Call to Order and Approval of Agenda</b>	<b>[6:03 p.m., Audio 0:00 sec]</b>
The meeting was called to order at 6:03 p.m. and there were no changes made to the agenda.	
<b>Agenda Item 2: Public Participation</b>	<b>[6:03 p.m., Audio 0:28 sec]</b>
None.	
<b>Agenda Item 3: Consent Agenda</b>	
<b>3A.: Approval of Dec. 4, 2013 special meeting minutes</b>	<b>[6:00 p.m., Audio 0:33 sec]</b>
Motion to approve the Dec. 4 meeting minutes as amended, presented by Sutter and seconded by Landry. Vote: 5-0, motion passes.	
<b>Agenda Item 4: Commission Priority Discussion and Input</b>	
<b>4A.: Main Library Renovation Project Update</b>	<b>[6:04 p.m., Audio 1:08 min]</b>
Magee presented the information listed below; the project budget summary can be found online in the January meeting handouts at: <a href="http://boulderlibrary.org/pdfs/commission/2014/handouts/14JanMeetingHandouts.pdf">http://boulderlibrary.org/pdfs/commission/2014/handouts/14JanMeetingHandouts.pdf</a>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Construction and vendor contract awards</li> <li>• Alternate selection process</li> <li>• Project funding strategy- According to the Project Cost Summary, the additional funds needed to accept all of the alternate items for the project is \$276,335. This number includes all of the 'vision' items for the project. It does not include the equipment for the teen technology lab (an additional \$10,000), as this was not in the original scope of the project. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Staff believes that the library fund balance can cover the costs of the additional funds needed for the scope of the project. Commissioner Landry asked if the healthy library fund balance meant that we could consider restoring library hours. Miles responded that the funds were one-time windfalls and not for continuing operations.</li> <li>○ It was recommended that the library pursue a 'seed money' request to the Boulder Library Foundation (BLF) for the funding of the teen technology lab as it is directly related to teen programming. Commission had consensus in agreement with staff's recommendation.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	

- Commission liked the idea of being able to recognize the BLF, if they do agree to fund the technology lab, with a plaque of some kind or similar acknowledgement, which can also serve to educate the public about the BLF and their purpose.

**Commission discussion, questions and comments included:**

- Better signage is important in the library and a statement was made in favor of the \$10,000 budgeted for this item.
- Are the flood improvements going to continue to be integrated with the renovation project? Yes; this is part of the 2014 Capital Improvement Project and, depending on the phasing of the renovation project, the flood improvements will most likely start in the fall. It was suggested that this be done along with the renovation project in order to avoid the library closing for this after the renovation is complete.
- Preliminary ideas for marking the start of project construction  
More information can be found in the Main Library Renovation Update Memo in the January packet found online at: [http://boulderlibrary.org/pdfs/commission/2014/packet/JanLCPacket\\_Combined.pdf](http://boulderlibrary.org/pdfs/commission/2014/packet/JanLCPacket_Combined.pdf)

**Commission discussion, questions and comments included:**

- Staff suggested tying the scheduling of this event along with children’s storytime. Commission was in favor of this idea.
- A suggestion was made to possibly include library-related quotes or important renovation-related dates on the confetti that is released from the confetti cannon.
- Another suggestion was made to invite all of BLF and to invite anyone that has specifically emailed regarding the renovation project.
- Automated Materials Handling (AMH) system replacement and RFID system project update- Schumm will be present at the February meeting and can provide more information about this project. The estimated timeline for the go-live of the new AMH is the end of May.
- Café vendor request for proposal document development- A question was raised about how other libraries handle the cost that the vendor must pay in order to have their café within the library. Staff agreed to follow up.
- Public art selection update- Information on the public art was presented and can be found online in the January meeting handouts at: <http://boulderlibrary.org/pdfs/commission/2014/handouts/14JanMeetingHandouts.pdf>  
The four art semifinalists will present their proposals to the art selection panel at the end of February and a finalist will be selected. This information will be shared at the March commission meeting and announced to the public.
- Design Advisory Group meeting summary

**Agenda Item 5: Matters from the Commission**

**5A: Annual review of orientation handbook (table of contents) [7:02 p.m., Audio 59 min]**

**Commission discussion, questions and comments included:**

- Commission requested a title change regarding Alex H. Warner to ‘Information related to the annual Warner Trust’.
- Commission suggested including a section in the table of contents about the Boulder Library Foundation.
- Commission requested an addition to Colorado Library Law, Title 24, under the legal background section.
- Suggestion to review the Library Commission by-laws during the next few months, at a retreat or at a meeting.

