



LARIMER COUNTY | ENGINEERING DEPARTMENT

P.O. Box 1190, Fort Collins, Colorado 80522-1190, 970.498.5700, Larimer.org

FLOOD REVIEW BOARD

Date: July 24, 2025

Time: 8:30 AM, MDT

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

Contact: Tina Kurtz, Larimer County Engineering Department

MEETING MINUTES

Staff Present: Tina Kurtz, Eric Tracy, Alan Kee, Connor Sheldon

Staff Online: None

Board Members Present: Chad Morris, Daniel Richardson, Matthew Hickox, Dr. Chris Thornton, John Hunt

Board Members Online: None

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

Introductions

Election of Vice-Chair

Appointment of a Vice-Chair for the Flood Review Board for 2025.

Mr. Morris motioned to elect John Hunt as the Flood Review Board Vice-Chair for 2025.

Mr. Hickox seconded the motion.

Further Discussion:

None

Vote:

Mr. Hunt – Abstain

Dr. Thornton – Yes

Mr. Morris – Yes

Mr. Darrow – Absent

Mr. Rounsaville – Absent

Mr. Richardson – Yes

Mr. Hickox - Yes



Motion passed [4-0], 1 abstention

Item 1: Approval of June 26, 2025, Board meeting minutes

Motion:

Mr. Richardson motioned to approve the June 26, 2025, Board meeting minutes.

Mr. Morris seconded the motion.

Further Discussion:

None

Vote:

Mr. Hunt – Abstain

Dr. Thornton – Abstain

Mr. Morris – Yes

Mr. Darrow – Absent

Mr. Rounsaville – Absent

Mr. Richardson – Yes

Mr. Hickox - Yes

Motion passed [3-0], 2 abstentions.

Discussion Items:

1. A petition filed by Alex Hoime, HT Land Partners 200, LLC for a Floodplain Project Review for a water line, outfalls, gravel road access grading, trail grading, and two water quality pond spillways within the Little Thompson River Zone AE (Floodway) Floodplain Overlay District at the following location to wit: Section 33, Township 4 North, Range 69 West, Larimer County, CO also known as 2020 South County Road 21, Berthoud, CO

Applicants Present: Alex Hoime, Jarred Corbell, Connor Griffin

Ms. Kurtz introduced the Floodplain Project Review project. The overall project is for a new development by Berthoud within the Little Thompson River floodway. The work in the floodway consists of a waterline installation which will involve trenching in three places and boring underneath the Little Thompson; two outfalls; two water quality ponds; and grading for a gravel access road and a trail which will both be at grade.

Mr. Hoime gave an overview of the project. There will be 43 two acre lots and three 35 acre lots. The lots on the south side of the project are outside of the floodplain. The work in the floodplain is in phase 2 of the project. There is dedicated open space within the floodplain.



Mr. Griffin went over maps of the project showing the items in the floodway. They pulled as much of the project out of the floodway as possible. All the building envelopes are out of the floodplain.

The waterline will be bored under the Little Thompson River and trenches for installation will be put back to grade. Mr. Morris asked what the depth below the channel would be. The answer was that it would be around 10' below the lowest point in the channel. They do not think it will be in bedrock. It will be a 16" HDPE pipe with no encasement crossing the river.

Mr. Hickox mentioned survey data vs FEMA data and wondered if the data is accurately reflected. He also questioned whether aggradation and degradation were adequately addressed. Mr. Griffin answered that the line depth on the cross-sections was based on the topography. Mr. Morris said that this river leans to aggradation and that the banks move around. Mr. Griffin said that they used LiDAR data in the analysis. The Board discussed that there could be a datum shift of 3 feet.

Mr. Hunt said a 2D transport model would be good to have and asked what there is to cause scour in that reach. Mr. Griffin answered that there are no obstacles, just a straight reach. Mr. Hickox referenced the pinch point upstream based on looking at the floodplain. Mr. Morris said there is a little bit of armoring in this reach. Mr. Hunt mentioned channel mobility laterally from 600-800 on the cross-section picture and said they would have 100 feet to work with. Mr. Morris said maybe there would be more mobility than 100 feet on each side. Mr. Griffin said that there was a shift during the 2013 flood that occurred because of a log jam on County Road 21. He also said that there is 5-foot depth at 500 and 600 on the cross-section in the scour report.

