South Boulder Creek Flood Mitigation Project
AD-HOC INFORMATIONAL AND ADVISORY MEETING
May 15, 2018, 10:00 am – 12:30 pm
Boulder Municipal Services Center, Large Conference Room, 5050 Pearl Street
Meeting Summary - DRAFT

Attendance: Karl Anuta, Kurt Bauer, Ben Binder, Don D'Amico, Rod Eisenbraun, Kathie Joyner, Gretchen King, Marki LeCompte, Harlin Savage, Molly Scarbrough, Ruth Wright

Facilitation: Heather Bergman and Dan Myers

ACTION ITEMS

Kurt Bauer and Molly Scarbrough	• Refine results from draft evaluation criteria survey and post to the project website. • Consider suggested changes to the draft evaluation criteria table and presentation: o Add "construction schedule" as a draft evaluation criterion to avoid confusion with other components of "construction complexity." o Change the rating system in the draft evaluation criteria tables ("least," "smallest," "lowest," etc.) so that terminology is consistent across all categories. o Replace check marks and question marks in the "landowner acceptance" rows of the draft evaluation criteria table with either "no change from agreements made within BVCP" or "requires changes to current BVCP land uses," respectively. o In the draft evaluation criteria table, change wording on the four rows beginning with "Change in land required by concept on BVCP land uses (acres)" to indicate that the numbers listed reflect the change in acreage needed for the flood mitigation project in each land type under the BVCP. o Label OSMP land precisely on the maps of BVCP land uses presented at the May 15 meeting. o Reinsert "wetlands" as a portion of "Direct Environmental Impacts" on the more detailed version of the draft evaluation criteria table. o Amend the draft evaluation criteria table so that "restoration potential" reads "restoration potential on BVCP-designated Open Space and Other (OS-O) land." o Color-code both draft evaluation criteria tables in the same way for clarity. o Reword draft evaluation criteria table to indicate that all variations are on the same or similar schedules up until construction.

Note: This is a summary of what occurred at the meeting, not a comprehensive account of everything that was said. Not all members of the group agree with everything that was said at the meeting or that is included in this meeting summary.

	○ Relabel all project maps to read "CO Highway 93" instead of "US Highway 93." ○ Add geographic scale to project maps. • Obtain "polished" numbers on acre-feet of detention capacity from DHI by the end of the week and share it with the group. • Send group summaries of the April 16 Ah-Hoc #2 and April 23 open house meetings for comment. • Send presentation slides to Dan Myers of Peak Facilitation.
Ben Binder	Send slides from today's presentation to Dan Myers of Peak Facilitation.

FEEDBACK FROM OPEN HOUSE

Molly Scarbrough, Senior Project Manager for City of Boulder Public Works, provided an overview of input received at the first community open house, which took place on April 23. Highlights are summarized below.

- Community members who attended the open house had the option of attending one or both of two portions of the meeting. The first portion consisted of presentations from City staff and "differing perspectives" panels with subsequent question and answer sessions. The second portion was an information board-centered open house.
- Some of the Boulder community members who visited the information board-centered open house portion of the meeting were interested in Phases Two and Three of the project. These residents wanted to know when these two phases will take place. It is currently unclear when the City will initiate these phases because of uncertain funding sources.
- In addition to the April 23 open house, community members provided public input via a questionnaire on the draft criteria for project concept evaluation. The questionnaire was available at the open house meeting itself, at Frasier Meadows Retirement Community, and on the project website. The questionnaire allowed residents to rate the importance of draft criteria. The percentage of respondents who considered each criterion "important" or "very important" are listed below:
    - Downstream flood benefits (building, dwelling units, and people no longer in existing 100 or 500-year floodplains): 96%
    - Construction complexity (anticipated amount of time needed to design, permit, and construct the concept): 72%
    - Adaptability (level of difficulty involved in modifying the concept in the future to account for climate change): 64%
    - Direct impacts to federally threatened and endangered species habitat (namely for Preble's Meadow Jumping Mouse and Ute Ladies' Tresses Orchids): 60%
    - Improved riparian connectivity (by removing University of Colorado (CU)'s levee on its CU South parcel): 44%
    - Maintenance/operations (long-term upkeep costs): 35%

