


South Boulder Creek Flood Mitigation Project

April 23, 2018 Open House Questionnaire results

A public open house was held on April 23, 2018 to provide the community with the background and status of the South Boulder Creek flood mitigation project and review the project design concepts being considered. A questionnaire was provided to those who attended the open house and was available online for approximately a week after the event. Members of the community were asked to provide feedback on the flood mitigation concepts and the criteria that will be used to evaluate concepts for stormwater detention at US36 to reduce the risk of flooding in the west valley. 122 people responded to the questionnaire.

The table below illustrates how the evaluation criteria was ranked by the community.




South Boulder Creek Flood Mitigation Project

The chart below shows the percent of respondents indicating a criterion was either “very important” or “important”.

% very important or important	Criteria
95%	Reduce the flood risk to as many people as possible
69%	Minimize time required to design, permit and construct
58%	Minimize environmental impacts
56%	Integrate flexibility into the design approach to anticipate future changing climate conditions
41%	Improve riparian connectivity and opportunities for habitat restoration
32%	Minimize maintenance and operation requirements / costs
28%	Limit dam size (height, length and footprint) to the extent possible
26%	Minimize construction cost


South Boulder Creek Flood Mitigation Project

Respondents were asked to identify one evaluation criterion that is the most important to them. The table below illustrates which of the evaluation criteria was most important to the community.



South Boulder Creek Flood Mitigation Project

Similar to the previous table, the table below provides how many respondents ranked each of the most important evaluation criteria.



South Boulder Creek Flood Mitigation Project

In addition to ranking the evaluation criteria, members of the community were asked to provide comments on the concepts presented during the open house.

Please list what you like about the concepts:

Master Plan Concept

- I like that this version doesn't come so close to Boulder Creek and keeps that area essentially the way it is now. From the photo simulations, it actually looks like the views from US36 will be fine.
- This concept seems to have the least visual and environmental impact from the standpoint of the perspectives that your representational slides showed. It seemed to preserve existing riparian ponds, follow US36 closely and perhaps even provide more of a visual and sound barrier to the constant traffic on US36. This would be my first choice of plans.
- Process seems transparent
- The whole area should NOT have any development, it should be left as a flood plain.
- I found the maps confusing as seemed upside down. So had problems understanding the different concepts- also very small. Would be better to comment if i had been able to attend the presentation. Hopeful i can come to the next.
- Best plan! Variant 1 and remove the existing east levee is best option. Removing existing levee to the east is the best plan, but please confirm levee to the west of CU property is high enough to keep 500-year flood out of neighborhoods to the west of the CU property.
- It appears considerable science and work has gone into this flood plan. The CU component is what really worries most people.
- I support the implementation of a flood mitigation dam to prevent water from South Boulder Creek overtopping U.S. 36 and flooding downstream homes and businesses.
- Protects more people and property
- Why isn't clearing up debris and clearing out of culverts of SBC part of the master plan? Why aren't you taking care of this first and foremost?
- Get started!
- that you have a visual
- Were the hydrology and engineering firms involved in any planning for Hogan-Pancost and/or East Boulder Rec Center – questionable prediction by those.
- Not sure I like any of these
- Need to see maps without levee.
- Seems like it would really help, and doesn't look bad.
- Helps the people of Frasier Meadows
- These all accomplish the main goal of reducing the flood risk to a large number of people
- The City staff have done a great job working on the options and I support their recommendation on this Master Plan Concept. Thank you.
- Removes homes from floodplain and is a starting point for conversation and analysis
- I like that the City of Boulder is moving forward on mitigating flood waters.
- Don't care - do whatever most quickly and thoroughly mitigate flood risk!
- i don't know enough about the three alternatives to give a thumbs up or down on any of them