**5B.: Commission update (from memo) [7:07 p.m., Audio 1:04 hr]**

- Reminder: Feb. 13 is the deadline for applicants to city advisory boards and commissions, including Library Commission. There was a question about whether we have advertised this opening in the library. The response was that the best way to advertise this is in the library e-newsletter. (Please note: This was done in the Jan. 22 edition and will be done again in the Feb. 5 edition.)
- 2014 annual letter to the City Council- priorities to inform goal setting- This was included in the packet just as a reference.

**Agenda Item 6: Matters from the Department**

[7:09 p.m., 1:06 hr]

**Introduction-** Hillary Dodge, Meadows Branch manager, was introduced to the Library Commission and provided some information about her background and professional interests.

**6A.: Update on library and arts director search**

[7:11 p.m., Audio

1:09hr]

- Select two library commissioners to serve on interview panel- Commissioners O'Brien and Sutter were designated as the Library Commission representatives to serve on an interview panel for the director position.
- Discuss interview question topics- Commission discussed themes and determined priorities for the most important topics to include in the director interviews.

**6B. : Library Update (from memo)**

[7:31 p.m., Audio 1:29 hr]

- NoBo Corner Library Update- Commission suggested not having the grand opening during the week of March 22 which is spring break for Boulder Valley public schools. Commission complimented the NoBo Corner Library Open House event on Dec. 6 and mentioned how pleased they were at the attendance of two City Council members at the event.
- Results of Boulder Library Foundation (BLF) program funding requests- This information about the four approved grants that the BLF are funding were included in today's e-newsletter.
- Information update: new electronic music and movie resource- A question was asked about whether the library is moving to streaming as opposed to downloading. A question was asked about the measurement goals for Hoopla (the new resource.) Staff will research this.
- Carnegie Daily Camera archive project update
- Maria Rogers Oral History Project website update
- Oral histories being collected from September flood victims- A compliment was given about this article in the Daily Camera.

**Agenda Item 8: Future Items/Scheduling**

[7:37 p.m., Audio 1:35 hrs]

- Main Library Renovation Project: Renovation update- furnishings and placement, furniture bid alternate acceptance, graphics package update
- Policy review: Co-sponsorship of library programs
- Update on operations: eServices division
- Library and arts director search update
- Funding goal review
- Commission by-laws (if not covered at the Library Commission retreat)

**Agenda Item 9: Adjournment**

[7:40 p.m., Audio 1:38 hrs]

There being no further business to come before the board at this time, the meeting was adjourned at 7:40 p.m.

**Date, Time, and Location of Next Meeting:**

The next Library Commission meeting will be held at 6 p.m. on Wed., Feb. 5, 2014 in the North Meeting Room at the Main Library, 1001 Arapahoe Ave.

APPROVED BY:

ATTESTED:

\_\_\_\_\_  
Board Chair

\_\_\_\_\_  
Staff Secretary

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

An audio recording of the full meeting for which these minutes are a summary, is available on the Library Commission web page at <http://boulderlibrary.org/about/commission.html>

Please note: Commissioner Sawyer approved these minutes on February 19, 2014; and Leanne Slater attested to this approval on February 19, 2014.



CITY OF BOULDER  
Boards and Commissions Minutes

NAME OF COMMISSION: Open Space Board of Trustees			
DATE OF MEETING: January 29, 2014			
NAME/EXTENSION OF PERSON PREPARING SUMMARY: Leah Case x2025			
NAMES OF MEMBERS, STAFF AND INVITED GUESTS PRESENT:			
MEMBERS: Allyn Feinberg, Tom Isaacson, Shelley Dunbar, Frances Hartogh, Molly Davis			
STAFF: Mike Patton    Jim Reeder    Dean Paschall    Mark Gershman    Mike Orosel    Dave Kuntz Todd Doherty    Don D'Amico    Leah Case       Michele Gonzales    Alyssa Frideres			
GUESTS: Clay Douglas, Jim Snow, Catherine Gates			
TYPE OF MEETING:	<b><u>REGULAR</u></b>	CONTINUATION	SPECIAL
SUMMATION:			
AGENDA ITEM 1- <b>Approval of the Minutes</b>			
Tom Isaacson moved to approve the minutes from December 11, 2013 as amended. Frances Hartogh seconded. This motion passed unanimously.			
Tom Isaacson moved to approve the minutes from December 18, 2013 as amended. Shelley Dunbar seconded. This motion passed unanimously.			
AGENDA ITEM 2- <b>Public Participation</b>			
Ray Bridge, FOBOS, said he commends the department for their efforts after the flood. He would like for the North TSA process to be more diligent in regard to planning then what has been done in the past. Also, make sure focus for conversation surrounding the overarching issues and carrying capacity be kept on whether the system is being loved to death.			
AGENDA ITEM 3- <b>Director's Updates</b>			
Dean Paschall, Communication and Public Process Manager, gave the Board an update on Chautauqua and the proposed locations for ADA bathrooms.			
Dave Kuntz gave an update on the 2014 work plan. This presentation is saved in S:OSMP\Admin\OSBT\Minutes\Minutes 2014.			