    - Dam height, length, and permanent footprint (highest elevation of the dam from existing ground level and other schematic concerns): 29%
    - Project costs (anticipated): 27%
    - **Note from staff: these percentages were calculated based on the percentage of people who responded to each criterion. The percentages have since been updated to reflect the percentage of total questionnaire respondents, to more accurately account for those who did not assign any level of importance to some of the criterion. See final questionnaire results document on the project website: www.southbouldercreek.com.*
- City staff are preparing a summary of the questionnaire results and will post it on the project website soon.
- One of the major themes in the feedback City staff received in both the questionnaire and the open house was concern about the complexity of Master Plan concepts. However, participants expressed support for the concepts as long as they met the baseline criteria established in the CU South Guiding Principles.
- Another comment received at the open house was an interest in addressing potential noise impacts. City staff has not added this as a criterion because they do not have sufficient information on what the noise impacts of the project will be at this stage of conceptual design. However, staff will consider this going forward.
- Residents also expressed concerns about outflows into Dry Creek Ditch #2. The City cannot construct a project that would negatively impact existing floodplains upstream or downstream of a project. One possible solution proposed by City staff is to divert floodwater to Viele Channel and South Boulder Creek via South Boulder Road, bypassing the ditch.
- Feedback from community members at the open house led staff to add a criterion capturing the cost per dwelling unit that would no longer be in the FEMA regulatory floodplain as a result of the project.
- Frasier Meadows residents and members of the South Boulder Creek Action Group (SBCAG) are highly interested in knowing when the City will complete the project.

Clarifying Questions
Group members asked a clarifying question about the April 23 open house presentation. Questions are indicated in italics with responses written below in plain text.

The third question on the questionnaire mentions minimizing the time required to design, permit, and construct. Where is that in the draft evaluation criteria tables? Does "construction complexity" refer to the most or least construction time required?
The term "construction complexity" was used because the schedule will be similar for all three concepts despite the delays unique to each concept, which are complex in different ways. While all projects differ in complexity, the construction completion timing can be dictated and enforced via the construction specification and bidding process. As a result, the City believes there is no difference in scheduling between the concepts. Staff will add "construction schedule" to the draft evaluation criteria.

EVALUATION OF FLOOD MITIGATION CONCEPT VARIATIONS

Kurt Bauer, Engineering Project Manager for the City of Boulder, gave a presentation on each of the three flood mitigation concepts and the different variations within them. Slides from the presentation are included as an attachment to this summary. Highlights are presented below.

- Mapping prepared by City staff and project consultants illustrates the impact of different flood mitigation concept variations on particular future land uses that the Boulder Valley Comprehensive Plan (BVCP) identifies for CU South. The three land use designations are "Open Space and Other (OS-O)," "Parks, Urban, and Other (PK-U/O)," and "Public (PUB)." An examination of these maps indicates the presence of areas of excavation, areas of fill, and maximum limits of ponding for each land use designations under the different flood mitigation concept variations.
- Staff showed the Master Plan 100-year flood variation without the CU levee (although Mr. Bauer noted that the presence or absence of the existing CU levee does not impact the hydraulics of the flood model). Staff then overlaid this map with a map of BVCP land uses that showed that maximum limit of inundation on the three land use designations identified in the BVCP.
- Hydrological analysis indicates that the Master Plan 500-year flood variation without the CU levee would require a larger detention area. Overlaying the map of the Master Plan concept with a map of BVCP land uses under a 500-year flood scenario makes it clear that the detention area would move into the PUB area and encroach into PK-U/O and OS-O areas. Under this variation, many structures would no longer be in the 500-year floodplain. The Master Plan 100-year flood variation with the CU levee in place would result in CU South being accessible by going up and over the dam. The project team would drain the existing pond, and an impermeable barrier would be installed to prevent the pond from being filled with groundwater.
- The Variant One 100-year flood scenario without the CU levee would not influence Viele Channel because it eliminates the siphon. This variation fits well with existing BCVP land uses on CU South. The Variant One 500-year flood variation with the levee would lead to a larger ponding area. This variant would encroach onto all three BVCP land use types. If the dam were moved south to avoid impacts to Viele Channel, the existing pond would remain, but excavation would need to be more extensive to provide more detention capacity.
- The Variant Two 100-year flood scenario without the CU levee would move the proposed dam along the edge of the 500-year floodplain, reserve a larger area for inflow, and add a restriction at the US Highway 36 bridge. This variation fits with BVCP land uses by moving storage capacity to the edge of US Highway 36. The 500-year flood variation of Variant Two without the levee would increase the area of maximum inundation on OSMP land. A rendering of Variant Two illustrates this concept.

