



LARIMER COUNTY | ENGINEERING DEPARTMENT

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

FLOOD REVIEW BOARD

Date: March 23, 2023

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, Traci Shambo, David Pringle

Staff On Line: Steven Rothwell, Connor Sheldon, Ken Bucko, Caryn Nezat

Board Members Present: Chad Morris, John Hunt, Chris Carlson, Elisabeth Ervin-Blankenheim (Need to excuse herself at 10:00 am), Jamis Darrow, Mike Oberlander

Call to Order: Mr. Carlson opened the meeting at 8:35 a.m., MDT

Introductions

Item 1: Approval of February 23, 2023, Board meeting minutes

Motion:

Mr. Morris motioned to approve the February 23, 2023, Board meeting minutes.

Mr. Hunt seconded the motion.

Further Discussion:

None

Vote:

Mr. Hunt – Yes

Dr. Thornton – Absent

Mr. Morris – Yes

Ms. Ervin-Blankenheim – Abstained

Mr. Oberlander – Abstained

Mr. Carlson – Yes

Mr. Darrow – Abstained

Motion passed 3-0, with 3 abstentions.



Item 2: A petition filed by Oldcastle Precast, Inc. for a Variance under Section 12.1.6.E of the Larimer County Land Use Code for outdoor storage of manufactured products within the Big Thompson River Best Available Floodplain Zone AE (Flood Fringe) Floodplain Overlay District at the following location to wit: NW ¼ of Section 30, Township 5 North, Range 68 West, Larimer County, CO also known as 1820 and 1930 East Highway 402, Loveland, CO

Applicants present: Andrew Bowen, Community Planning Strategies; David Melton, Oldcastle Precast Inc.

Ms. Kurtz introduced the project to the Flood Review Board (FRB) and stated that this is a Variance request for outdoor storage of pallets with pavers below the base flood elevation. The project is located within the Big Thompson Best Available Flood Fringe. The applicable Larimer County Land Use Code (LCLUC) for the Variance request is LCLUC 12.1.6.E.

She explained that the pallets with the pavers will be stacked five high with 702 pavers per pallet. This results in the stack weighing 9,307.48 pounds. The pallets will be stored in an area where the velocity has a maximum of five feet per second. The storage area is below the base flood elevation (BFE) by a maximum of 1.4 feet.

Mr. Oberlander stated his thought is that these palettes are heavy and in a shallow flooding area and therefore he is not concerned with the request as long as they are aware of the importance to make sure palettes are loaded and will not be stored empty since empty palettes could float away.

The applicant provided more detail on why they were hoping to not bring so much fill in since they are putting their efforts into an existing structure and new structures being in compliance with floodplain regulations. Ms. Kurtz discussed how staff has been working with the applicant to ensure the structures will be elevated to the Flood Protection Elevation.

Mr. Hunt asked what the maximum depth of water is of the storage area. Ms. Kurtz stated that it is 1.4 feet. He asked about the storage of aggregate and stated he was not too concerned with pallets. The applicant said that the aggregate is walled off on three sides. He noted it will be accessed from the east and that side will be open. Mr. Hunt asked if the aggregate is clean material and applicant stated that it is.

Mr. Morris has no concerns but wants to add a restriction of no empty palettes.

Mr. Hunt asked about enforcement of conditions placed by the Board. Ms. Kurtz said that the Code Compliance Department helps with code enforcement issues.

The applicant said they will have empty storage but that will be on fill.

Mr. Darrow mentioned that his concern if the aggregate will wash away. Mr. Hunt said that he anticipates that two feet per second of flow will move sand. However, if the west side is blocked than



velocity flow will not occur. The applicant clarified that the concrete bumper on the west side is about 6-8 feet high.

Motion:

Mr. Hunt moved to recommend approval of the Oldcastle Precast Incorporated outdoor storage Variance to the County Engineer with the condition that no empty pallets are stored below the base flood elevation.

Mr. Morris seconded the motion.

Further Discussion:

None

Vote:

Mr. Hunt – Yes

Dr. Thornton – Absent

Mr. Morris – Yes

Ms. Ervin-Blankenheim – Yes

Mr. Oberlander – Yes

Mr. Carlson – Yes

Mr. Darrow – Yes

Motion passed 6-0, with 0 abstentions

Item 3: A petition filed by Patrick McKeekin with Mulberry Development, LLC for a Floodplain Project Review under Section 12.1.6.H of the Larimer County Land Use Code for the placement of underground water and sanitary lines in the Cooper Slough FEMA and Best Available Floodplain Zone AE (Floodway) Floodplain Overlay District and FEMA and Best Available Floodplain Zone AE (Flood Fringe) Floodplain Overlay District at the following location to wit: SW ¼ of Section 6, Township 7 North, Range 68 West, Larimer County, CO

Applicants Present: Suleyman Akalin, Galloway; Darren Hander, Galloway (online); David Thorpe, Hartford Homes (online)

Ms. Kurtz introduced the project and stated that this is a Floodplain Project Review request for construction of water and sewer lines under Cooper Slough. The project will involve trenching and they will return the trenched area to the existing grade. They will be placing erosion control blankets to minimize erosion. This project will result in a no-rise condition.

Mr. Akalin presented the project and explained the details in a PowerPoint presentation.

Mr. Morris has questions about scour potential. He asked if they looked at scour potential. Mr. Akalin said the velocity is very low, 0.3 feet per second at a maximum, and it is backwater so they are not



seeing erosive velocity in this area. They are providing an erosion control blanket just in case there is some loose material. Ms. Ervin-Blankenheim asked what type of blanket they will use and if it is natural or biodegradable material. Mr. Akalin said that it will be a standard blanket, straw matting with fibers.