**AGENDA ITEM 4- Matters from the Board**

Tom Isaacson wanted to note that Mark Hesse has passed away. He said he wanted that to be captured on the record. Mike said Mark has worked with staff on a variety of projects and was a mountain expert. He helped to design and led several volunteer projects and trail reroutes. He dedicated his life to sustainable recreation. He had a passion for a sport and doing it in the right way. The community is losing something in not having Mark here.

The Board decided to move the date of their next meeting to Feb 19<sup>th</sup>.

**AGENDA ITEM 5 – Consideration of a motion to approve disposal of 6,883 square feet or approximately 0.16 acres of Community Hospital Open Space land described as a permanent easement to Silver Lake Ditch and Reservoir Company to allow the relocation and piping of a portion of the Silver Lake Ditch and consideration of a motion to grant Silver Lake Ditch and Reservoir Company a nonexclusive license to do this work pending completion of the disposal. This is a disposal of Open Space land under City Charter Section 177 and grant of a nonexclusive license under Charter Section 175. \***

Todd Doherty, Water Resources Administrator, gave a presentation to the Board regarding significant amounts of sediment which filled a portion of the Silver Lake Ditch located on Open Space and Mountain Parks (OSMP) Community Hospital property making the ditch inoperable. During reconstruction, the Silver Lake Ditch and Reservoir Company (the company) seeks to pipe and bury a portion of the ditch to allow for a more efficient flow of water. This presentation is saved in S:OSMP\Admin\OSBT\Minutes\Minutes 2014.

This item spurred two motions:

**Tom Isaacson moved the Open Space Board of Trustees approve and recommend that City Council pass a motion approving the disposal of 6,883 square feet or approximately 0.16 acres of Community Hospital Open Space land described as a permanent easement to Silver Lake Ditch and Reservoir Company for the relocation and piping of a short portion of its ditch. Shelley Dunbar seconded. This motion passed unanimously.**

**Tom Isaacson moved the Open Space Board of Trustees recommend that Open Space and Mountain Parks grant a nonexclusive license to Silver Lake Ditch and Reservoir Company to allow it to move the ditch and install the pipeline pending completion of the disposal. This license would terminate upon completion of the disposal. Frances Hartogh seconded. This motion passed unanimously.**

ADJOURNMENT: The meeting adjourned at 8:30 p.m.

ATTACH BRIEF DETAILS OF ANY PUBLIC COMMENTS:

None.

TIME AND LOCATION OF ANY FUTURE MEETINGS, COMMITTEES OR SPECIAL HEARINGS:

The next OSBT meeting will be at 66 S. Cherryvale Rd. Feb. 19, 2014 at 6:00 p.m.



CITY OF BOULDER  
Boards and Commissions Minutes

NAME OF COMMISSION: Open Space Board of Trustees			
DATE OF MEETING: February 19, 2014			
NAME/EXTENSION OF PERSON PREPARING SUMMARY: Leah Case x2025			
NAMES OF MEMBERS, STAFF AND INVITED GUESTS PRESENT:			
MEMBERS: Allyn Feinberg, Tom Isaacson, Frances Hartogh, Molly Davis			
STAFF: Mike Patton    Jim Reeder    Dean Paschall    Mark Gershman    Chris Wanner    Mike Steinbeiss Dave Kuntz    Don D'Amico    Mike Orosel    Phil Yates    Leah Case    Michele Gonzales Alyssa Frideres			
TYPE OF MEETING:	<u>REGULAR</u>	CONTINUATION	SPECIAL
SUMMATION:			
<b>AGENDA ITEM 1- Approval of the Minutes</b> Tom Isaacson moved to approve the minutes from Jan. 29, 2014 as amended. Frances Hartogh seconded. This motion passed unanimously.			
<b>AGENDA ITEM 2- Public Participation</b> Nancy Egbert, Boulder, spoke to the Board about the Voice and Sight Tag Program. She said this program is wonderful but should only be for those can adhere to the regulations. She also recommended that the department put up more educational signs pertaining to this program throughout the system.  Mike Barrow, Boulder Mountain Bike Alliance (BMA), updated the Board on the new BMA "SmartTrail" application for smart phones. He said in regard to the 2014 work plan, the department should make sure cattle grades keep getting put in and look at the option for using road base in heavy use areas. He looks forward to BMA and OSMP working together on future trail projects.  Karen Hollweg, Boulder, said the concept of sustainability needs to keep focus on the whole system and not just with regional trails.			
<b>AGENDA ITEM 3- Director's Updates</b> Chris Wanner gave an update on the 2013 Forest Management Summary Report. This presentation is saved in S:OSMP\Admin\OSBT\Minutes\Minutes 2014\February.			