South Boulder Creek Flood Mitigation Project

- Plan to complete phase 1. 500-year flood mitigation. Eliminating structures/population in floodplain. Annexation of CU. Restoration of ecological aspects on CU property. Dam is important to minimize risk of loss of life.
- Dam creates sound barrier. Will soil absorb sound?
- Has been well studied. Would handle 100-year flood. Don't worry about 500-year flood. You can't cover 100% of anything.
- Not able. have too little knowledge to evaluate pros and cons
- It gets homes out of the floodplains
- I am open to all concepts and hope that those in charge will make the best decisions maximizing benefits and minimizing negative impacts. I am most interested in the impacts of CU's annexation and development (traffic on Table Mesa especially) and losing a great recreation space (walking/biking/dog space, etc.) easily accessible to S. Boulder residents (thanks CU, til now anyway!)
- Not really much, I have more concerns - size of detention pond and impact on downstream
- Thoroughly studied and essentially "ready to go!" We continue to be at risk 5 years after 2013.
- I trust the engineers to pick the option that will make the best sense. Thank you for all your work!
- The concept is great. It needs to be implemented as soon as possible.
- Seems to stop the water
- I don't have the expertise to determine which plan is best
- If all of these prevent US36 from overtopping, I trust the engineers to choose the best plan possible.
- NO
- Already approved, go ahead and build it
- This is Plan D and over the past two years, it was the plan agreed to by city and county boards. I think this plan, or either of the two variants whichever the engineers prefer, will do the job. The key is doing the job quickly to prevent another damaging flood as in 2013.
- All good as long as the floodwaters do not overtop US36. Also, hope this can be done soon to protect people from flooding.
- Need an assembly room explanation meeting
- Let the engineers and planners choose which concept but please get started on construction!
- All these concepts meet the baseline criteria. Most importantly, the water must be prevented from overtopping US36 and must be done as quickly as possible.
- Engineers should make decision
- this is an engineering decision. Build it now
- Engineering to make decisions
- Master Plan D
- Engineering decision - the fastest one!
- Looks good
- This concept was approved
- I am not significantly knowledgeable with regard to engineering and water management issues to be able to evaluate the 3 proposals. Let experts decide which method is best and GET STARTED ASAP!

South Boulder Creek Flood Mitigation Project

- Engineering decisions. either is fine with non-professionals.
- Im not qualified to say
- This was approved in 8/15
- Engineer's decision. Any will do if engineers agree
- that four committees have reviewed and approved
- I like all aspects of this concept. I trust the city's engineers and support their guidance. Please move forward ASAP!
- I am happy with the work produced by city engineers and recommend the city move forward expediently with any option that meets the baseline criteria
- Sounds good to me
- Since all appear to do the job and save lives from flooding, what I am most concerned about is that after approaching five years, one is chosen and the process of building begins NOW. ENOUGH TIME HAS PASSED. GET GOING!!!
- Preventing dangerous flooding - death/damage. The berm can be landscaped and will provide habitat/beauty. Engineers have designed both options and both will work it seems, we hope. We really ought to turn Foothills Pkwy/47th into a canal. But number 1, do something now!!!
- We understand all three concepts meet the baseline criteria, the most important is that water is prevented from overtopping US36 during a 100-year storm at minimum and needs to be completed as quickly as possible.
- Ok if it stops flooding on US36. Get knowledgeable engineer to pick one now and do it now
- I am only concerned that future flooding will be reduced as much as possible as soon as possible.
- I thought the plan presented by the city seemed to be well thought out and researched. The presenters were articulate and seemed knowledgeable.
- Well thought out

Variant I:

- The dam will cause more flooding because it would restrict the water feom dispersing over the whole atea.
- I like this version as well but prefer Master Plan Concept
- I guess this would be my second choice, and it looks similar to the impacts of the first concept. That being said, it reduces the beauty of the continuity of riparian areas between the two ponds.
- Seems viable
- This appears the least damaging to the homeowners boarding CU. My property is 4844 W. Moorhead Cir. This is a single family residence. No city or CU employees have reached out to our neighborhood.
- I am happy to defer to the City's consultants and engineers about which Variant is preferred as long as the recommended variant complies with the baseline criteria.
- This has fatal flaws that will flood people to the east and north. This has been confirmed by a professional flood engineer.
- Seems to address issue with MPC - Viele Channel