Mr. Hunt asked about profile drawings. There was discussion on the profile sheets and the Board asked about manholes being above base flood elevation (BFE). Mr. Akalin said the manholes are above the BFE. Mr. Carlson had questions about scour analysis. He said they usually require more protection or analysis. There should be more documentation in the report to better explain why these extra analyses were not needed at this location.

Mr. Morris agrees with Mr. Carlson to ask to add more narrative on their assumptions. Mr. Oberlander asked if staff could review any Board conditions on the approval with this information being added into the report. Mr. Akalin states that because it is backwater area it will not be an issue. Mr. Morris asked them to look at a range of flow since lower flows may cause higher velocities. However, since the channel is contained, he does not anticipate this situation.

Mr. Darrow asked about the minimum criteria between the two proposed utility lines for horizontal separation. Mr. Thorpe said 10 feet of separation.

Mr. Carlson asked the applicant to check on details of the City of Fort Collins stormwater master plan for this area.

Mr. Oberlander said to check all manholes to ensure they don't float if they are below the BFE and to bolt them down. The furthest east manhole (number A1) is showing below the BFE where they are hooking on to existing main. It is an existing manhole where they are removing the stub and putting in a smaller pipe. He thinks the manhole cover should be protected.

Motion:

Ms. Ervin-Blankenheim motioned to recommend approval of the Mulberry Development, LLC placement of water and sanitary lines for the Peakview Development Floodplain Project Review to the County Engineer with the following conditions:

- The applicant's engineer shall evaluate scour and the scour evaluation shall be reviewed by staff.
- Future scour conditions shall also be considered based on the best available information pertaining to the City of Fort Collins Upper Cooper Slough Selected Plan for Improvements.
- The east manhole shall be protected from the base flood elevation floodwaters.

Mr. Darrow seconded the motion.

Further Discussion:

None

Vote:

Mr. Hunt – Yes



Dr. Thornton – Absent
Mr. Morris – Yes
Ms. Ervin-Blankenheim – Yes
Mr. Oberlander – Yes
Mr. Carlson – Yes
Mr. Darrow – Yes

Motion passed 6-0, with 0 abstentions

Item 4: A petition filed by Patrick McKeekin with Mulberry Development, LLC for a Floodplain Project Review under Section 12.1.6.H of the Larimer County Land Use Code for grading activities, detention ponds, riprap placement and stormwater outfalls in the Cooper Slough FEMA and Best Available Floodplain Zone AE (Floodway) Floodplain Overlay District and FEMA and Best Available Floodplain Zone AE (Flood Fringe) Floodplain Overlay District at the following location to wit: SW ¼ of Section 6, Township 7 North, Range 68 West, Larimer County, CO

Applicants Present: Suleyman Akalin, Galloway; Darren Hander, Galloway (online); David Thorpe, Hartford Homes (online)

Ms. Kurtz introduced the project and stated that this is a Floodplain Project Review request. The project will involve multiple grading projects including excavation to connect a culvert under Mulberry to a proposed outfall. There will also be grading and excavation for proposed detention ponds which outfall to Cooper Slough. There will be riprap at the pond spillways and pipe outlets.

Mr. Thorpe added information related to the annexation limits of the adjacent Bloom site. He explained that the remainder of the Peakview property is another applicant, and they need to do work on the Peakview site. The Peakview property is going through the annexation process. He pointed out the engineering teams for both developments have been working together. Mr. Thorpe went through the details of the grading plan.

Mr. Darrow asked to go back to the floodplain mapping in the applicant's slides. He asked for clarification on what each model intends to evaluate.

Mr. Hunt opened the floodplain models and had questions on the model labeled "NO RISE". He does not see what the model is showing related to what is proposed for grading within the floodway. He states that the model seems to show conflicting information. It appears that the grading plan is not reflected in the model. Mr. Akalin tried to clarify that they are creating a cut to widen the channel bottom in this area to make the needed tie-in/connection.

Mr. Hunts explains that he is not sure how to move forward with the models and tables provided that show conflicting information. He does not see how these two models provided show accurate results when the cross sections are so different.



Mr. Hunt said in summary that the Flood Review Board needs to see a model that represents the existing conditions and the proposed conditions. Mr. Akalin explains why this is difficult to show and why it is difficult to survey this accurately. Mr. Hunt confirms that there is not a comparison model. He also noted that he is thinking the model may have the conditions reversed and that he thinks the no-rise labeled is actually the existing ground.

Although Mr. Hunt anticipates a no-rise based on the explanations given, his position is that the Flood Review Board cannot evaluate the proposal and make a recommendation until the model is more clear.

Ms. Ervin-Blankenheim left at 10:00 am, MDT.

Motion:

Mr. Hunt moved to table the Mulberry Development, LLC grading activities, detention ponds, riprap placement and stormwater outfalls for the Peakview Development Floodplain Project Review for a maximum of 120 days to address the following items:

- A new application is needed that includes a HEC-RAS model that accurately compares proposed conditions to existing or corrected effective conditions and that the modeling should show that the proposed activities within floodway causes no-rise in both the encroached and un-encroached scenarios.

Mr. Morris seconded the motion.

Further Discussion:

While discussing conditions for tabling, Mr. Hunt and Mr. Oberlander discussed what they will need to see to explain what work is happening in the floodway and what work is happening outside of the floodway.

Vote:

Mr. Hunt – Yes

Dr. Thornton – Absent

Mr. Morris – Yes

Ms. Ervin-Blankenheim – Absent

Mr. Oberlander – Yes

Mr. Carlson – Yes

Mr. Darrow – Yes

Motion passed 5-0, with 0 abstentions

Other items:

- Discussed upcoming agendas

Meeting adjourned at 10:20 a.m., MDT.