Dave Kuntz gave a presentation on the 2014 Work Plan Update. This presentation is saved in S:OSMP\Admin\OSBT\Minutes\Minutes 2014\February.

**AGENDA ITEM 4- Matters from the Board**

Molly Davis provided a few suggestions for possible contractors that OSMP could use.

ADJOURNMENT: The meeting adjourned at 8:15 p.m.

**ATTACH BRIEF DETAILS OF ANY PUBLIC COMMENTS:**

None.

**TIME AND LOCATION OF ANY FUTURE MEETINGS, COMMITTEES OR SPECIAL HEARINGS:**

The next OSBT meeting will be at the Council Chambers, 1777 Broadway Mar. 12, 2014 at 6:00 p.m.

**CITY OF BOULDER  
BOULDER, COLORADO  
BOARDS AND COMMISSIONS MEETING  
MINUTES**

<b>Name of Board/ Commission:</b> Transportation Advisory Board	
<b>Date of Meeting:</b> 9 December 2013	
<b>Contact Information Preparing Summary:</b> Laurel Olsen-Horen 303.441.3203	
<b>Board Members Present:</b> Andria Bilich, Matt Moseley, Dom Nozzi, Jessica Yates, Zane Selvans, <b>Board Members Absent:</b> None	
<b>Staff Present:</b> Tracy Winfree, Director of Public Works for Transportation Kathleen Bracke, GO Boulder Manager Tim Plass, City Council Member Bill Cowern, Transportation Engineer Randall Rutsch, Senior Transportation Planner Marni Ratzel, Senior Transportation Planner Cris Jones, Transportation Planner Micki Kaplan, Transportation Planner Laurel Olsen-Horen, Board Secretary	
<b>Consultants</b>	
<b>Present:</b> Tom Brennan; Nelson Nygaard	
<b>Type of Meeting:</b> Advisory/ Regular	
<b>Agenda Item 1: Call to Order</b>	<b>[6:00 p.m.]</b>
The meeting was called to order at 6:00 p.m.	
<b>Agenda Item 2: Approval of minutes from 14 November 2013</b>	<b>[6:00p.m.]</b>
<b>Motion to approve the 14 November meeting minutes as presented by: Nozzi; seconded: Bilich</b>	
<b>Vote: 5-0 Motion Passes</b>	
<b>Agenda Item 3: Public Participation</b>	<b>[6:02 p.m.]</b>
None	
<b>Agenda Item 4: City Council Boards and Commission Report</b>	<b>[6:03 p.m.]</b>
Council member Tim Plass presented item to the board.	
<b>Board discussion and comments included:</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What are other communities doing to recruit board members?</li> <li>• Appreciate council's focus on recruiting for boards and commissions. Perhaps using the comments section in local papers would help bring varying personalities out of the woodwork.</li> <li>• Broadening recruitment is definitely important city-wide.</li> <li>• Five-year commitment can be a deterrent for potential applicants.</li> <li>• Strong agreement with group dynamic focus in regards to making boards and commissions successful.</li> <li>• Potential conflicts of interest should be looked at carefully, especially with individuals whom have certain backgrounds which could offer expertise on specific boards and commissions. General interests should not be misconstrued as a true conflict of interest when it comes to the actions and requests of the boards and commissions. Be careful to work within the parameters of the city's policies while also not being prematurely dismissive of an applicant's possible conflicts.</li> <li>• Building a rapport between council members and applicants prior to the appointment of new members may be beneficial.</li> <li>• An expectation, once an applicant is appointed, that clarification of what their role is (especially in terms of being a functioning part of the board and not confusing the appointment with staff roles and responsibilities) will occur.</li> <li>• Specific examples and scenarios on group dynamics should be presented either as part of the written application or the interview process.</li> <li>• Some applicants come to the application process with a specific personal agenda and consequently representation of the community may be lost. Once on a board, members must balance listening to the community, direction from council and comments of staff when having discussions and making decisions</li> </ul>	

or recommendations. Important for Council to be aware of the ability to listen to fellow board members and the community when selecting new board members.

- During the application process, a list of council and staff contacts for each board if an applicant has any questions may be helpful.

**Agenda Item 5: Staff briefing and TAB input regarding the TMP Update progress, with an emphasis on the “Complete Streets” Focus Area including: transit planning scenarios and evaluation framework; and status update regarding bike/walk innovations [6:37 p.m.]**

GO Boulder staff presented item to the board  
Power point given for this item.

