

## MEETING MINUTES

### Willow Creek Tributaries MDP

#### Progress Meeting

Virtual | January 17, 2024 | 2:00PM

#### Attendees:

MHFD – Jen Winters, Jon Villines

SEMSWA – Jessica Traynor

Douglas County – Brad Robenstein

SSPRD – Melissa Reese-Thacker, Joe Odrzywolski

ICON – Craig Jacobson, James Duvall, Jackson Winterrowd

#### 1. General Items

- a. ICON submitted the FHAD Step 4 – Final Review on 1/11/2024. The FHAD is under review by MHFD.
  1. ICON will share the FHAD report and workmaps with SEMSWA and Douglas County; however, SEMSWA and Douglas County indicated that they would not be conducting a technical review of the hydraulic models or detailed output tables.
- b. ICON briefly reviewed the 2024 scope & budget contributions for the MDP.
  1. ICON is currently partially scoped through Alternatives Development, not including Alternative Selection or the final report deliverables. Per conversations in 2023, MHFD, SEMSWA, Douglas County, and the City of Lone Tree will provide the remainder of the Alternatives Development scope in 2024.
    1. Following the meeting, ICON will provide MHFD with a detailed cost breakdown.
  2. MHFD will invoice Douglas County and the City of Lone Tree directly for their contributions rather than going through a formal IGA.

#### 2. Problem Identification Status Update

- a. ICON provided a progress report for the 5 key Problem Identification categories as detailed below. The discussion included description of the metrics and input data utilized for each category and a walkthrough of the GIS maps that have been prepared to visualize the analysis.
- b. Water Quality
  1. ICON used GIS points for existing detention and water quality ponds to symbolize subbasins that currently have some level of water quality treatment.
  2. The presented GIS map for Problem Identification will evolve during the Alternatives Development phase to include potential locations where regional inline detention and local water quality treatments (e.g. retrofits of outlet structures or replacing concrete rundowns with vegetated swales) could be implemented.
- c. Flooding
  1. All roadway crossings within the study area have been symbolized by whether the crossing has 100-year capacity.
    1. ICON used the 1D FHAD model to analyze crossings within the FHAD study limits and 2D models to analyze the crossings outside of the FHAD extents.
    2. The Crossings – Problem ID layer will be updated to show whether the crossing meets SEMSWA/Selected design criteria.
      - a. SEMSWA criteria states that for collector roads, no overtopping is allowed for the 10-year event and that there may be a maximum of 12” depth in the gutter flowline for the 100-year event. No overtopping is allowed for arterial roadways.



2. FHAD 100-year Floodplain and Floodway
  1. ICON noted that the FHAD floodplains and floodways will be finalized after one more FHAD submittal (Step 5).
  2. MHFD agreed that showing the preliminary FHAD floodplains (as submitted with Step 4) would be good information to present at public meetings as part of FHAD outreach. ICON stated that as the 100-year FHAD models have previously been reviewed, only minor changes are anticipated to come out of the Step 4 review. No insurable structures are shown in the 100-year floodplain.
3. 2D 100-year Floodplains
  1. ICON has developed 2-Dimensional HEC-RAS models (lower resolution than the 1D FHAD HEC-RAS models) for all non-FHAD tributaries primarily for the purpose of evaluating crossing capacities.
  2. The team agreed that due to the unofficial nature of the 2D floodplains, being that they have not been formally reviewed to the same extent as the 1D FHAD floodplains, the 2D floodplains will not be provided as a digital deliverable for this study.
    - a. ICON will provide cleaned up 2D floodplains to the project stakeholders for informational purposes only.
- d. Stream Function
  1. ICON is utilizing the active management dashboard's "Stream Conditions", "Erosion Hazards", and "Headcuts" GIS layers to identify stream health problems within the study area.
  2. ICON noted that this data will be further organized into one "Stream Function" polyline layer and one "Erosion Points" point layer for the Problem ID maps. ICON is working through the data and there will be more mapping progress to show at the next progress meeting.
- e. Maintenance
  1. ICON is utilizing the active management dashboard's "Point of Interest", "Grade Control", "Outfalls", and "Crossing Inspection" GIS layers along with the provided SEMSWA and SSPRD maintenance comments to identify maintenance issues within the study area.
  2. ICON noted that this data will be further organized into "General Maintenance" and "Vegetation Management" layers for the Problem ID maps. ICON is working through the data and there will be more mapping progress to show at the next progress meeting.
- f. Social Vulnerability
  1. ICON asked about how stakeholders would like to incorporate social vulnerability into the master planning effort.
    1. MHFD mentioned they have a standard social vulnerability dataset, developed in coordination with Michael Baker, that is based on a FEMA template. Jon noted that MHFD's GIS team will be able to send ICON these layers for incorporation.
    2. ICON noted that this data may best be suited for helping to rank the priority of alternatives during the Alternatives Development and Alternatives Selection phases.
    3. SEMSWA requested that ICON prepare a study area map with the clipped census data to show at the next internal progress meeting.