Mr. Hunt said that for the two outfalls the Board needs to see the grading plan. There was a discussion of the cut and fill grading for the outfalls. Mr. Hunt asked what the outfall diameters were, and the answer was 18 inches on both.

Mr. Hickox had a question about the no-rise analysis due to fill over the east outfall pipe as it is shown on the construction drawings. Mr. Hunt asked where the east outfall pipe would be in relation to the cross-section as the cross-section on the culvert misses the fill. The Board said that the existing ground profile needs to be drawn correctly.

There was discussion of not having certainty of a no-rise condition due to the topography at the east outfall outlet. Mr. Hunt said that if any point ends up above grade as shown on design plans, they need to have modeling show a no-rise.

The Board discussed what they would like to see in the next submittal.



Motion:

Mr. Hunt moved to recommend tabling this application for 120 days to provide the applicant with an opportunity to provide the Board with the following items as listed:

1. Provide the 1D and 2D models.
2. Expand the narrative of the scour analysis to include the transport function used and the d50.
3. Provide a lateral stability assessment.
4. Clarification on outfall grading to see no fill in the floodway or make it clear in the model that fill in the floodway doesn't show a rise.
5. Clarification on datums.
6. Update construction drawing profile.

Mr. Richardson seconded the motion.

Further Discussion:

The Board gave the applicant two weeks to resubmit the application if they want to bring this item back for the August Board meeting.

Vote:

Mr. Hunt – Yes
Dr. Thornton – Yes
Mr. Morris – Yes
Mr. Darrow – Absent
Mr. Rounsaville – Absent
Mr. Richardson – Yes
Mr. Hickox – Yes

Motion passed [5-0].

2. Discussion of and recommendation to the County Engineer for a hydraulic and hydrologic study of the Miller Fork Basin at the following location to wit: Sections 23, 26 and 27, Township 6 North, Range 72 West, Larimer County, CO

Applicants Present: Dylan Armstrong, Ayres Associates; Eric Tracy, Larimer County Engineering Department

Mr. Hunt and Mr. Hickox abstained from this item.



Ms. Kurtz introduced the project. This study is for a portion of Black Creek and a portion of Miller Fork located in The Retreat area of the North Fork Big Thompson Basin. There has been significant flooding and infrastructure issues post-Cameron Peak fire in this area. This project is to potentially create a regulatory flood prone area which would be a County only designation. There will be outreach to the landowners and meetings with the Planning Commission and Board of County Commissioners prior to adoption of any regulatory flood zone.

Mr. Armstrong gave a PowerPoint presentation describing primarily the hydrology and hydraulics of the project.

Mr. Morris talked about calibration of the hydrology model and mentioned that the documentation should say something about calibration.

Mr. Hunt left the meeting at 10:30.

Dr. Thornton asked if the 2D model showed it to be supercritical. Mr. Armstrong said that it didn't.

Mr. Armstrong said that there would be a larger extent in the 2D model, and that it would have been 10% wider.

Dr. Thornton asked what the effect on structures in the 2D model was and Mr. Armstrong said that there weren't any structures affected in the 2D model that weren't affected in the 1D model.

Mr. Armstrong mentioned that there is a 2D model in only a portion of the study area.

Motion:

Mr. Richardson moved to recommend adoption of the Miller Fork Basin hydraulic and hydrologic study for use in the potential future adoption of a regulatory flood prone area to the County Engineer.

Mr. Morris seconded the motion.

Further Discussion:

None

Vote:

Mr. Hunt – Absent

Dr. Thornton – Yes

Mr. Morris – Yes

Mr. Darrow – Absent

Mr. Rounsaville – Absent

Mr. Richardson – Yes

Mr. Hickox – Abstain



Motion passed [3-0], 1 abstention

Item 3: Other Business:

Discussed upcoming agendas

Meeting adjourned at 10:51 a.m., MDT.