South Boulder Creek Flood Mitigation Project

- Seems like this option provides most protection with least impact/disruption particularly at Viele Channel.
- No comment I am not an water expert, so I trust our City's engineers.
- I like the idea of avoiding the Viele Channel so that it doesn't cause problems down the road.
- Avoids Viele Channel (syphon is a negative impact to Viele Channel and has a risk of failure).
- Don't know details or pros and cons
- Seems like a shorter dam than the Master Plan
- It gets homes out of the floodplains
- I appreciate using more of the land for wetland but piping under US36 seems very costly.
- If necessary and within ready to go criteria
- Seems to be a nice middle ground, and take less room
- Corrals Viele lake water
- NO
- Not an engineer, so wouldn't know.
- smaller length dam
- Looks good
- is it important to avoid Viele channel?
- Could work very well and the dam will store water with slow release.
- We support the city engineering staff and engineering consultants in their upcoming evaluation of which of the three concepts they believe will accomplish the goal.
- well thought out
- The dam will cause more flooding because it would restrict the water feom dispersing over the whole atea.
- I like this version as well but prefer Master Plan Concept
- I guess this would be my second choice, and it looks similar to the impacts of the first concept. That being said, it reduces the beauty of the continuity of riparian areas between the two ponds.
- Seems viable
- This appears the least damaging to the homeowners boarding CU. My property is 4844 W. Moorhead Cir. This is a single family residence. No city or CU employees have reached out to our neighborhood.
- I am happy to defer to the City's consultants and engineers about which Variant is preferred as long as the recommended variant complies with the baseline criteria.
- This has fatal flaws that will flood people to the east and north. This has been confirmed by a professional flood engineer.
- Seems to address issue with MPC - Viele Channel
- Seems like this option provides most protection with least impact/disruption particularly at Viele Channel.
- No comment I am not an water expert, so I trust our City's engineers.
- I like the idea of avoiding the Viele Channel so that it doesn't cause problems down the road.
- Avoids Viele Channel (syphon is a negative impact to Viele Channel and has a risk of failure).
- Don't know details or pros and cons
- Seems like a shorter dam than the Master Plan

South Boulder Creek Flood Mitigation Project

- It gets homes out of the floodplains
- I appreciate using more of the land for wetland but piping under US36 seems very costly.
- If necessary and within ready to go criteria
- Seems to be a nice middle ground, and take less room
- Corrals Viele lake water
- NO
- Not an engineer, so wouldn't know.
- smaller length dam
- Looks good
- is it important to avoid Viele channel?
- Could work very well and the dam will store water with slow release.
- We support the city engineering staff and engineering consultants in their upcoming evaluation of which of the three concepts they believe will accomplish the goal.
- well thought out

Variant II:

- I don't like that this version more directly impacts the banks of the creek.
- also seems viable
- Seems to be closest to 'natural' flood situation. With only limited knowledge I like this the most.
- This has fatal flaws that will flood people to the east and north. This has been confirmed by a professional flood engineer.
- Did I understand that this might protect for larger than the 100-year flood event?
- No comment I am not a water expert, so I trust our City's engineers.
- Like restoration within berm.
- Don't know details or pros and cons
- it gets homes out of the floodplains
- Best Option! Slows flows and spreads it out over large area. Much easier to control slow flow and low water. It maximizes retention
- I choose this one. I think we really need to remove the levee so flood flows can flow into existing gravel pit. This is what the land should do.
- NO! Looks like too much flooding
- Best plan
- would provide maximum storage of flood water
- looks good
- This looks more complicated. Is it?
- Ruth Wright stated we need to move forward quickly and said Variant 2 was...
- the concerns raised by ad hoc committee need addressing so this tries and should be... (unknown)
- This plan is also ok thought may not be so effective as the berm.
- Most important this project needs to be done soon, as human lives are at continued risk

South Boulder Creek Flood Mitigation Project

Please list your concerns with the concepts:

Master Plan Concept

- Wonder if the wall will be visually unattractive from the houses to the southwest.
- Seems very far along to be seeking public input now
- No – syphon could clog!
- Too complicated
- The MPC continues to fail to incorporate identified concrete uses planned by CU. They continue to be the wildcard that most homeowners and users of the general area are wary of. A major concern is that the city of Boulder will “fold” and let CU do what they want under the constant mantra of “affordable housing.”
- Worry about Viele Channel syphon getting blocked during a significant event and flooding around surrounding roads.
- I trust the extensive process the City has engaged with these past years. My main concern is that the process is moving too slowly.
- Concern for those who will still remain in 100-year floodplain. How can they be helped?
- Remove current CU levee. Design for 500-year flood. Proceed expeditiously with each phase!
- Several Concerns: 1. I do not like that CU requires annexation in order for us to use that land. I also do not like that CU restricted the options that we considered initially. They shot down the alternative option early on. 2. You have already made up your mind on what you are going to do so why bother with public information? We have been giving feedback for over a year and I never see that it makes any difference. I completely distrust city staff – you are not neutral and do not want people who disagree with you to be heard. 3. Give Save South Boulder a place at the table. They represent my point of view and I would like them to be part of the conversation. 4. At these meetings I always hear people bringing up objections to the science and engineering of the plan. This worries me greatly, as usually the people are smart scientists and engineers.
- Does not include a plan to clean up debris and clean out culverts that already exist for SBC.
- So many homes are still in the 100-year floodplain. This was not discussed previously. The entire proposal should be re-thought in order to get as many homes as possible out of the floodplain.
- It might not happen.
- I trust our City's engineers that they will make this safe for everyone.
- All negatively impact Dry Creek Ditch #2 by Keewaydin Meadows area and Manhattan Middle School
- I'm concerned that the Phase I is the only one in the works. I'm frustrated that all efforts are ending at Baseline. I realize that the our neighbors in Frasier Meadows have been most vocal, but they are not the only ones impacted by flood waters in Southeast Boulder, yet it seems like they are getting the majority of the benefit.
- Don't care! Do it ASAP, whichever will best mitigate flood risk.

South Boulder Creek Flood Mitigation Project

- Lack of monitoring, assessing commute times to estimate the potential loss of life, if flooding occurs when people are out and about. 2013 flooding over US36 happened at 10 p.m. or so. What would be the potential harm if flooding jumped US36 during commute times? How many more people would be at risk of harm (in addition to the 4000 people the dam would protect) if flood mitigation isn't completed?
- Do not like impacts to Viele Channel.
- Dam is too large – will take too long to complete. Very expensive, harder to maintain. Cooperation with CU won't be easy.
- Limits access to CU South
- piping water, cost, not built for 500-year events, structural approach, small detention
- None - go with it please!
- I have no concerns other than the large amount of time that it is taking to do something to reduce our flood risk.
- Doesn't protect enough people!
- Taking too long!
- The city was very clear in their presentation and I am grateful for the work that has gone into its preparation. The alternative plan presented by Ruth Wright agreed on a speedy resolution and conclusion of the berm; however, their overall goal as presented seemed to add up to delay. The last speaker on that panel, Binder, concluded his statement stating that the University should show contrition and turn the land over as open space for beaver ponds and other wildlife. Not a realistic idea!
- The schedule keeps getting pushed out further and further
- syphon unreliable in a large flood?
- Not an engineer
- Engineering decision - do it now!
- none - do it
- Main concern is timeliness - Please proceed as soon as possible to protect lives and property
- No concerns, I trust our city engineers!
- No comment, I am not a water engineer
- same as on the other side
- Some people think this is a waste of money. They don't live "downstream" but do live in Boulder and are part of the community. We are all in this together.
- There is no sense of urgency in completing the project. Two and a half years we have been asking to help with move ahead when the alternative was approved.
- That you folks are too lazy, scared, ignorant, whatever to move
- Please select the plans that will create the highest possible of use of flood control. No flooding- as soon as possible... Quit studying and act on flood abatement.
- Our major concern is to make a decision regarding which plan is best and begin construction ASAP! Our apartment is on the ground floor, I am caregiver for my 90-year old husband with dementia so for personal reasons time is of the essence. However, most residents (and local community as well) are at risk for flood damage and loss of life and possessions as happened in 2013. The stress and anxiety our aging population has due to lack of preparation to prevent another nightmare experience is taking its toll on daily functioning , cognitive and emotional

South Boulder Creek Flood Mitigation Project

health and may influence poor physical health as well. We do not feel safe and secure in our homes and won't until the flood mitigation is completed.