**Executive Summary from Packet Materials:**

The primary purpose of this memo is to provide a status report, check-in and opportunity for the Transportation Advisory Board (TAB) to provide input on progress to date on the Transportation Master Plan (TMP) Update, with an emphasis on the Complete Streets Focus area. The Dec. 9 TAB meeting will include brief updates on all the TMP focus areas and feature a more in-depth discussion of the transit planning and bicycle and pedestrian innovations. In January 2014, staff will provide an update to TAB that features the other TMP Update Focus Areas including Funding, Transportation Demand Management, and Regional in more detail. The goal is to provide multiple opportunities for in-depth input from TAB for all areas of the TMP Update in advance of the City Council study session geared toward February/March 2014.

Staff will continue to move forward with the TMP Update process into 2014 in accordance with City Council and TAB guidance. Upcoming topics will include the results of the modeling of the transit scenarios, regional updates, the TDM toolkit and the TMP investment program. Staff will continue to incorporate TAB comments and community input throughout the update process. In addition, staff is actively working on a number of other efforts as part of the city’s Sustainability Initiatives.

**Board discussion and comments included:**

**[6:57 p.m.]**

- What is the most likely of the transit scenarios? Funding for the TMP improvements – there are options of funding levels for different services; where is that funding coming from? Staff response: three financial plans will be created – fiscally constrained, action and vision. The transit scenarios will help test the best bang-for-buck result to select the preferred transit plan.
- What is the general feedback from the public to date? Staff response: Real-time transit information is ranking high on public desire. Enhanced bicycle capacity on transit also is ranking high. Generally like the ideas that are coming forward which are based on community input.
- Looking at the efficiency metrics and how those metrics change with different land use. Explanation on how the two are tied together (scenario examples) may help the community better understand some of the options on the table.
- Invert the thinking for transportation needs in terms of land use. Would like to see a community member have the ability to walk two blocks to a get to a bus stop for a bus that comes every five minutes. What do we have to do from a land use perspective to make that happen? How do we make transportation solutions drive land use more rather than the other way around?
- The importance of outreach to communities outside of Boulder city limits. Regional connections and viewpoints are important. Staff response: Boulder County, BVSD, CU, RTD and other partners are on the committee, plus staff is coordinating with the Northwest Area Mobility Study.
- How are trip patterns created? Does it fall under “if we build it, they will come?” or is it rather going to where people already are?
- Take into consideration the potential safety implications for protected bike lines by on-street parking by left turning commuters.
- The use of high and low stress street designation is a great idea.
- Mitigating speed through street design should be considered.
- Reduction of free parking throughout the city could increase the use of alt modes of transit.
- Looking at land use scenarios is important.
- The document needs to be less academic and more readable for a lay audience.
- How much of the transit scenarios are dependent on RTD? Staff wanted to do the analysis first without creating too much bias to what various providers can offer. How do we manage our expectations without setting ourselves up for failure?
- Boulder shouldn’t lower its aspirations for what is feasible. Anything is possible with time.

**A.) Matters from the Board Included:**

Board member Yates brought up the below matter(s):

- Updates on collaboration with other city boards – anything to report? Some contact has been made. TAB will be participating in a joint board workshop next week.
- Council input for their January 2014 retreat:
  - Question One:
    - Community-wide Eco pass
    - TMP
    - AMPS
  - Question Two:
    - Fundamental relationships within city policy are not always obvious to the public. Making it very clear to everyone could be useful. Integrating land use policy with transportation policy is key. More transparent linkage between the two policies and how they can work better together. (examples for other peer cities) Perhaps the use of a study session.
  - Question Three:
    - Good with what was presented in draft document.
- Moving forward with the Legislative Agenda: Had a conversation with Tracy and the city’s policy advisor, Carl Castillo and learned a lot about how policies vs. the legislative agenda flow.
  - TAB needs to be careful to not be the city’s lobbyist for legislation.
  - Best approach is to identify possible legislative issues as TAB advances policy recommendations to the city council, rather than suggesting additional items for the legislative agenda that are not yet reflected in current City policy.

Board member Nozzi brought up the below matter(s):

- Is the city using designated areas that are walkable and drivable to better calibrate our regulations and policies? If we knew what places it makes sense to use different tactics, it would be helpful.

