
Grange Hall Creek MDP and FHAD Hydrology Progress Meeting Minutes

Date: April 9, 2015, 9:30 AM
Location: UDFCD Building
Distributions: Subcatchment/Routing, Subcatchment Size, Existing Land Use, Future Land Use, and Detention Maps

Attendees:

NAME	ORGANIZATION	E-MAIL
Shea Thomas	UDFCD	stthomas@udfcd.org
Terri Fead	UDFCD	tfead@udfcd.org
Brik Zivkovich	UDFCD	bzivkovich@udfcd.org
James W. Kaiser	City of Thornton	jim.kaiser@cityofthornton.net
Pam Acre	City of Northglenn	pacre@northglenn.org
Anna Sparks	Adams County	asparks@adcogov.org
Shannon McDowell	Adams County	smcdowell@adcogov.org
Alan Leak	RESPEC	alan.lead@respec.com
David Delagarza	RESPEC	david.delagarza@respec.com
Mike Bannister	RESPEC	mike.bannister@respec.com

I. Purpose

The purpose of this meeting was to discuss and verify the preliminary hydrology with the sponsors. Specifically the boundaries of subcatchments, routing network, future and existing land use, and detention basins to include in the baseline hydrology were discussed.

II. Subcatchments and Routing

David Delagarza opened the meeting by thanking the sponsors for hydrologic information that had been provided to RESPEC since the kick-off meeting. David requested the sponsors provide any information about existing detention basins (as-built plans, curves) to RESPEC. David also stated that RESPEC's goal was to have a working hydrologic model by the next progress meeting.

Shea Thomas commented that the preliminary watershed boundary near the South Platte River was significantly different from the 1997 MDP. This area was discussed and it was decided to retain the preliminary boundaries.

Subcatchment 867 in the southwest portion of the study was discussed. Jim Kaiser and Shea stated that all flow from 867 should be assumed to drain to Grange Hall Creek (GHC). Shea stated that the alternatives analysis may include piping flow from 867 to the Niver Creek watershed.

Jim described needed changes to the subcatchment boundaries and routing on the 104th and Riverdale Tributaries upstream of Colorado Blvd.

It was decided that RESPEC would send KMZs of the subcatchment boundaries and routing network to the project sponsors for review.

Pam Acre asked about the importance of storm sewers on subcatchment boundaries. David responded that boundaries are based on 100-year flows and storm sewers typically have inadequate conveyance for the 100-year event and are therefore not used to delineate subcatchments.

Alan Leak asked if RESPEC should show other watersheds on study maps in addition to the Niver Creek watershed. Shea responded that the Niver Creek watershed should be shown as it has been recently studied and that other watersheds in the area have not been recently studied and therefore should not be shown.

David stated that it is easier to modify subcatchment boundaries at this point in the study than in the future. Shea agreed with David and added that sponsors should put in the effort review subcatchment boundaries now.

Anna Sparks stated that Adams County is interested in channelizing flood flows on GHC near the South Platte River.

III. Land Use

Land use from the National Land Cover Data Base (NLCD) was discussed. David stated that NLCD uses a minimum imperviousness of 0% and that RESEPC would increase all areas of 0% imperviousness to 2%. Shea noted that all lakes and ponds should have an imperviousness of 100%.

Future development in the water shed was discussed in a number of locations, notably near Colorado Blvd and the Riverdale Tributary, at the North Tributary and RTD crossing, and near the confluence of GHC and the South Tributary.

IV. Detention

Existing and proposed detention sites from the 1997 MDP were individually discussed. It was decided whether or not individual sites should be included in the baseline hydrology. Criteria for inclusion consisted of ownership, maintenance responsibilities, permanence, and size. For a number of the smaller sites it was determined that the impact of the site on the hydrology should be determined before a final decision on inclusion of the site in the baseline hydrology

would be made. Sources for obtaining detention site characteristics were also discussed. Detention sites to be included in the baseline hydrology are listed in Table 1.

Table 1 – Detention Sites to Include in Baseline Hydrology

Jurisdiction	Pond Number	Notes
Thornton	301	
Thornton	302	
Thornton	303	Carpenter Park Fields
Thornton	304	Two Ponds in Series, Include Both
Thornton	305	
Thornton	306	
Thornton	307	Old Irrigation Pond
Thornton	308	Kmart Pond
Thornton	309	
Thornton	310	
Thornton	351	Settlers Chase Pond
Thornton	352	
Thornton	353	
Thornton	361	Carpenter Park Lake
Thornton	901	Lambertson Lake
Thornton	902	Croke Lake
Northglenn	311	
Northglenn	312	
Northglenn	353	
Northglenn	354	
Northglenn	355	
Northglenn	1356	

David asked how RESPEC should handle size discrepancies for detention sites. Shea responded that RESPEC should refer to as-built plans for the site.

V. Schedule

The next progress meeting will be scheduled approximately one month after the meeting herein described.

VI. Action Items

- RESPEC will send out KMZs for subcatchments and the routing network
- RESPEC will send out an updated list of detention sites to include in the baseline hydrology
- The project sponsor will review subcatchment boundaries and the routing network for accuracy

- The project sponsors will provide as-built plans, models, etc. for detention sites being included in the baseline hydrology

These minutes are true and accurate to the best of my knowledge based on notes and recollection. Should any attending party have additions or corrections to these minutes, please forward them to David Delagarza of RESPEC Consulting within one week of the date of receipt. The absence of a response will be considered concurrence to the previous information and these minutes will be considered matter of fact.