- I don't have the expertise to feel concerns with any of the concepts. I am concerned about the delay in deciding upon and implementing one of them. Given climate change, I don't think we can depend on having no more major floods for another 100 years. Please decide and get moving.
- You are proceeding too slowly

Variant I:

- appears to be less complex
- Best plan. But remove east levee.
- Less complicated
- Costs. This dam will ruin views, lake and land use around Tantra community. Why have you spent all this money on the concept without first getting land use permission from CU South???
- No comment I am not an water expert, so I trust our City's engineers.
- Do not like reliance on outflow tunnel. Risk of failure.
- Cooperation with CU
- Dam height might be undesirably high
- Better. Still involves piping water which doesn't seem like the answer for bigger flows
- Whatever variant of the original master plan concept. what is most important is for the work to begin and end quickly to prevent future loss of life and damage to homes.
- needs a large fill area. spillway adequate?
- none - do it
- Height may be insufficient to hold water. Must construct according to dam building codes, not just make a pile of dirt. Visibility - some think it's too high, but better to lose a little view than a life.

Variant II:

- Looks like it has more impact on the open space along Boulder Creek.
- It seems strange to have the dam reverse it's direction and jut out into the middle of the Open Space. I can't speak to it's benefits, but visually this would seem pretty intrusive and not environmentally sensitive.
- Concerned about reliance on siphon
- Least complicated
- Costs. This dam will ruin views, lake and land use around Tantra community. Why have you spent all this money on the concept without first getting land use permission from CU South???
- Adds too much complication
- No comment I am not an water expert, so I trust our City's engineers.
- Do not like removal of levee – could increase risk of flooding for properties west of CU South.
- Cuts right into CU property. Kind of disruptive!
- restricting flow, raised erosion along the creek and under US36
- is this 500-year on fill spillway size of detention pond?
- none - do it

South Boulder Creek Flood Mitigation Project

- Won't work to prevent overflow. too late in stopping for slowing water flow. unable to control water quantity.

Additional comments about the draft evaluation criteria:

- Criteria do not address connectivity and interactions among multiple, simultaneous flood risks (e.g., Bear Canyon Creek, Boulder Creek). Can we be sure that the SBC solutions will not aggravate floods e.g., at Foothills & Arapahoe & downstream
- There is a small creek that flows maybe 1/3 of the year. It runs north/south along the east side of the CU levee which parallels Moorhead Av. It is unclear if CU's "area of fill" would fill this small creek. I find it especially disingenuous that all proposals include an "area of fill" that encompasses the CU tennis courts. CU speakers include the tennis coach, made public pleas to allow annexation so they can have state of the art facilities. How is that possible with "area of fill" over the courts? I find CU's argument for development dishonest.
- The evaluation criteria to limit dam size is in direct conflict with the first criteria to remove the flood risk to as many people as possible - BIG MISTAKE!
- Lack of trust in projects after 20+ years at Hogan-Pancost
- Reduce flood risk: first mention without this, the project is solely to protect US36 from overtopping. Minimize construction costs: Too simple. this has to be considered along with B/C - what's being protected. Minimize time required: already been years - take the time to do it right! Minimize maintenance: these costs need to be included and accounted for. Include, don't minimize. Minimize environmental impacts: where opportunity exists. Limit dam size: Need to impound enough water! Integrate flexibility: Life of structure vs rate of climate change.
- Thanks to the City staff for their excellent work on this so far. Please make this project a priority, health and safety is important to our neighborhoods!
- Can Dry Creek Ditch #2 even be used for flood mitigation? What changes need to be made to the ditch for that to be OK? (During Hogan-Pancost discussions it was stated that flood and ditch water must remain separate.
- I would like to speak to someone about Phase 2 and how to implement simple projects into an earlier phase.
- Since I'm not an engineer, hydrologist, or any other type of scientist/technical person, I can only hope the suggestions of those technical types have more weight than than political or NIMBY concerns with the ultimate goal of getting this project done well ASAP with my top 2 criteria in mind.
- Noise level needs to be considered if flood south side of US36 pushes noise to homes along north side of US36 on South Boulder Road.
- It is important that we get a plan in place ASAP to get people's homes and lives out of danger!
- It seems odd we are voting on concepts without full data of groundwater. How can we choose a design that is not responsive to groundwater on site.
- Cost / benefit ratio important. Yes, please consider 'Oh ----- climate change!'
- Maintenance is very important - has been neglected. No dam is necessary. US36 and South Boulder Road serve as dams. Flow under 36, out of Frasier Meadows and north along Foothills to Boulder Creek must be improved to minimize flooding of these areas. A dam will channel water that should be moving south to north into S. Boulder Creek which is unacceptable. Flooding of Old Tale Rd and Gaptor area was unacceptable in 2013.

