

SBC Flood Mitigation Study - CU Meeting 5-6-10

ATTENDEES: Kurt Bauer/City of Boulder
C Jeff Lipton/ University of CO
Mark Glidden/CH2M HILL
Alan Turner/CH2M HILL

FROM: CH2M HILL

DATE: May 6, 2010

The Taggart study indicated that considerable value accrues from storage in the South Boulder Creek watershed. This study has reached the same conclusion. Several different storage, size and geometries are being considered. Jeff indicated he wanted to know how much the current study proposals differ from those in the Taggart study so that he can approach his boss and the Board of Regents.

The current study looks at three different storage concepts, ranging from 300 acre feet (AF) to over 1200 AF. Each of these has some impact on the CU South Campus and may impact the use of the land for some of the identified purposes. Jeff recognized this would probably be the case. He wanted to make sure the impacts were limited and that full advantage was taken of the designated areas, including the lower pond.

Jeff described some of the basic constraints Cu would like to impose. First, they want to try and minimize the impact to the plan they formulated and presented to us at the first workshop. This describes areas they anticipate will be inundated as well as those areas they wish to preserve for development. He also described the access road and the challenges they faced when developing that alignment. They need to maintain the proposed configuration as closely as possible. There may be some potential to modify grades but not the alignment.

The team described the 750 AF alternative. This has an 18' maximum berm height and minimizes excavation. However, it does have a pretty big impact to the identified building sites. Jeff asked if it would be possible to minimize that impact by doing some excavation and increasing the storage volume on areas not designated for development. He also expressed concerns about the extent of ponding at the current tennis court site. He encouraged the team to look at more excavation and any other means to reduce the footprint of the ponded area. He reiterated his interest in using the low area and pond to the north to the fullest extent possible. The team indicated we would look at ways to use more of the designated flooding area and reduce the impact on the sites designated for development.

Jeff did note that the fact the site has a reclamation permit means there are no designated wetlands on the site.

The team asked that Jeff provide some insights on the cost and political implications of the proposed plans. In particular, it was hoped that there would be a better understanding of the cost associated with land acquisition and any other necessary infrastructure improvements. Any other issues such as annexation or utility service needs could impact the feasibility of the alternatives and would need to be identified as early as possible.

The team mentioned that the cost of land required by other entities was getting clearer. Parks would not require any direct payment of land used. Boulder Valley Schools would require the purchase of an easement at prevailing land rates. Open space was not likely to charge for the use of their lands but were likely to require other concessions.

The schedule was discussed. The interest in having the first presentation to WRAB on June 21 and then a public meeting in July make the determination of some of the details of the CU storage site critical. It is hoped that CU can provide feedback as soon as possible.

Jeff offered that the current alternatives that show ponding at a depth of 20' at the tennis courts is unworkable and unacceptable. The team should look at excavation to minimize the depth and footprint of flooding in those areas designated for development.