

# MEETING MINUTES

<b>Date:</b>	July 13, 2023
<b>RE:</b>	Brantner Gulch MDP Alternatives Submittal Discussion
<b>Project #</b>	018-2897

## ANTICIPATED ATTENDEES

Attendance	Name	Company	E-mail
x	Andy Stewart	Mile High Flood District (MHFD)	<a href="mailto:astewart@mhfd.org">astewart@mhfd.org</a>
x	Russ Nelson	Adams County	<a href="mailto:nelson@adcogov.org">nelson@adcogov.org</a>
	Denise Beltran Torresdey	Adams County	<a href="mailto:dbeltrantorresdey@adcogov.org">dbeltrantorresdey@adcogov.org</a>
x	Eden Steele	Adams County	ESteele@adcogov.org
	Trevor Graf	Adams County Parks and Open Space	<a href="mailto:tgraf@adcogov.org">tgraf@adcogov.org</a>
x	Pam Acre	City of Northglenn (Northglenn)	<a href="mailto:pacre@northglenn.org">pacre@northglenn.org</a>
x	Jim Kaiser	City of Thornton (Thornton)	<a href="mailto:Jim.kaiser@ThorntonCO.gov">Jim.kaiser@ThorntonCO.gov</a>
x	Rachelle Plas	Thornton	<a href="mailto:Rachelle.Plas@ThorntonCO.gov">Rachelle.Plas@ThorntonCO.gov</a>
x	Amy Gabor	Olsson	<a href="mailto:agabor@olsson.com">agabor@olsson.com</a>
x	Hannah Pring	Olsson	<a href="mailto:hpring@olsson.com">hpring@olsson.com</a>

The meeting was held to discuss the Draft Alternatives submittal of the study. This summary is intended to reflect the key points raised, issues for further consideration, and action items resulting from the discussions. The non-bold items comprised the meeting agenda. The items in bold resulted from the discussions.

## SUBMITTAL NAVIGATION

1. Bookmarks
2. Figure Links – Blue Text
  - a. Figure 5: Problem Areas Figure
  - b. Figure 6: Alternatives Figure
  - c. Base layer toggles

## SUBMITTAL DISCUSSION ITEMS

1. Channel-related alternatives
  - a. More general
  - b. Grade control, longitudinal slope, and channel sections not included
  - c. Modeling and calculations were done for a high-level feasibility analysis
2. Cost estimates
  - a. **Rachelle Plas:**
    - i. **A scale or range of cost for the alternatives portions would be useful and then the conceptual design could go into more detail.**
    - ii. **Costs are used in long term CIP planning and budgeting**

- iii. A general understanding of cost is used for developers
  - b. Amy Gabor:
    - i. Ranges could work
    - ii. Narrow corridors would be more expensive per lineal foot vs wide open areas.
  - c. Andy Stewart:
    - i. Average cost per linear foot for cross section width and length?
  - d. Jim Kaiser:
    - i. Brantner US of Quebec is the only developer reach that would have improvements done by the developer. Any other channel improvements are going to be implemented/initiated by the city or district.
- 3. Floodplain information
  - a. Draft 100-year floodplain, but close to what will be included with the FHAD submittal
  - b. Golf course area floodplain is continuing to be developed

## **SCHEDULE**

- 4. Anticipated Schedule
  - a. Comments back by mid-August? Project sponsors are going to evaluate commitments and get back to us on when they think comment turnaround is feasible
  - b. Once comment timeline is received, Olsson will re-evaluate the schedule

## **OTHER**

- 5. Ohio Lake Berm/Spillway
  - a. Add an alternative where there is sheet pile across the berm because of issues with trees along berm, roots rotting, prairie dog holes. Not a stable berm.
  - b. One alternative would be updating the outlet structure sooner so it doesn't overtop, and then not map the 100-year spill downstream of the detention basin.

Please contact Olsson at 303-237-2072 with changes or questions regarding these meeting minutes. These minutes will be considered final unless comments are received within seven days of distribution. Although comments will be incorporated, as appropriate, only major revisions will be redistributed.

Minutes prepared by: Hannah Pring  
cc: Attendees, File