
**PROGRESS MEETING FOR
COAL CREEK AND ROCK CREEK (CCRC) MDP & FHAD
MEETING MINUTES**

Date: August 27, 2012
Location: City of Lafayette
Distributions: Agenda, Revised Schedule, Summary of Comments, Table B-2 Future Land Use, Existing & Future Land Use maps.

Attendees:

| NAME | ORGANIZATION |
|------------------|---------------------|
| Rebecca Baker | City of Broomfield |
| Peter Johnson | City of Lafayette |
| Rick Moser | RESPEC |
| David Delagarza | RESPEC |
| Tony Tran | RESPEC |
| Teresa Patterson | RESPEC |
| Wendi Palmer | Town of Erie |
| Alex Ariniello | Town of Superior |
| Shea Thomas | UDFCD |

I. Purpose

The purpose of this meeting was to review the comments for the draft Baseline Hydrology sections of the Coal Creek and Rock Creek Major Drainageway Plan.

II. Hydrology Review Comments

The electronic PDF containing all the project sponsor review comments is available for download via UDFCD Dropbox. Teresa went over review comments that warranted group discussion. Other comments that were not discussed will be addressed in most cases as the reviewer intended. A summarized list of the review comments is attached with the meeting minutes. The following summarizes the discussion for each of the comments.

Comments 2 and 3: To maintain consistency with the future alternative reach descriptions (reaches are numbered and discussed from downstream to upstream), the project area description will remain describing Coal Creek and Rock Creek from downstream to upstream. However, text will be revisited to discourage the notion that water is flowing uphill.

Comments 6 and 7: City and County of Broomfield will be added.

Comment 8 / Future Land Use: Wendi expressed concern regarding the designated future % impervious values. She felt they were too high and not an accurate representation of what has been developed in Erie. The higher future % impervious designations are consequently producing higher future peak flows. Wendi recommended taking into consideration the new stormwater design regulations for development and redevelopment by local governments over the past few years and reassess the % impervious designations used for future Land Use. The % impervious assigned to the land use designations is based on information published in the UDFCD Criteria manual.

- Shea will investigate basis for % impervious values published in UDFCD Criteria manual.
- Impervious layer available in Broomfield to be used for comparison purposes.

Comments 10, 11, and 25: The Land Use legend indicating the % impervious as part of the interactive Hydrology Map should have reflected a range (i.e. 0-10% Impervious) rather than a single value. To provide more clarity regarding the Land Use layers, the range of impervious values will be displayed using a solid and non-transparent color range on the Hydrology Map.

- RESPEC will send out the revised Existing & Future Land Use maps as well as Existing vs Future Land Use comparison map. The comparison layer will also be added to the interactive Hydrology Map pdf.
- For additional reader value, example descriptions for typical Land Use % impervious designations will be included for Table 2-1 and 2-2.

Comments 12, 14, and 17: Throughout the report text when the entire watershed is being referenced, “Coal Creek/Rock creek Watershed” will replace just “Coal Creek Watershed”.

Comment 20: Design points 5110 and 5112 will be added to the summary table and additional text will be included to provide an engineering justification on why the future flows are increasing to the extent shown. Also, the addition of a design point west of 6010 will be considered.

Comment 23: A traditional SWMM schematic will not be provided due to the newer digital interactive format, but inserts/blow-ups will be necessary to clarify SWMM routing in areas where overlapping of labels exist.

Comment 29: The peak flow profiles were based on the reported values in the table and the “blip” was a result of the table values being rounded to the nearest two significant figures. It was decided that values reported in the range of 1000 to 9999 will be reported to 3 significant digits. This should provide smoother peak flow profiles.

Comment 30: This will be completed and the conclusions will be shared with the project sponsors.

III. Mapping and Schedule

Shea announced that UDFCD plans to have the project mapping available to RESPEC in three to four weeks. When taking into account that RESPEC is allowed three weeks to address the

baseline hydrology review comments and the timing of the project mapping, Teresa provided an updated project schedule based on RESPEC receiving the mapping by October 1st. Once the mapping is available, the FHAD portion of the study will commence. Approximately four to six weeks into the FHAD, a preliminary floodplain will have been developed and then the alternatives can begin to be developed.

The timing of the mapping and completion of the alternatives will drive the date of the public meeting. Also, Shea suggested that everyone consider holding only one public meeting rather than the two, as originally planned. Therefore the public meetings planned for October 4th and October 10th are postponed until a later date.

Due to timing of the mapping and the anticipated progress in late September, it was decided that the next scheduled progress meeting on September 24th would not be beneficial and instead will be pushed back until October 22nd (at 1:00 pm, Town of Erie). At the next progress meeting the details of the public meeting(s) will be re-visited.

IV. Action Items

Action items:

Project Sponsors

- UDFCD – To inquire regarding the basis for designated % impervious land use values published in UDFCD criteria manual. To notify RESPEC and project sponsors if any changes will be made.
- Broomfield – Provide RESPEC with Land Use layer for comparison purposes.

RESPEC

- Send out Existing and Future Land Use maps for sponsor feedback.
- Address Review comments by September 14th, 2012.