Note: This is a summary of what occurred at the meeting, not a comprehensive account of everything that was said. Not all members of the group agree with everything that was said at the meeting or that is included in this meeting summary.

- Finally, Mr. Bauer showed a rendering of the existing US 36 bridge with one possible concept for the floodwall and flow restriction shown. The current multi-use path that goes under the US Highway 36 bridge would stay in place. The proposed flow restriction would narrow the size of the opening under the bridge and include a structure in front of the bridge within the 40-foot Colorado Department of Transportation (CDOT) right-of-way. The City would work with project consultants and Open Space and Mountain Parks (OSMP) to allow for wildlife to pass under the bridge at this location. Doing so would require narrowing and deepening the creek for habitat purposes and providing a vegetated wildlife corridor under the bridge. The bridge would retain its current piers and corridors.

Clarifying Questions
Mr. Bauer and Mr. Eisenbraun of RJH Consultants, Inc. (RJH) responded to questions about the hydrological analysis of the three concepts and related concerns. Questions are indicated in italics with responses written below in plain text.

Would digging deeper change the groundwater surface level?
It would, but a proposed impermeable barrier wall around the perimeter of the excavated area would prevent water from flowing into the excavated site.

If the City removes the existing CU levee, why do maps not show the surrounding area as included within the area of maximum inundation?
The existing CU levee is at a higher elevation than the area around it. If the City removes the levee, it will remove it to ground level rather than excavating beneath it. Ponding during large events would, therefore, extend on both sides of where the existing levee is.

What about the nearby gravel pits? Would they remain as they are or be brought up to the elevation of the land that surrounds them?
The project team needs to discuss this with CU, the Open Space Board of Trustees (OSBT) and the community to determine what "restoration" would mean for the gravel pits. OSMP staff noted that their understanding of "open space" is different from that of CU, which envisions open space as sports fields, solar arrays, and other forms of land use that do not involve buildings and that all parties would need to negotiate restoration goals.

Has the project team considered the idea to use the land where the levee was as small detention ponds and berms for attractive water storage?
The City and its consultants have evaluated these various concepts numerous times beginning in the Master Planning phase and have concluded they are not necessary from an engineering perspective.

Why is a flow restriction needed in Variant Two?
A flow restriction is needed to detain the water so that there are no impacts to downstream floodplains.

How do the gravel pits fit into Variant Two?
The concept of this variant uses existing topography. That means that existing low areas like the gravel pits would remain in their current form and that there would not be additional excavation.

Has Variant Two been changed since the last time staff showed it to this group?
Yes. The project team moved the proposed dam to align with an existing rise in topography, the existing boundaries of the 500-year floodplain and BVCP land use designations.

Does the spillway change under any of these variations?
The spillway is the same for each of these variations. If a flood hits any of these project concepts with more water than they can handle, floodwater over the spillway will flow in the same manner as it would today (down US Highway 36 and into the West Valley).

For each model storm event, is the height of the dam based on exactly 100- or 500-year flood flows? Does the height of the dam include a buffer for any uncertainty in the model flows?
RJH is refining each project variation to the point where they offer the same downstream benefits. Any infrastructure constructed would be sized to include freeboard to account for this uncertainty. ,

Can material from the existing levee be used to build the dam?
The current assumption is that the City can use existing CU levee material for the construction of the concepts. The current cost estimates reflect this.