### 3. Project Website

- a. ICON shared the progress of the public website which can be found at the following link:  
<https://www.iconeng.com/project/willow-creek-tributaries/index.html>
  1. The project stakeholders requested that ICON keep track of public survey response comments. ICON will provide a summary of comments to the stakeholders.
  2. Prior to the public meeting, the public website will include a link to the ESRI StoryMap once the StoryMap is developed.
  3. SEMSWA requested that their contact information on the public website reference their general office contact information.
  4. MHFD will add the public website link to their website with the other ongoing FHAD & MDP studies.

### 4. Public Meeting

- a. Location



1. Melissa (SSPRD) offered to host the public meeting at South Suburban Sports Complex on County Line Road.
2. MHFD suggested that the room should have capacity for 100+ people as there has been large turnouts in the past at this venue.
3. Joe (SSPRD) confirmed that the South Suburban Sports Complex has a room that should be big enough for this project and they have hosted these types of meetings in the past.

b. Time & Date

1. ICON suggested that the middle of March be targeted for the public meeting date. This should give ample time to wrap up the Problem ID phase and engage the public. ICON proposed the following schedule for the 8 weeks leading up to the public meeting:
  1. Approximately 2 weeks for ICON complete the Problem Identification phase.
  2. Approximately 2 weeks for ICON to publish an ESRI StoryMap and develop any needed materials.
  3. Approximately 2 weeks for MHFD to develop and send out the public meeting notifications.
  4. Approximately 2 weeks after the mailers are sent out to give the community time to plan and for word to spread.
2. MHFD and SEMSWA indicated that the meeting time should be after work hours during the work week. ICON suggested a starting time of 6:30pm.

c. Notifications

1. ICON asked how the stakeholders usually coordinate the notification mailers and who in the study area should be included.
2. MHFD responded that they will ask their GIS team how notifications have been performed in the past. MHFD noted that they can either apply a buffer from the centerline of the tributaries or invite all residents within the study area.
3. Douglas County mentioned that it may be best to limit the notifications to the stream corridors to minimize comments on local drainage concerns not involving the Willow Creek tributaries.
4. SEMSWA noted that they have in-house social media capabilities which can be utilized to share the public meeting information through multiple online avenues.

d. Meeting Format

1. The team discussed the preferred format of the public meeting and suggested needed materials and visual aids that should be prepared.
2. MHFD noted that a printout map could be provided along with sticky notes for residents to place comments spatially.
3. SEMSWA noted that at past public meetings, laptops have been provided at the venue for attendees to add comments to online maps.

## 5. Action Items

a. ICON

1. Share the FHAD Step 4 submittal with SEMSWA and Douglas County.
2. Update website contact information according to the notes in Section 3, above.
3. Invite Jon Nelson and Nicole Harwell to the future progress meetings as they are both listed as Willow Creek CIP managers.
4. Invite Joe Odrzywolski to future progress meetings.
5. Prepare draft public meeting presentation materials to show at the next internal progress meeting.
6. Provide SSPRD (Joe Odrzywolski) with potential dates for a public meeting.

b. SSPRD

1. Check availability of the public meeting room at the South Suburban Sports Complex for the middle of March

c. MHFD



1. Coordinate with GIS team regarding how notifications letters have been distributed for previous projects.
2. Coordinate with GIS team to send ICON the social vulnerability dataset.
3. Add the Willow Creek Tributaries MDP website link on the MHFD website.

**- END OF MEETING MINUTES -**

---

*To the best of my knowledge, these minutes are a factual account of the business conducted, the discussions that took place, and the decisions that were reached at the subject meeting. Please direct any exceptions to these minutes in writing to the undersigned within ten (10) days of the issue date appearing herein. Failure to do so will constitute acceptance of these minutes as statements of fact in which you concur.*

Minutes prepared by: Jackson Winterrowd | 01/24/2024  
ICON Engineering Inc