

54th and Pecos OSP – Baseline Hydrology Comments

ATTENDEES: Shea Thomas/UDFCD Danny Elsner/CH2M
 Anna Sparks/Adams County Dan Hill/CH2M
 Russell Nelson/Adams County Haley Heinemann/CH2M

PREPARED BY: Haley Heinemann

MEETING DATE: February 23, 2017

LOCATION: UDFCD

PROJECT: 683292

Summary

The purpose of this meeting was to discuss comments on the Draft Baseline Hydrology report. The intent was to discuss questions, issues, etc. that were identified in the comments received on February 20, 2017. The comment log is attached to the end of this meeting summary. The resolutions to the issues discussed in this meeting will be incorporated into the hydrologic modeling and Final Baseline Hydrology report to be submitted to the stakeholders in mid-March.

- **Review of comment log**

- The group reviewed the comments made on the Draft Baseline Hydrology report, which were compiled into a log of 42 items. A handful of specific comments were discussed.
 - Comment #5: The group discussed how the report describes the overlap of the southern 54th and Pecos OSP drainage area with the northern drainage area of the Globeville/Utah Junction OSP.
 - It was decided that this section should be expanded to discuss the other areas of overlap and how each area was reconciled in this study.
 - ACTION – CH2M to expand discussion of basin overlap in the report. CH2M will also clarify report by moving the text to a subsection for “Coordination with Globeville.”
 - Comment #24: Direct peak flow comparisons with the 1989 OSP are difficult to make due to differences in basin delineation and routing. Current documentation in the report was selected in order to depict a large quantity of overland flow, which flows to the northeast between basins following the natural terrain.
 - It was decided that in addition to the description of the northeast inter-basin flow, the report should also compare relative runoff for the overall watershed.
 - ACTION – CH2M to add comparison of relative watershed runoff in CFS/AC to the 1989 OSP. Text will discuss reasons for differences in flow.

- **Soil Type:** The group discussed NRCS soil report data in comparison to nearby soil types. It was decided that the soil report should not be modified, even though it was noted that the report likely predates the construction of Cat Lake.
 - ACTION – CH2M to add date of NRCS soil report to report and figures and clarify discussion of Cat Lake in the report.
- **Basin CC-A:** Russel noted that flow in the southeast corner of Basin CC-A may flow to the northeast instead of the northwest direction identified in the hydrology.
 - ACTION – CH2M to review terrain data in this area and provide screenshot for the stakeholders.
- **Routing Maps:** The Routing Maps were missing internal basin IDs and the overall map needed to be reviewed and cleaned.
 - ACTION – CH2M to review PDF loading issues with Routing Maps and fix.
- **Schedule:**
 - Final Baseline Hydrology Report will be submitted to the stakeholders in mid-March.
 - CH2M will begin work on the Alternatives Analysis.
 - Team will meet again in mid-April to discuss conceptual ideas for the Alternatives.

Action Items

1. ACTION: CH2M to expand discussion of basin overlap in the report. CH2M will also clarify report by moving the text to a subsection for “Coordination with Globeville.”
2. ACTION: CH2M to add comparison of relative watershed runoff in CFS/AC to the 1989 OSP. Text will discuss reasons for differences in flow.
3. ACTION: CH2M to add date of NRCS soil report to report and figures and clarify discussion of Cat Lake in the report.
4. ACTION: CH2M to review terrain data in this area and provide screenshot for the stakeholders.
5. ACTION: CH2M to review PDF loading issues with Routing Maps and fix.