Are the project options presented today only intended to address flooding in the mainstem of South Boulder Creek? Did the project team consider project configurations that would detain flood flows in Viele Channel or South Boulder Creek's northern tributaries?
City staff recently met with Pete Palmer to discuss the design storm. Palmer agrees with the reasons that the City selected the design storm that it did for this phase of the project. The Viele Channel floodplain is small in comparison to the modeling storm. The design storm includes the maximum flows that would result in the overtopping of US Highway 36.

What are the effects of Variant Two on groundwater?
All of the project concepts are required to avoid affecting the current movement of groundwater. Variant Two would require much less work than the other two concepts because it does not require the construction of a barrier wall to prevent an inflow of groundwater to the detention area.

How much does the flow restriction in Variant Two constrict the capacity of the area under the bridge at US Highway 36?
Master Plan Option D and Variant One require more excavation, but Variant Two still requires some excavation. The same amount of water will flow under the bridge in all three concepts, but the smaller bridge opening would be required in Variant Two to avoid

impacts to downstream floodplains. The opening under the bridge is designed to handle roughly 3600 cubic feet per second (CFS) of water, but flows will vary for each storm event.

The City is only allowed to detain the floodwater for 72 hours, so where will that water drain under the 500-year flood event without the levee?
Water will flow back to the creek by gravity, although the project team may need to do some minor regrading to facilitate that drainage.

Do the flood model results account for potential blockages of the small opening under the US 36 bridge?
The pond will stop most debris at its upstream end. Debris tends to fall out as velocity decreases. It is difficult to make a general statement about debris because some will be floating on the water's surface and some will be below the surface. During project design, RJH will look at solutions to potential debris problems.

What is the detention volume of each concept?
The project team has rough numbers that need to be confirmed by DHI. The Master Plan Option D 100-year variation provides around 450 acre-feet (AF) of detention, and its 500-year flood variation provides around 600 AF. Variant One's 100-year variation provides roughly 400 AF and its 500-year variation provides around 570 AF. Variant Two's 100-year variation provides about 400 AF and its 500-year variation provides around 500 AF, although these numbers will probably be higher after quality control.

Why is the hydrology the same for all concepts with or without the levee?
The hydraulics is the same with or without the levee because removing the levee does not impact the general flow direction. The levee protects a portion of the CU South parcel, not the entire area.

Why is the floodwall shown in the rendering at the US Highway 36 bridge lower than the highway itself?
The floodwall will maintain the same elevation along its length, while the highway itself is slightly lower at the Foothills Parkway on-ramp and somewhat higher at the bridge. The floodwall will be higher and lower than the highway at those points, respectively.

Can the project team show the group cross-sections of the floodwall and the bike path?
The project team will show these to the public in the future, but these were not ready for today's meeting.

DRAFT EVALUATION CRITERIA ASSESSMENT
Mr. Bauer presented two tables, one highly detailed and one less so, that rated each project concept and storm event or levee variation on its ability to address each draft evaluation criterion. City staff explained that they interpreted their task as presenting information to help decision-makers and the public to select one concept variation. As a result, the current evaluations are shown as being among concept variations, not within one concept. Staff

also noted that, in general, a structure designed to protect against a 500-year flood will be better for flood mitigation but will be more expensive and have more of an environmental impact. Staff tried to quantify criteria wherever possible to avoid subjectivity, but when necessary they attempted to answer subjective questions using their professional judgment. Mr. Bauer summarized the differences between the concepts concerning each criterion as follows:

- Downstream flood benefits: Any of the 500-year concepts would maximize these benefits.
- Adaptability for climate change: Variant Two is the best option for addressing this criterion.
- Project cost: The least expensive options are Variants One and Two under 100-year flood scenarios.
- Construction complexity, operations, and maintenance: As noted above, City staff will include construction scheduling as a criterion separate from construction complexity. Variant Two has the least amount of infrastructure, so it is the least complex.
- Direct environmental impacts (of the final configuration's footprint): This criterion refers to required mitigation caused by the direct permanent impacts of the configuration. More specifically, this criterion pertains to impacts to threatened and endangered species, open water, wetlands, and other habitats through filling or excavation. Variants One and Two do best on this criterion because they involve less infrastructure than Master Plan Option D.
- Riparian connectivity and habitat enhancement opportunities: Any concept that the City builds without the CU South levee will do better under this criterion.
- Landowner acceptance: Staff placed checkmarks next to CU for Master Plan 100-year and Variant 1 100-year concepts because these options have not changed dramatically from agreed-upon land use assumptions on CU South within the BVCP. Likewise, check marks for OSMP for Master Plan and Variant 1 concepts indicate that these configurations would have similar effects on OSMP land as the Master Plan Option D, which OSBT recommended during the SBC Master Plan process. Elsewhere, question marks serve as placeholders to remind stakeholders that the project requires landowner comment on project concepts and variations. Staff noted that all of the proposed concepts meet the project's baseline criteria, but the question of landowner agreement is a political one, so staff separated it from the technical evaluation criteria. However, staff noted that the last conversation with landowners regarding the acceptability of flood mitigation as a land use was during the BVCP Guiding Principles discussions, so this is only a preliminary indication that landowners would be amenable to some of these concepts.

Clarifying Questions
Group members asked several questions about City staff's assessment of the project concepts in relation to the draft evaluation criteria. Questions are indicated in italics with responses below in plain text.

In the three rows under "Change in land required by concept on BVCP land uses (acres)," why are some numbers positive and some negative?
These numbers indicate how many acres would be added or taken away from the current acreage needed for flood mitigation in the land use categories as defined by the BVCP update. For example, a 500-year flood event for Master Plan Option D or Variant One would require using an additional 36 acres of public [PUB] land use designated area on CU South for detention capacity from the 129 acres as defined in the BVCP. However, Master Plan Option D and Variant One would not use 20 acres of land currently slated for flood detention to the PK-U/O land. City staff will change the wording of these rows to make this clear.

On the bottom row of the less detailed table, why does the total difference in the area of inundation not add up to the numbers above it?
Those numbers refer to existing floodplain limits, as opposed to the extent of inundation. The confusion stems from the fact that staff did not label OSMP land on the map. City staff will label that land for future presentations.

Does "restoration potential" refer only to OSMP land? Can it be applied more generally?
"Restoration potential" applies to the land labeled as OS-O on CU South under the BVCP, not the land that is supposed to be labeled as OSMP on the map. Removing the existing CU levee provides more opportunities for restoration potential. If the levee remains, the potential for restoration is assumed to be lower due to reduced riparian connectivity potential. There is an interest in restoring areas on CU South in the BVCP OS-O land use designation in alignment with OSMP values.

Will restoration provide benefits to threatened and endangered species in addition to wetlands, including by providing an opportunity for species to move into non-inundated areas during storm events?
Yes. Restoration would support native habitat.

Can 100-year and 500-year flood events be compared against each other on these tables?
Yes. These are ranked consistently across each row. For example, the numbers on the left of the table show the downstream benefits that a 100-year facility would provide in the event of a 500-year storm. The columns correlate to the concept variations.

Why is the detention volume higher for a 500-year flood?
Detention volume is greater due to the larger storm and corresponding rainfall and runoff volumes. The embankment would need to be longer and correspondingly wider for a 500-year flood facility.

Why is "construction complexity" marked "least" for Variant Two? Is that the result of permitting or scheduling?
It is the "best" option because it includes the least amount of infrastructure (i.e., no siphon and a smaller dam).

Why do all of these concepts involve closing off Boulder Creek? Why not leave it open and get as much water out as possible?
The project team examined the feasibility of widening South Boulder Creek during the Master Plan process. It was unworkable because of the cost of property acquisition, impacts to critical habitat, and the fact that OSMP had recently completed a creek restoration, thereby narrowing the stream.

How have the consultants arrived at project cost estimates? Can group members receive copies of the spreadsheets used to arrive at these estimates?
Ultimately yes, but RJH has yet to document all of the assumptions used to develop the current conceptual-level costs that include 40 individual items.

Group Discussion
The group discussed the project team's assessment of the project concepts in relation to the draft evaluation criteria; highlights are presented below.