**B.) Matters from staff included:**

- **Flood update:**
  - Council received a flood update last week. The streets which received repairs from the bond initiative fared very well during the event. Other investments, like Greenways, served their purpose during the flood.
  - Pocket areas outside the city are interested in annexation. Many of these areas are on well or septic and have not received much street maintenance from the county over the years, thus it may create an on-going liability for the city. These costs need to be included in annexation negotiations.
  - Reevaluate the CIP with the Greenways division on areas of interest throughout the community.
  - Our operating reserve will be completely spent. FEMA and AHWA reimbursements will help to replenish the reserve.
- **Regional Studies Update:**
  - Council received folders from CDOT on the upcoming US36 Project (folders passed out to board members)
  - MPACT64 is still possible for Nov 2014. Polling is underway and it is unclear if the Governor will take a position.
  - RTD will be using BRT vehicles provided by their current contractor rather than going out for a RFP. There is a push from the Mayors and Commissioners to use continue the original commitment for an RFP and use the current rider survey results to help inform the RFP.
- **Project Updates/Closure (i.e. progress, Council action, “after” studies):**
  - 63<sup>rd</sup> Street Bridge replacement (bond item) is proceeding.
  - Arapahoe Ave. 15<sup>th</sup> St. to Folsom will be completed fall of 2014.
  - Boulder Junction – the bridge over Goose Creek construction has begun, private developments are underway and south side of Pearl continues.
- **Other matters:**

**Agenda Item 7: Future Schedule Discussion:**

Joint Board Meeting on Sustainable Streets and Centers and East Arapahoe on Dec. 19<sup>th</sup>.

Next meeting will be January 13<sup>th</sup> with a focus on Travel Demand Management in the 1777 West Conference Room.

Tentative February 25<sup>th</sup> Study Session on the TMP Update

**Agenda Item 8: Adjournment**

**[8:26 p.m.]**

There being no further business to come before the board at this time, by motion regularly adopted, the meeting was adjourned at 8:26 p.m.

**Motion:** moved to adjourn; Moseley, seconded by: Yates

**Motion passes 5:0**

**Date, Time, and Location of Next Meeting:**

The next meeting will be a regular meeting on Monday, 13 January 2014 in the 1777 West Conference Room, 1<sup>st</sup> floor of the Municipal Building, at 6 p.m.; unless otherwise decided by staff and the Board.

APPROVED BY:

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Board Chair

2/10/14  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

ATTESTED:

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Board Secretary

10 Feb. 2014  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

---

An audio recording of the full meeting for which these minutes are a summary, is available on the Transportation Advisory Board web page.

**CITY OF BOULDER, COLORADO  
BOARDS AND COMMISSIONS MEETING MINUTES**

<b>Name of Board / Commission:</b> Water Resources Advisory Board	
<b>Date of Meeting:</b> 18 November 2013	
<b>Contact Information of Person Preparing Minutes:</b> Laurel Olsen-Horen 303.441.3203	
<b>Board Members Present:</b> Chuck Howe, Vicki Scharnhorst, Mark Squillace, Ed Clancy <b>Board Members Absent:</b> Dan Johnson	
<b>Staff Present:</b> Jeff Arthur, Director of Public Works for Utilities Bob Harberg, Principal Engineer – Utilities Bret Linenfelder, Water Quality and Environmental Services Manager Douglas Sullivan, Engineering Project Manager Pieter Beyer, Civil Engineer II Ken Baird, Budget Financial Analyst Michelle Wind, Drinking Water Program Supervisor Mike Leone, Water Quality Inspector Laurel Olsen-Horen, Board Secretary	
<b>Meeting Type:</b> Regular	
<b>Agenda Item 1 – Call to Order</b>	<b>[7:02 p.m.]</b>
<b>Agenda Item 2 – Approval of the 21 October Meeting Minutes:</b> <span style="float: right;"><b>[7:03 p.m.]</b></span> Motion postponed until the arrival of board member Johnson. <b>Motion to approve the 21 October meeting minutes as presented: Squillace; Seconded by: Scharnhorst</b> <b>Motion Passes; 3:0 – board member Howe abstained</b>	
<b>Agenda Item 3 – Public Participation and Comment</b>	<b>[7:01 p.m.]</b>
<b>Public Comment:</b> <b>Roger Koenig:</b> Resides along Gregory Creek. Mr. Koenig presented a Power Point Presentation to the board. The 2013 flood exceeded FEMA’s 500-year boundaries. There was a massive amount of damage to residences along Gregory Creek. Mr. Koenig is seeking WRAB to assist with the maintenance of Gregory Creek. If the creek had been properly maintained prior to the flood event, damage to current structures would not have been so catastrophic. <b>Dennis Kennedy:</b> The undersized culvert in the trench along Pennsylvania St. caused much of the damage near Mr. Kennedy’s property. Taking out the old culvert and leaving it as a creek bed, cleaning it up a bit and not leaving Pennsylvania as two dead end streets would be cheap options for the city to help residents during future events. <b>Scott Hoffenberg:</b> Mr. Hoffenberg brought a map from 2010 Gregory Creek Floodplain Study which was used for the LOMR. The new 500-year flood zone boundaries were not representative of where the water went down 7 <sup>th</sup> St. The water went beyond the extents of the 500-year flood zone. Two of the major failures (Willowbrook and 7 <sup>th</sup> Street) had trash racks on them. There is no consistency in the size of the culverts as water flows downstream. The originally planned 4’ x 8’ culvert would likely have worked well had it been installed. <b>Stewart Machle:</b> Mr. Machle’s largest concern is that over the years, no city official has actually walked the creek to see what maintenance is needed. Over the years, residents have been told that they need to maintain the culverts, the city will hire a private company to do it and the residents would need to pay for it. The culvert overflowed due the trash racks being placed at a 45 degree angle. Debris and child safety are the biggest concern especially near Flatirons Elementary. Being proactive would be a good thing <b>George Shopp:</b> Please maintain the system. The culvert under Willowbrook was clogged before the event. Maintenance for both the culverts and the creek is vital. The Gregory Creek meeting residents were told culverts are the property owner’s responsibility to maintain. If that is the case, then residents need to be told that before events happen. <b>Rebecca Roser:</b> 7 <sup>th</sup> Street was a raging river for days post the flood event. Anderson ditch is still filled with silt to this day. Ms. Roser’s concern is for the safety of the children that attend Flatirons Elementary. Also, the flashing lights sometimes go off at night and the city needs to fix the flashing lights to keep people from falling into the hole in front of her property. Remediation of Gregory Creek is a serious issue. The culvert that runs under 7 <sup>th</sup> St to a smaller diameter culvert is a serious issue. This really needs attention from the city.	

