



Gregory Canyon Creek Mitigation Study Open House and WRAB Meeting October 20, 2014 Summary of Public Comments Received

Purpose of Meeting

The purpose of the October 20, 2014 Open House and Water Resources Advisory Board (WRAB) meeting was to present the preliminary alternatives for the Gregory Canyon Creek Flood Mitigation Study and to receive feedback from the public and board members. City staff and the project consultants are assimilating the comments and suggestions received at these meetings, as well as additional comments received by the public, in order to continue to refine and identify the best alternatives.

Summary of Open House Comments:

- We live in a beautiful city. We are fortunate to live near running water, but everything has a price! I think we should start whatever we end by deciding to do from Boulder creek going south. The culvert on highland school land is 36"! Since Canyon Blvd. is going to be impassable during a Boulder Creek 100 year flood, we need to ensure that Arapahoe is passable. Hence we need to expand the Arapahoe culvert first, and hopefully when we do others. As a stakeholder, I am willing to walk with City staff, grant an easement, be taxed or whatever it takes to finish the project & help the Civic Area designers glam our Gregory Creek is not going to be forgotten.
- How are the alternatives going to be chosen? How will city decide when or how to purchase identified properties in hazard area? How does the city decide how big to make the different box culverts?
- The 31'x6' culvert at Euclid is a major concern to us. This is a major physical intervention that would impact us visually, aesthetically, and in the way we use our property in a significant way.
- I am concerned with the accuracy of the modeling. At no time was the culvert at 6th and Euclid, which is presently ~ 4ft diameter, at capacity in the 50-75 year event of 2013. Water flowed primarily down 6th and Euclid and down from Edward Smith Park. I don't see any attempt at mitigation of the Smith Park overflow.
- To truly utilize a 31' wide culvert at 6th and Euclid one would need to deepen the creek. That would destroy the deer/fox habitat along with removal of significant trees and vegetation. Occasional flooding would be preferred to this kind of destruction.
- BOTTOM LINE: the engineers have addressed lots of issues that I and neighbors have been thinking. Putting in large box culverts will be a big improvement and "buy insurance" against rock/vegetation clogs. Modifying road grades/crowns (eg directing flow down 7th street) is exactly right.
- Good job at making the effort to reach out and educate the neighborhoods. Consider the following financing proposal: There may be home owners who are retired and thus "asset rich" and "income poor". They may be willing to make improvements to their properties, but not be able to afford them from current income. This could be accommodated by a grant to the owner for the improvements and a lien on the property to be paid off when the owner moves or by their estate. This would fit in the philosophy of "public-private partnership".
- All three alternatives seem viable and reasonable. However no particular improvement has increased priority, nor do the recommendations align with the 2001 Belt Collins problem areas. The 2012 mitigation suggestions or the actual observations from Sept. 2013.

Summary of Open House Suggestions:

- The storm drains in front of 833 Marine are old, and are inadequate for the kind of debris that cover them up. We've been cleaning up the drains for 60 years because they are too small.
- It appears that the SECOND culvert under Euclid Ave, about 30'-40' to the west of the proposed 31'x6' culvert has been overlooked in the study. It likely should be considered as part of any flood mitigation- maybe two smaller culverts?
- What about the 100 year trees that border the creek? What care would the city take to maintain their health?
- A) The city should be aware that a high flow event down 7th street (Univ. - Arapahoe) will destroy the paving and curbs. This is not against doing the redirection, just a heads up on future repairs.
B) As a property owner, I have invested in flood mitigation measures. The ones I did prior to 2013 worked well. I believe that this is a "private" or "public project" not just a city project.
- 1.) Strongly suggest purchasing the property in the high hazard at 1655 9th street. There are 2 houses, one of which is 2ft from the creek channel and should be the highest priority.
2.) The culvert enlargements should be considered at the same time as the up-and downstream channel enlargement.
- I liked the Pennsylvania roadway removal plan that was considered.

Summary of WRAB Meeting Comments:

- Lives near Flatirons Elementary School, really appreciates where city is going with their plan and agrees that conveying a 100 year flood out of the question. Read study in its entirety. Alternatives proposed do not necessarily match what actually happened on the ground during the flood. Problematic area during this event that may not adequately be addressed at 7th. Does not have a strong feeling on option three in the roadway. Feels that spending money to make the roads convey without hurting property is money well spent. People are open to having flood mitigation done on their properties, but there are possible challenges there. Impressed with how accurately earlier studies match up with what was seen during the flood event. May be able to leverage earlier studies going forward.
- Lives midway on creek and has specific question regarding two maps and noticed there is a chart in attachment A that shows different culverts and what improvements would look like in a 10-year plan or maximum culvert (35x6). The 10 and 50 year maps only show maximum 50-year extent. Comments were heard during open house questioning this finding showing 35 foot culverts on the 10-year map, which isn't actual benchmark for 10-year event. Requests clarification whether the maps reflect 10-year or maximum numbers and asks if maps need updating.
- Wants to thank the board for hearing the neighborhood last year and putting neighborhood's name out there for potential for growth, which shows a lot of thought. Concerns about map showing 35-foot culvert and hopes that Board will take closer look at document from CH2M Hill to address and consider street conveyance. Appreciates Board taking a closer look at this creek and looks forward to the future.
- Didn't have problems like University and 7th. Suggests putting energy into conveyance because Mother Nature is going to decide, not what planners decide. Water went back into Gregory Creek because a car diverted it. This area is packed with cars and not enough parking.
- Lives on College and appreciates looking into this issue. Mentioned culvert at College Avenue, which was filled with fences and BBQ grills that were piled into culvert, forcing water to run over

the creek onto other properties. Suggests looking at this issue and better advising people not to put objects in the creek bed. Mentioned 22-foot wide culvert at Aurora and feels that a 35-foot culvert is too excessive.

- Lives on College, family built house in 1950. At height of flood, banks took all the flood waters, bank to bank and held a 1.5 – 2 feet of water before touching his foundation. Some of the street did have water conveying and he built diversion with 2x4's which diverted water down College, past Flatiron Elementary School. According to charts – what happened on College is being compared to what happened on Pennsylvania, which are not comparable. Stone bridge on his property has weathered 3 major storm events in his lifetime, which is a good model.
- Lives below Anderson Ditch. Asks what kind of incentive programs are being considered for property owners to keep stream beds clean?
- Lives at 7th and Pleasant and thinks that street conveyance is a good idea. With some work on 7th, a lot of the damage could have been avoided. East side was severely damaged. Could make a difference in the future with better street conveyance.