



## PROGRESS MEETING FOR UPPER FIRST CREEK PLANNING & FHAD STUDY MEETING MINUTES

Date: July 22, 2008  
Location: Urban Drainage and Flood Control District Conference Room A  
Distributions: Map Indicating Problem Areas, Alternatives Matrix

Attendees:

Name	Organization	Email
Ken MacKenzie	UDFCD	
David Mallory	UDFCD	
Shea Thomas	UDFCD	
Brian Schat	City of Denver Public Works	
Kevin Wegener	City of Aurora Public Works	
Clinton Weisz	Aurora Water	
Stacey Thompson	Arapahoe County	
Teresa Patterson	Moser & Associates	
David Delagarza	Moser & Associates	
Alisha Goldstein	Moser & Associates	

### I. Purpose

The purpose of this meeting was to discuss progress on the FHAD and alternatives and review problem areas of concerns.

### II. Study Watershed

#### Baseline Hydrology Report

- Ken asked for any comments on the hydrology before he declared it accepted.
- Kevin Wegener noted that the baseline hydrology doesn't include the effect of interim detention ponds put in until the regional detention is built (i.e. Adonea).

#### FHAD

- Teresa reviewed the HEC-RAS modeling results areas at Peña Boulevard and the I-70/E-470 Interchange and discussed that due to large baseline flows (twice those of existing), the available mapping is insufficient to map the FHAD floodplain.
- The point was raised that the floodplain delineation resulting from the future land -use and existing detention would not serve a useful purpose because it wouldn't be used as a floodplain enforcement tool. The existing IGA and good practice would necessitate that regional ponds be constructed long before reaching the reported high flow rates. Therefore, obtaining the extra mapping may not be necessary. This issue will be reviewed by Ken, Dave, and Bill for clarification before proceeding.
- Clinton informed us that City of Aurora LIDAR mapping will probably be available for use in 2 weeks.
- Another alternative to gain the mapping would be from development mapping for the Prologics Development east of E-470 and the E-470 LOMR being completed by DMJM.

- The flow split at Peña Boulevard could possibly be modeled by showing an arrow indicating direction and amount of flow lost. Floodplain risks are not an issue unless Peña Boulevard is overtopped because the flow passes through DIA and federal lands and would have no effect on homes.

#### Alternatives

- David D. discussed the problem area already identified.
- David D presented the Alternatives Screening Matrix and described each of the different alternative categories.
- The goal of the alternatives will be to match flow conditions at roadways and other major structures specified in the IGA. The IGA should be treated as a guideline but checked for effectiveness.
- The Blue Grama Pond will be modeled according to the CH2M Hill Conceptual Plan. The proposed ponds in Green Valley Ranch East will be considered per the Stantec plan.
- Specifically with respect to the City of Aurora, propose alternatives that would make considerations for development.
- Aurora and Denver want culverts to be designed so that major roadways are not overtopped during the 100-year event. The 500-year even will be considered when examining the freeways.
- Noted that Colfax will be realigned to the south affecting the embankment for the I-70 pond. This may be affected by the American Quality Landscape Development in Arapahoe County.

### **III. Next Meeting**

The next progress meeting was tentatively set for August 19 at 1:30pm at UDFCD.

### **IV. Action Items**

- Moser will contact Brain Schat to obtain Denver Base Mapping
- Moser will contact sue Lu or Stacy at Arapahoe County for the development plans of the American Quality Landscape Development.
- Once Ken, Dave, and Bill have discussed the FHAD mapping issues, the list of structures to be surveyed will be finalized. At a minimum, Ken will have the railroad bridge north of Smith Road and the new Conspan bridge at Tower Rd surveyed.