**Jack Jewell:** Mr. Jewell's property is next to Gregory Creek. Mr. Jewell provided a detailed map of his property with marked points of where the water was on his property during the event. The Willowbrook culvert was blocked and didn't function at all during the event. That culvert isn't even the lowest point of the creek. City officials need to look at the flows (from his map) and where the water tends to flow, and any plans to take his notes into account. – Mr. Jewell's map was scanned and shared with appropriate staff.

**Richard Macintosh:** Mr. Macintosh has spoken with a number of hydrologists and they were pleased with how accurate the estimated flows were. However, the debris was not taken into account on the flood maps. You cannot ignore debris when taking into account what will happen with water flows during an event like this one.

**Ed Von Blacher:** Mr. Von Blacher has resided in his home for 20 years, and does not have flood insurance as he was not in the current floodplain. He sustained over 1,000+ ft<sup>2</sup> of damage to his basement. The sediment created a dam between University and Pleasant which caused the water to flow into Mr. Von Blacher's property. Mr. Von Blacher is facing around \$20,000 worth of damage restoration and only received \$1,250 from FEMA. What resources are available not only to replace what was there, but to improve? A clear picture of funding sources, and who they are would be helpful. A clarification of WRAB's role would be helpful.

**Jose Jimenez:** The city could do a lot in coordination and facilitation of information. Mr. Jimenez started working with engineers prior to the event to address issues with the creek next to his property, and struggled with the city's processes on permitting etc. The city's process is very difficult to understand.

**Al:** There are two issues that could be addressed. 1.) The sizes of the culverts are not sized large enough and filled with debris. 2.) There are varying sizes of culverts along the creek which tends to divert water onto the streets. Once the water gets out of the creek, all bets are off as to where the water goes. The culverts need to be rebuilt and sized properly. The retaining wall which was built after the flood of '69 was completely blown out in this event. The retaining wall needs to be built to reasonable standards, or at least better than they were built in 1969. Rebuilding the retaining walls to previous conditions does not make sense as those walls will not perform during this type of event. Mr. – would like to be given permission to make the retaining wall on his property stronger.

**L Neimith:** Mr. Neimith only found out about this meeting last night which does not allow for adequate time to prepare. The main issue was the culverts were blown out. Around five years ago the city had a meeting at the Senior Center. At that time, Mr. Neimith brought to attention the size of the downstream culverts being too small. The city told residents that there were no such smaller culverts downstream.

Staff responded to some of the comments made during public comment.

**Continued Public Comment:**

**Julie:** It would be helpful to know as the plan is developed for the flow of Gregory Creek, what is the city's plan? Knowing that would be helpful to the residents as they work on remediation.

**Agenda Item 4 – Information Item – Backflow Prevention Program Update [8:39 p.m.]**

Mike Leone presented the item to the board.

**Executive Summary from the Packet Materials:**

As part of compliance with drinking water regulations, the City of Boulder (city) implements a program for cross-connection control, also known as backflow prevention, to prevent contamination to the city's water distribution system. The Backflow Prevention Program includes tracking the installation and testing of cross-connection control devices (also known as backflow prevention assemblies) on customer water service lines to protect the city's system from back pressure and back siphon events, as well as performing education and outreach and field inspections and investigations. In Boulder, backflow prevention assemblies are required on commercial facilities, fire lines, dedicated metered irrigation lines, but not residential households unless they have dedicated irrigation systems.

