

FLOOD REVIEW BOARD

Date: August 26, 2021

Time: 8:30 AM, MDT

Location: Lake Estes Conference Room, 3rd Floor, 200 W Oak St., Fort Collins, and Zoom meeting

Contact: Tina Kurtz, Larimer County Engineering Department

MEETING MINUTES

Staff Present: Tina Kurtz (remote), Devin Traff

Board Members: Bets Ervin-Blankenheim (remote), Chris Thornton (remote), John Hunt, Chad Morris (Remote)

Applicants Present: Michael Turner, Anderson Consulting Engineers (representing Larimer County)

Call to Order: Dr. Thornton opened the meeting at 8:32 a.m., MDT

Introductions

Item #1: North Fork Big Thompson PMR

Ms. Kurtz and Mr. Traff introduced the project. This is a petition filed on behalf of Larimer County Engineering Department to review a map amendment proposal to revise the regulatory floodplain boundaries along the North Fork of the Big Thompson River between Drake and Glen Haven. This project ties into the North Fork of the Big Thompson Colorado Hazard Mapping Program (CHAMP) model which ends just downstream of Glen Haven and will eventually tie into the Big Thompson Canyon Physical Map Revision (PMR).

Mr. Turner gave a brief overview of the project.

Mr. Morris asked about the permitting status and stability of the seven bridges built after the 2013 flood. Mr. Turner and Mr. Traff answered that all of them were permitted by the County under a no-rise condition and the stability was addressed in the modeling for each bridge. The as-built information from these bridges was incorporated into the North Fork model.

There was a discussion about the restoration work that was done between Storm Mt. Road and Drake and whether it was incorporated into the North Fork model. Mr. Turner said that the as-builts were incorporated and the work was permitted by the County.

There was a discussion of the hydrology used for the model.



The mountain criteria for floodway delineation is no longer applicable. This is what was previously used in the Big Thompson Basin upstream of the Narrows. This report follows the current Colorado Water Conservation Board (CWCB) requirements for floodway delineation.

This project captures what has been done in this stream reach since the effective map in 1979. This map change reflects the current conditions and the current flood risk. It was mentioned that the channel has completely changed from the flood, so it is a different system now. This is the main driver of the change, not the bridges.

Cleaning-up the 1979 mapping to incorporate all of the changes since, including the aftermath of the 2013 flood, results in an impact to existing structures. Some structures are being put into the floodplain, some have BFE increases, and some are being taken out of the floodplain. Given this, there was a discussion on landowner notification procedures. The incorporation of this project into the Big Thompson Canyon PMR is years away. Notifications will be done as part of that process.

The post-2013 flood reconstruction of County Road 43 was submitted to the County as a 2-D model showing a no rise condition. The County permitting of private crossings that were replaced after the flood was done individually. These crossings showed a no-rise condition using the best available data which was either the effective model or the effective mapping.

There was a discussion of Manning's n values used in this project. In particular, the pre-flood heavy vegetation in this area which was removed by the flood resulting in a smoother surface. Future vegetation in the area may result in a future evaluation.

There was a discussion on how the existing rise due to changes in the channel and the road project will be treated by CWCB and FEMA. The question arose as to whether mitigation will be required or will it be integrated into the new map without mitigation.

The downstream tie-in was discussed, specifically concurrent floods on the Big Thompson and the North Fork. The report for this project said that it would not happen. However, when the Big Thompson FIRM is produced, they may use the most conservative approach which is both rivers flooding at the same time.

The Board discussed whether the project information would be considered the best available data for regulatory purposes and what the process is to make that happen. Mr. Traff said it would take CWCB adoption of the data.

Motion:

Mr. Hunt motioned to recommend approval of the North Fork Big Thompson study and map amendment proposal to the County Engineer and to forward it to the Colorado Water Conservation Board for approval to use as Best Available data. Ms. Ervin-Blankenheim seconded. Motion passed 4-0.



Item #2: Approval of April 22, 2021, Board meeting minutes

Ms. Ervin-Blankenheim made a motion to approve the April 22, 2021, Board meeting minutes. Mr. Hunt seconded. Motion passed 3-0. Mr. Morris abstained.

Meeting adjourned at 9:30 am, MDT.