- Group members recommended that staff rephrase the criteria rankings so that "best," "'better," etc. are replaced with "highest," "middle," and "lowest." These replacements would create consistent terminology for each criterion.
- City staff reiterated that it is using Master Plan Option D as a baseline, not necessarily as the most viable of the concept options.
- Staff noted that "direct environmental impacts" differs from "riparian connectivity" because the former pertains to enhancement opportunities, beyond any regulatory habitat mitigation requirements. Staff acknowledged that "wetland impacts" were mistakenly omitted and will be reinserted into the table.
- Several group members expressed concern that staff had placed check marks indicating agreement with landowners on some of the project concepts. These group members suggested replacing the check marks and question marks on the appropriate table with "no change from BVCP" or "requires changes to current BVCP land uses." One group member suggested moving these rows to a new document to avoid confusion about the technical evaluation criteria.
- The group agreed that the project concepts and variations will have the same or similar schedules from now until construction begins, but that City staff should reword the "construction schedule" criterion to reflect this accurately.
- The group recommended that City staff color-code both tables in the same way to avoid confusion.

PRESENTATION OF PROPOSED PROJECT DESIGN CONCEPT

Ben Binder, Save South Boulder, gave a presentation of a proposed project design concept that he developed. Highlights of the presentation are summarized below.

- In 2014, the Boulder Water Resources Advisory Board (WRAB) received a proposal to place all floodwater detention facilities on OSMP land. OSBT and the City rejected this proposal and directed that detention facilities be placed on other properties. However, on February 14, 2018, Molly Scarbrough presented to OSBT, and the Board stated that the project team could consider the use of OSMP land for flood inundation if it could result in net open space benefits.
- Mr. Binder does not want to see the newly-built bike path demolished and rebuilt for $500,000. If the project team moved the floodwall 25 feet to the south, it would eliminate the need to destroy the path and use the CDOT right-of-way. Mr. Binder noted that CDOT has not formally agreed to allow the City to use the right-of-way for flood detention yet and that this might add uncertainty to the project.
- Mr. Binder stated the City could use two acres of Open Space for the floodwall that would have the added benefit of providing access downstream to the toe of the dam and would ease requirements from the State Engineer's Office. Additionally, this would avoid placing a vital dam against the most important highway in the county, which CDOT may expand in the future to the detriment of the flood detention facility.
- It is more expensive to squeeze the floodwall into the 40-foot right-of-way corridor than it would be to use some OSMP land. Mr. Binder pointed out that CDOT might prefer to give up 15 feet of its right-of-way than the entire corridor.
- Additionally, Mr. Binder stated that the area next to the highway is probably not ideal habitat for threatened and endangered species.
- Mr. Binder presented Mr. Eisenbraun with a grid showing calculations that indicated the detention capacity of a 500-year flood facility under Variant Two would be 740 AF.

Group Discussion

The group discussed Mr. Binder's proposal; highlights are presented below

- A group member noted that the City would still need to obtain an easement even if it only used 15 feet of the CDOT right-of-way.
- Mr. Binder clarified that he had estimated cost savings based on a spreadsheet that CH2M Hill developed for the Master Plan. He estimated that it would cost $500,000 to rebuild the bike path and $3.5 million to build the floodwall.
- OSMP personnel clarified that while the open space adjacent to the highway might not seem like ideal threatened and endangered species habitat, it has a high density of endangered Ute ladies' tresses orchids. This high density means that the project probably cannot be built there, especially if there is a viable alternative. When CDOT built the bike path, the City disposed of some open space and CDOT was required to

mitigate orchid habitat by purchasing 20 acres north of US Highway 36 near the recreation center and mitigating that land for $3,000,000. That was the first time that that sort of mitigation has been done, and it is not yet clear if it will successfully recreate orchid habitat. OSBT provided clear instructions to OSMP to come back to the Board if the project would result in non-trivial impacts on Open Space. OSMP staff are part of the project team. OSMP has not yet vetted detailed design for structures for this project on open space land because the City has not developed those details yet. However, some group members stated that this would be surmountable.

REVISED SCOPE OF WORK FOR RJH

Rod Eisenbraun, senior project manager with RJH, provided an update on revisions to the scope of work that RJH recently submitted to the City.

