

FLOOD REVIEW BOARD

Date: May 25, 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: Traci Shambo, Caryn Nezat, Steven Rothwell

Staff Online: None

Board Members Present: Chris Carlson, Jamis Darrow, Mike Oberlander, Dr. Chris Thornton, Elisabeth Ervin-Blankenheim, Chad Morris

Board Members Online: None

Call to Order: Dr. Thornton opened the meeting at 8:33 a.m., MDT

Introductions

Item 1: Approval of April 27, 2023, Board meeting minutes

Motion:

Dr. Thornton motioned to approve the April 27, 2023, Board meeting minutes.

Mr. Oberlander seconded the motion.

Further Discussion:

None

Vote:

Mr. Hunt – Absent

Dr. Thornton – YES

Mr. Morris – Abstain

Ms. Ervin-Blankenheim – Abstain

Mr. Oberlander – YES

Mr. Carlson – YES

Mr. Darrow – YES



Motion passed [4-0], with 2 abstentions.

Item 2:

Applicants present: Suleyman Akalin, Chris Pauley, Sam Elison, Nathan Hoover, James Prelog, Dave Thorpe

Tabled from the March 23, 2023, Board meeting - 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

Discussion:

Ms. Nezat introduced the project to the Flood Review Board (FRB) and stated that this is a Floodplain Project Review request.

Suleyman described the project, including the location and effective floodplain mapping. Proposed work is in the floodway and flood fringe. Work in the floodplain includes cutting to connect to the outfall and grading for ponds and stormwater outfalls, erosion control measures and fill. He discussed their modeling analysis. For more information, see the PowerPoint presentation.

Mr. Carlson asked about the model showing the floodway and the flood fringe and the results from both models regarding the rise in water surface elevations. He mentioned that the rise is from work in the flood fringe and not in the floodway.

Mr. Darrow asked whether the topography used for the corrected effective is LiDAR or a true ground survey and Mr. Akalin responded that it is a true ground survey. He notes there is a 3' rise between the duplicate effective and corrected effective in the ground surface. Mr. Akalin said that it shouldn't have an impact on the results because it's in a backwater area. Mr. Darrow said that they are taking credit for a ground surface that is not really there. Didn't know that it would change the model that much because it is ineffective flow through the culvert.

There was further discussion on this topic.

Dr. Thornton asked if the corrective effective is 3' higher than the duplicate effective. Mr. Akalin said that was correct. Dr. Thornton asked if they got the same water surface and Mr. Akalin said that was correct. Dr. Thornton asked if the proposed is the same elevation as the duplicate effective. Mr. Akalin said in the proposed condition they are opening it up. Mr. Darrow noted that it is controlled by the culverts. He noted that it is the same water surface with corrected effective to duplicate effective.

It was noted by the applicant that the utility crossings are installed but they have not done the ponds yet. Mr. Akalin noted that all work is captured in the model.



Mr. Darrow said that this project seems okay from a floodplain standpoint. If there was 3' of sediment drop over 5 years and now they are going to dig up a swale to make things work again. What happens if 5 years from now there is another 3' of sediment that would cover the pipe draining the ponds, which is a maintenance question. Mr. Carlson said if the modeling shows it works who has maintenance responsibility for the project long term. Considerations of maintenance will be part of the development agreement with the County. It will be the developer/owner responsibilities for maintenance as well as CDOT if the sedimentation is within their ROW. Ultimately, this project will be part of the annexation process.

It was noted that the manhole that was above grade from the previous meeting has been lowered to grade.

Motion:

Mr. Morris moved to recommend approval of the Mulberry Development, LLC grading activities, detention ponds, riprap placement and stormwater outfalls for the Peakview Development Floodplain Project Review to the County Engineer.

Mr. Oberlander seconded the motion.

Further Discussion:

None

Vote:

Mr. Hunt – ABSENT

Dr. Thornton – YES

Mr. Morris – YES

Ms. Ervin-Blankenheim – YES

Mr. Oberlander – YES

Mr. Carlson – YES

Mr. Darrow – YES

Motion passed [6-0], with 0 abstentions

Meeting adjourned at 9:00 a.m., MDT.