South Boulder Creek Flood Mitigation Project

- Minimizing environmental impacts should include noise after construction is completed
- knowing something about groundwater cannot be done in just one year given yearly variations
- Have accurate map of maximum flood area. Variant 1 map doesn't change --- plan D
- The last criteria - this would give you an excuse to delay - forget it!
- the 100-year decision is OK
- As we were horribly flooded and suffered the destruction of our property I want the powers that to be more concerned about us not being "Brown" (covered in sewage) rather than being environmentally "Green"! A primary concern of government should be for the safety and well-being of its citizens. Do that and I will be happy.
- please move forward with this project ASAP!

General Comments:

- Great job. We live in the impacted 100 year flood area and are very excited to have a plan that takes us out of the 100 year flood take effect.
- Thank you for the transparency and information. Also, thanks for Q&A and opposing presentation.
- We have been studying and commenting on this problem long enough. It is time for action!
- We need to lock CU into what they plan on doing with the site. Flood mitigation / protection of citizenry can be done (I hope) without sacrificing the environment and being poor neighbors to those who have chosen to live adjacent to the CU South property.
- I would have liked to have the different perspectives earlier so they could be included in the Q&A. I feel like you were controlling the flow of information which was very frustrating. (Heather – please do not give that introductory speech ever again. You were insulting our intelligence and treating us like elementary school children.)
- Why aren't you putting money, time and effort into clearing up debris from the existing creeks and cleaning out and opening the existing culverts?
- It is my opinion that the flood in 2013 to my neighborhood (Keewaydin west) could have been prevented by filling in the gap where US36 on ramp from westbound South Boulder Road allows access to the south side of Keewaydin west. This would be substantially cheaper! However, as a good neighbor, I will say this would not cure the problem for our Keewaydin East neighbors. I am concerned about the studies. No one has ever come forward to explain what caused a four foot wall of water to crest the berms south of Keewaydin West. Wouldn't the water slowly flow through the gaps? We noticed no build up of flow before the wall of water. This tells me that something else happened that night to cause a catastrophic flow event. Did a significant amount of water come down the Viele Channel and/or Table Mesa Drive?
- What is the cost with annexing CU South?
- None of these variations will help the hundreds of structures/homes that will be left stranded in the 100-year floodplain. Phases 2 and 3 are illusory as there are no plan to ever fund them.
- The drainage/ditches at Baseline and Foothills must be given priority. How do the two large ponds at that intersection impact this?
- pros and cons to all plans??
- If you re-do this survey, improve the scale. It doesn't make sense to have "neutral" as a category between "slightly" and "important"

