

CITY OF BOULDER, COLORADO
BOARDS AND COMMISSIONS MEETING MINUTES

Name of Board / Commission: Water Resources Advisory Board	
Date of Meeting: 16 December 2013	
Contact Information of Person Preparing Minutes: Laurel Olsen-Horen 303.441.3203	
Board Members Present: Chuck Howe, Dan Johnson , Vicki Scharnhorst, Mark Squillace, Ed Clancy Board Members Absent:	
Staff Present: Jeff Arthur, Director of Public Works for Utilities Bob Harberg, Principal Engineer – Utilities Bret Linenfelter, Water Quality and Environmental Services Manager Annie Noble, Flood and Greenways Engineering Coordinator Katie Knapp, Engineering Project Manager Ken Baird, Financial Manager Laurel Olsen-Horen, Board Secretary	
Meeting Type: Regular	
Agenda Item 1 – Call to Order	[7:05 p.m.]
Agenda Item 2 – Approval of the 18 November Meeting Minutes: [7:05 p.m.] Motion to approve the 18 November meeting minutes as amended: Squillace; Seconded by: Clancy Motion Passes; 4:0 – board member Johnson abstained	
Agenda Item 3 – Public Participation and Comment	[7:11 p.m.]
Public Comment: <p>Scott Hoffenberg: Mr. Hoffenberg gave a power point presentation (with a focus on the current engineering of the creek bed) which began with photos of culverts starting with Flagstaff Road and following downstream of Gregory Creek from there. Many of the trash racks on the culverts are what caused such catastrophic flooding in homes along the creek.</p> <p>Justin Hoffenberg: Mr. Hoffenberg continued the power point presentation showing the difference in sizing of the culverts (from Flagstaff Road to Boulder Creek) shown in the previous public comment. Along the upper and lower sections of Gregory Creek, the culverts are rather small whereas the culverts in the middle section are much larger and since flows increase as water moves downstream it doesn't make sense to have small culverts near the lower end of the creek. The angle of the trash racks on some of the culverts is too steep (and not angled to current flood mitigation standards of 3:1) which added to the buildup of debris during the flood event. Also the trash racks are to have clear opening at least three-times the culvert opening area, which the ones on Gregory creek do not. In the 2010 LOMR, were the affects of sediment transmission considered during the revision? The answer was no as sediment was not consider to be an issue for Gregory Creek due to the steepness and speed of the creek. However, the sediment was a huge issue along the creek.</p> <p>Roger Koenig: Mr. Koenig continued the power point presentation given by the above presenters with a focus on the big picture of flood hazard in the State of Colorado and how it affects Gregory Canyon Creek. Mr. Koenig provided a copy of the Flood Hazard Mitigation Plan for Colorado which summarizes CO's vulnerability to flooding and outlines strategies to manage and reduce the impact of flood hazards. Boulder has a continuing history of flooding. Mr. Koenig read some statistics from the Flood Hazard Mitigation document. Gregory Creek is known to have engineering problems. WRAB has a responsibility of advocating to City Council embrace the two-step plan of action (provided in the presentation) as a priority. First to maintain and repair and second, fund bottom up flood mitigation for Gregory Creek.</p> <p>Ed von Bleichert: Mr. von Bleichert continued the power point presentation given by the above presenters. The neighborhood is aware of the on-going recovery efforts the city is facing. Mr. von Bleichert discussed the financial aspect in regards to the funding issues faced by the city for use on recovery. There are five funding sources within Utilities, three of which are enterprise funds; water, wastewater and stormwater and flood management. Neighbors would like to know more about how the fees could be used to raise some money needed to work on mitigation. Some next steps for how the Gregory Creek neighbors can be of use to the city and assist in the process. Gregory Creek is primarily a CIP issue, but are there other sources of funding available? The neighbors have been working together to collect information and would like for WRAB to work with the community to demonstrate that need. When can we see significant funding in the CIP for Gregory Creek?</p> <p>Stewart Machle: Thank you for removing the stump from the creek. The neighbors would like to find</p>	

ways to work with the city. Mr. Machle's major concern surrounds erosion issues which impact safety, and something needs to be done prior to spring run-off. The residents are being tasked with paying for and repairing damaged structures as part of the recovery, but are being told they must do any mitigation to the city's standards; that seems unfair. One safety concern is the rock wall near Mr. Machle's property is falling down. There is a large erosion patch occurring on private property, but working with the city to build to city standards is a difficult process.