- RJH believes that it has exceeded its existing scope of work even though it is still within the initially authorized budget. RJH has requested more funding for work on the project. The City is reviewing the revisions and will forward them to its funding partner on the project, the Urban Drainage and Flood Control District (UDFCD).
- The original scope of work was for $790,000 to collect data and analyze the concepts and flood scenarios that had the City had identified at the time. The change request is for an additional approximately $800,000 to analyze other flood events, to analyze concepts with and without the levee, to conduct additional geotechnical work, to attend additional meetings, and to do low-impact drilling during restricted hours. The change order request will be negotiated with the City.
- The project is on a "rolling-wave" schedule, meaning that RJH maintains a narrow focus on the portion of the project that it is completing. The project schedule is changing on a near-weekly basis. As of now, the project team is trying to reach a decision (via boards and the community) on which variation with which to proceed into preliminary design. Once the variation has been selected, the engineers will likely be able to lay out a more specific schedule.

Group Discussion

Group members discussed Mr. Eisenbraun's scope of work update. Highlights are presented below:

- Group members had questions about how much of the work that RJH had been initially scoped to complete remained. City staff clarified that RJH was initially slated to submit a change order request in March, but that input from the ad-hoc advisory group and the public had resulted in changes to the scope. If RJH had submitted the request in March, it would be obsolete. Mr. Bauer noted that it is not uncommon to have 20 change orders submitted for a project of this scale.
- A group member stated that the community is most concerned with balancing the speed and quality with which the project team completes this project and that changes to the scope of work are less significant than attaining this balance. City

staff reiterated that City Council would be asked to select an alternative in August. The same group member emphasized the need for the City to take Mr. Binder's proposal seriously and to consider the degree to which the south end of the CU South parcel can add detention capacity by using swales and berms.

- The project team mentioned that Mr. Binder's proposal for the floodwall did not need to be resolved during this phase of the project, but that the project team could consider it during the design phase.
- The project team stated that they believe that project concepts have been adequately vetted for this phase of the project to present necessary information to the public, boards and City Council.
- Staff noted that requirements of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) would also need to be addressed in the future, as would a determination of the least environmentally damaging practicable alternatives (LEDPA).
- Staff envisions updating Council with background information on project concepts and variations provided at today's meeting. A group member suggested employing a strategy similar to that used at the first open house meeting wherein staff offers a simplified version of the issues and a more detailed one for those who want to go deeper.
- Although this is a departure from past practice, City staff is considering not providing a staff recommendation on concept selection. Instead, the staff is considering presenting the concepts to the boards and Council because each of those bodies might have different views on the issue. Staff and consultants are focused on meeting the baseline criteria for the project: preventing overtopping of US 36, ensuring environmental permittability, etc. All of the concepts and variations under consideration meet these criteria.
- Staff will provide some version of the presentation on project concepts and variations at the next open house.

NEXT STEPS

- Group members should send any additional suggestions for the presentation of this material or comments on information provided today to Molly Scarbrough by May 23 (two weeks before the next open house).
- Molly Scarbrough will send an electronic version of the April 16 group meeting summary for suggested revisions, as well as the summary of the first open house and today's meeting shortly after that.
- Ben Binder and City staff will send slides from their presentations to Dan Myers of Peak Facilitation for inclusion in the summary.
- The *tentative* schedule for project meetings this summer is as follows:
    - May 22: City staff update to Council on the public process for the project (whom to consult next, etc.)
    - June 7: Next public open house

Note: This is a summary of what occurred at the meeting, not a comprehensive account of everything that was said. Not all members of the group agree with everything that was said at the meeting or that is included in this meeting summary.

- June 18: Joint OSBT and WRAB informational meeting with a public hearing
- July 11: Meeting at which OSBT will provide its recommendations on the project
- July 16: Meeting at which WRAB will provide its recommendations on the project
- August 2: Staff update to Planning Board with focus on BVCP land uses
- August 7: Council meeting for project concept selection

Note: This is a summary of what occurred at the meeting, not a comprehensive account of everything that was said. Not all members of the group agree with everything that was said at the meeting or that is included in this meeting summary.