South Boulder Creek Flood Mitigation Project

- Thank you.
- Please take Crescent Drive homes out of the 100-year floodplain!
- I appreciate the presentation. This is such a complex issue. Good to learn more about the various options. I'm very concerned with the negative impact on Dry Creek Ditch #2 – increasing flooding and groundwater issues in Keewaydin Meadows.
- Thank you for all your hard work on flood mitigation!
- I just want you to protect our homes (Frasier Meadows area) ASAP! AND do not create more noise pollution. Please mitigate for our health and safety ASAP. It is highly possible that people in my neighborhood will die next time if you don't take care of this.
- The facilitator at your Open House was so obnoxious! As a home owner near 55th Street, I am concerned that funding planning for Parts 2 and 3 of this project are not being considered at this time. Climate change is here. We could have another similar event THIS September. Let's get moving and forget about adding art to the parking garages!!!
- I live in Greenbelt Meadows. Am concerned that the west valley (Frasier Meadows) is the focus of flood mitigation and you are forgetting about the folks further east. The creek runs right behind our subdivision. Noise from cars traveling along US36 and S. Boulder Road is horrible right now. If you construct a dam on the south side of US36, you are forcing the noise to the north and impacting our quality of life even more.
- Our lives matter! This is government's main responsibility to its citizenry
- I'm less concerned about which plan is chosen, more concerned that one is chosen and constructed quickly to get people out of danger
- While I appreciate the drawings where is the data about flows and what flood events each variant can hold? This open house seems to forego evidence of how flows - what size flows (100 vs. 500) will the spillway hold. No acres provided for detention or spillway. Please share the data with the residents who will be impacted by your decision.
- Removing CU levee would probably be a great benefit: if possible. Avoiding Viele 'Outlet tunnel' in final implementation seems like a great idea to avoid unanticipated blockage/overflow. Can, or has, the city helped broker collective bargaining for reduced cost flood insurance for property owners?
- Dry Creek Ditch #2 must be improved from CU through golf course. Under Arapahoe Rd and north under RR tracks. Howard and other small ditches must be restored to carry seasonal and intermittent water flow out which is key in a flood situation to keep water moving out before US36, S. Boulder Rd, Baseline, and Arapahoe are crested. Many homes are flooded if water and road culverts are allowed to clog and water crests the roadway.
- Thank you!
- Liked the moderator to control the level of passion in the room and keep meeting on track.
- It has been over four years since the last flood, and my house and my neighborhood are still just as vulnerable as they were then. The Master Plan is wonderful. Let's implement it as quickly as possible, before we are devastated again.
- I want the city to get with it and get flood mitigation done soon before we have another flood. Almost five years have passed since the Sept. 2013 event. We should not keep studying for another five years. I would like action as soon as possible.
- Please start construction as soon as possible.
- We have been waiting too long to see the project completed

South Boulder Creek Flood Mitigation Project

- Too much delay! Start construction NOW
- Almost 5 years of talk. It's time to build!
- No more meetings - build it!
- The flood experts disagree on what the best plan is, then it's hard for us non-experts to understand what the long-range ramifications of the different plans would be. Boulder has been studying the problem and issuing different floodplain maps for many years. Let's make a decision and get going on flood control to protect residents NOW!!
- No more meetings, build it!
- Thank you to the tiring work the city staff has been doing!
- Expediency matters most to me.
- I am not an expert on design and construction of civil structures nor of storm drainage channeling. I do feel, however, that this project should move ahead with great haste in order to provide as much protection for those threatened by severe storm drainage mishaps as soon as possible. From what has been presented, it appears that the proposals have had thoughtful review and should move forward rapidly. No more meetings, build it!
- #1 Priority - Prevent flood damage to protect people and property and do so now. This process is taking much too long and seems more important than such expenditures as buying the old Poor Farm, even though open space is also so important.
- Thank you for the presentation at the open house. We have waited too long to see this project completed.
- would like to see personal meetings with FMRC folks and staff
- We are uneducated re, these deliberations so will not complete the survey. We have heard that the overpass to the east of FM on Foothills is to be replaced with an underpass. If this is true, does it make sense to have a tunnel in a flood zone?
- Don't drown old grandmas and grandpas at Frasier Meadows