Helen El Mallakh: Ms. El Mallakh provided a power point presentation on what went wrong on Willowbrook Road. The culvert failed so catastrophically and by doing so, there was no water in the creek due to water flows being diverted to properties rather than the creek bed. The Gregory Canyon Gulch is not taken into consideration for mitigation. If there is a large spring runoff and no maintenance done to this gulch, more water is going to adversely affect the neighborhood.

The board asked staff to answer some of the questions presented during public comment.

General Staff Response:

Council is prioritizing maintaining the drainage ways prior to spring run-off. The actual restoration of some of the areas in the city will take longer. The city is currently working on a bid to get sediment removed from the drainage ways. The city's focus will be on city owned and maintained land. Private property owners impacted with a drainage way running thru their property would need to apply for a floodplain and wetland permit.

Community dialogue in response to staff:

The neighbors would like to know specifically, what is the responsibility of the residents vs. what is the city's responsibility. The neighbors are planning to convene after the new year and will be discussing the issue of granting easements to the city.

Agenda Item 4 – Public hearing and WRAB Consideration of a Recommendation to City Council Regarding the 2014 City Council Work Plan and Goals [8:14 p.m.]

Jeff Arthur presented the item to the board.

Executive Summary from the Packet Materials:

City Council has requested that each city board and commission respond to three questions related to 2014 work program and goals. Responses will be considered during the annual City Council retreat scheduled for January 12-13, 2014. The questions were forwarded to WRAB members with a request to provide input for inclusion in the December agenda materials. Responses are included as Attachment A and are intended to allow for more efficient discussion and consensus building around a recommended motion.

Public Comment:

None

WRAB Discussion Included:

- Develop a brochure or outreach tool to provide people basic information on how to deal with flood recovery (i.e. permitting process, public vs. private responsibilities)
- What is the city doing with the vast amount of information collected at the open houses and from various forms of communication with community members? Staff response: The data collected will help us calibrate floodplain modeling and mapping.
- How will the modelers use the information gathered around sediment? Staff response: The city has never done debris-flow modeling. The modeling is probability based analysis and what the probability of deviation for water flow is.
- Board members amended the provided draft document as part of their discussion.

Motion: Made by: Squillace; Seconded by: Clancy: Motion to approve the draft document as amended.

Vote: 5:0

Agenda Item 5 – Matters

[9:22 p.m.]

From the Board:

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

- The annual Natural Hazards conference in June will have a preliminary session on lessons learned from the Boulder flood.
- Foundation for Water Education has a sequence of pamphlets for everything from conservation to water law.

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

- City of Boulder was featured in the American Water Works Association Opflow magazine and it speaks to the resiliency of our water system and how we had only 10 of the city's 28,600 metered customers loose water during the flood. Kudos to staff!

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

- The city finally has appeased the FERC in testing a gate up at Barker.

From Staff: [9:26 p.m.]

- Impacts of cost escalation are becoming apparent and trends may be clearer as more of the recovery occurs throughout the state.
- Sump pumps are continuing to run due to an elevated ground water table. The city may be more flexible in allowing for residents to resolve any icing issues caused by pumping.

Agenda Item 6 – Discussion on Future Schedule [9:31 p.m.]

Jeff Arthur presented the item to the board.

Executive Summary from the Packet Materials:

As part of the Nov. 18, 2013 WRAB packet, staff provided a memorandum outlining flood impacts, capital improvement plan considerations, policy issues, and financial considerations for each of the three utilities enterprises (Attachment A) to help guide a discussion of future schedule. This memorandum is intended to provide additional information regarding upcoming items that are expected to require WRAB consideration in 2014. Staff is seeking input on the potential items and any additional items that may warrant consideration next year.

WRAB Discussion Included:

- What is the likely turnout from the public for the CIP discussions? Staff response: There is an assumption the 2015 CIP discussion will involve more public interaction due to individuals wishing to bring up flood recovery issues.
- WRAB meetings at various water treatment plants would help to better understand the items on the CIP.
- Meetings in the neighborhoods to bring in more public input.
- Board members shared topics which carry priority weight for items to discuss in the CIP.

Agenda Item 9 – Adjournment [9:53 p.m.]

There being no further business to come before the Board at this time, by motion regularly adopted, the meeting was adjourned at 9:53 p.m.

Motion to adjourn by: Squillace; Seconded by: Scharnhorst

Motion Passes 5:0

Date, Time, and Location of Next Meeting:

The next WRAB meeting will be Monday, 27 January 2014 due to the Martin Luther King Jr. Holiday at 7:00 p.m., in the West Conference Room, 1st floor of the municipal building, 1777 Broadway unless directed by staff or the board.

APPROVED BY:

ATTESTED BY:

Board Chair

Board Secretary

Date

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.