The city's Backflow Prevention Program has been in place for many years, but in the past five years, staff has made significant changes in the program. This agenda item is intended to provide WRAB with an overview of the backflow prevention program. Staff is not requesting any formal action by the WRAB.

**WRAB Discussion Included:**

As this was an informational item, no action was requested of the board. The board asked some clarifying questions to better understand the materials and presentation.

**Agenda Item 5 – Information Item – Background on Wastewater Collection, Comprehensive Flood and Stormwater Master Plans [9:18 p.m.]**

Bob Harberg and Douglas Sullivan presented item to the board.

**Executive Summary from the Packet Materials:**

This information item presents background information concerning the Comprehensive Flood and Stormwater, the Stormwater and the Wastewater Utility Master Plans. These master plans provide an analysis of the utility infrastructure and improvements needs. The identified needs and their relative importance are the primary basis for prioritizing projects identified in the 6-year Capital Improvement Program (CIP). It is important that WRAB members have an understanding of the analysis approach and master plan recommended project priorities. WRAB has a key role in reviewing staff recommendations and making recommendations to City Council on master plans as well as the annual 6-year CIP budget process.

The flood disaster will likely influence the previously identified master plan based project priorities. Consideration of additional improvements to utility infrastructure designed to mitigate future damages may be warranted.

Maps depicting the location of recommended master plan based improvements, along with the location of flood damages will be available at the meeting for review and discussion.

Staff will be investigating the cause of various damages and reviewing the recommendations of these master plans in preparation for the 2015 budget process. Recommendations will be made regarding any revisions to the previously approved master plan based project priorities along with financing options.

**WRAB Discussion Included:**

- The city’s decision to keep maintenance of culverts on a two-year cycle, and is that the best practice?
- The city’s practice for communication with private land owners on the importance of maintaining culverts on their land.
- The city’s use of Inquire Boulder and its ability to assist with addressing community concerns with blocked culverts.
- The city’s ability to bring the stormwater system back up to standard prior to the spring run-off season.
- A concern was raised regarding the importance for the city to prioritize a maintenance schedule for the conveyance of waste water to the 75<sup>th</sup> WWTF in order to mitigate sewer backups in private residences.

**Agenda Item 6 – Board and Commission Report**

[8:00 p.m.]

Council member Plass presented item to the board.

This item was moved up on the agenda to accommodate Councilmember Plass.

**Executive Summary from the Packet Materials:**

No executive summary given.

**WRAB Discussion Included:**

The board gave suggestions to Councilmember Plass including:

- Cross-board communications and increasing relationships with other board members.
- Board likes getting rid of the city resident requirement to be appointed to a board.
- Develop a poster to be placed around the city indicating when each board meets and possibly use it as a recruitment tool to attract more people to the boards and commissions.
- Having a clear mission/direction on how to be a useful, helpful and impactful board for staff and council.
- Knowing staff’s “view of the world” would be helpful, as it may differ from what the board thinks is important.

**Agenda Item 7 – Matters**

[9:57 p.m.]

**From the Board:**

Board member Scharnhorst brought up the below matter(s):

- The GAC went on a bike tour of the Greenways system post flood event. The Greenways system really functioned well in the areas where improvements had been made.

Board member Howe brought up the below matter(s):

- Last Friday there was a meeting at the Library between the City, the University and NCAR on the

flood event. This partnership will result in a more effective way of moving forward.

**From Staff:**

**[10:03 p.m.]**

None

**Agenda Item 8 – Discussion on Future Schedule**

**[10:03 p.m.]**

- The need to tailor the agenda and locations of future WRAB meetings to handle the large public interest in post-flood comments.
- The increased pressure from the community to facilitate system upgrades and how it will impact the WRAB's decision on the CIP for 2015.
- December's meeting will have a large portion of time set aside for how to move forward with the flood recovery discussions.

**Agenda Item 9 – Adjournment**

**[10:25 p.m.]**

There being no further business to come before the Board at this time, by motion regularly adopted, the meeting was adjourned at 10:25 p.m.

**Motion to adjourn by: Squillace; Seconded by: Scharnhorst**

**Motion Passes 4:0**

**Date, Time, and Location of Next Meeting:**

The next WRAB meeting will be Monday, 16 December 2013 at 7:00 p.m., in the West Conference Room, 1<sup>st</sup> floor of the municipal building, 1777 Broadway unless directed by staff or the board.

APPROVED BY:

Board Chair

Date

ATTESTED BY:

Board Secretary

Date

---

An audio recording of the full meeting for which these minutes are a summary, is available on the Water Resources Advisory Board web page.