

-----Original Message-----

**From:** Rippentrop Kay

**Sent:** Monday, May 21, 2007 1:51 PM

**To:** Council Group

**Subject:** Building in Floodway - Margaret King 348-1510

**Margaret King called today (5/21/) regarding the proposed building in the floodway. She asked that I forward her comments to all Council members - She has been advised that the City was looking at allowing building in the floodway - she lived here in 1972 and lost family members and is VERY opposed to any building within the floodway.**

**Kay**

07RZ014 / 07CA009

-----Original Message-----

From: Joyce Payton [<mailto:wilosprs@rapidnet.com>]  
Sent: Tuesday, May 22, 2007 9:31 AM  
To: [planning.commission@rcgov.org](mailto:planning.commission@rcgov.org)  
Subject: proposed development

Dear Planning and Zoning Board.

I am writting to you with great concerns of a proposed development along Hwy 44. This proposed development is in the flood plain, in the green parkway- which was created after the 1972 flood, in which many Rapid City Residents lost their lives and the ones who survived, were very traumatized that night. If I remember correctly, the families that had homes remaining in this floodway were forced to relocate and their homes were then removed. This was done for their safety, understandably so.

I ask you then, why would the city of Rapid City give the approval to build a 32 unit condominium complex in this same area along Rapid Creek? I understand the plan is to build up the soil so the property is then out of the flood plain. This 13' wall of dirt will not stop the water in case of a flood, it would only divert it. Then what? Who's life and property would be taken then? I see this as an obstruction to the open floodway that has already been created to handle large volumes of water if a flood should ever happen again.

This plan is not only dangerous. It is disrespectful to the families who lost their homes and lives in the flood of 1972. Additionally this sets a very ugly precedence of what is yet to come, building residential homes all along the way of the flood plain. Forgetting what happened June 9, 1972.

I ask you to consider this carefully. I'd like to see the promise that was made, kept.

Thank You

Joyce Payton  
11515 Sheridan Lake Road  
Rapid City, Sd 57702  
343-2547

RECEIVED  
MAY 17 2007  
MAYOR'S OFFICE

Robert F. Corner  
4780 Idlehurst Lane  
Rapid City, SD 57702

RECEIVED

MAY 23 2007

May 16, 2007  
Hand Delivered

Rapid City Growth  
Management Department

The Honorable Jim Shaw  
Mayor, City of Rapid City  
300 Sixth Street  
Rapid City, SD 57701

Re: Request to Revise 500 Year Flood Plan  
Rapid City, SD

Dear Mayor Shaw,

I am contacting you concerning a request by an adjacent property owner to revise the 500 Year Floodplain across Rapid Creek from my house.

I've attached correspondence I've sent previously to the City, County, and FEMA. I've received no response from FEMA to my questions and concerns about the affect of this revision on my home and property. Several thousand cubic yards of fill were dumped there after the first of the year, seemingly without FEMA approval.

I've now been informed that the Owner of this property has requested not only to revise the 500 Year Floodplain, but rezoning to Medium Density Residential and a Planned Residential Development.

It is my understanding that a 30 unit condominium development is being planned for this property, including five 46' tall buildings and over 50,000 cubic yards of earth fill.

The area in which this development is being planned currently consists of City-owned and privately owned land in the 500 Year Floodplain, and Park Forest zoned property with single family dwellings. The property under discussion is a fairly low, level field that sits between Rapid Creek and Highway 44. My home and property are adjacent to this parcel across Rapid Creek against a hillside on the outside of a bend in the creek.

I am adamantly against approval of this plan due to the increased potential for serious damage to my home and property, and loss of life, in the case of another flood similar to the one that occurred in this area in 1972. I lost a family member and our house in Magic Canyon was destroyed in that flood. Our family is not allowed to rebuild there because it is in the floodway, and I agree with those regulations. They were adopted to minimize property damage and loss of life in the event of another flood, and they should not be revised or lessened.

**There is no question that this planned development and infill will adversely affect my home and property (including bridge access across Rapid Creek) in the event of another flood similar to the 1972 flood, as it will change the flow of floodwater toward my house and will increase the height and velocity of the floodwaters on my property. The 1972 flood caused significant damage to my property at 4780 Idlehurst Lane, as well as destroying adjacent houses.**

**My secondary concerns are:**

- **The inappropriateness of such a development in an area of floodway and single family homes. This is "spot zoning" at it's worst.**
- **The devaluation of my property.**
- **Problems caused by increased vehicle traffic entering and exiting Highway 44 in a concentrated area.**

**I appreciate you taking the time to review these concerns and look forward to receiving your response. Please feel free to contact me with questions. I'd be happy to forward photos of the area in question, or meet with you to look at the site, etc.**

**Sincerely,**



**Rob Corner**

**cc: Karen Gunderson Olson  
Ward 3 Council Member**

**A RESOLUTION ESTABLISHING A  
RAPID CREEK FLOODPLAIN POLICY**

WHEREAS the Army Corps of Engineers has, with the aid of the City of Rapid City Engineering Division, completed a re-evaluation of the Rapid Creek Floodplain through Rapid City; and

WHEREAS the re-evaluation established the limits of the 100 year hydraulic floodway and the new limits of the 100 year floodplain; and

WHEREAS a Floodplain Boundary Policy Committee was appointed by the Mayor on July 20, 1992, to review the City's policies on the management of the Rapid Creek Flood Hazard Area and formulate a recommendation for the Planning Commission and City Council to consider;

WHEREAS the Rapid City Planning Commission and Rapid City Council adopted this resolution on May 20, 1993 and June 7, 1993 respectively;

WHEREAS the Floodplain Boundary Policy Committee was reconvened by the Mayor on July 1, 1996 to review and clarify the previously adopted policy;

WHEREAS the reconvened Floodplain Boundary Policy Committee reviewed the previously adopted policy and recommended re-adoption of the policy with the minor clarifications and amendments;

WHEREAS the Rapid City Planning Commission and the Rapid City Council re-adopted this policy with revisions on February 20, 1997 and March 3, 1997 respectively;

WHEREAS the Floodplain Boundary Policy Committee was once again reconvened by the Mayor on July 24, 2000 to review and clarify the previously adopted policies;

WHEREAS the Floodplain Boundary Policy Committee has reviewed the previously adopted policy and finds that it is necessary to restrict the use of the 100 year hydraulic floodway to protect property and the lives of both residents and visitors to the community;

WHEREAS the Floodplain Boundary Policy Committee has identified appropriate city owned areas for festivals, carnivals and other temporary uses located outside the 100 year hydraulic floodway where special events may occur without significant risk to the public health and safety; and

WHEREAS the Floodplain Boundary Policy Committee recommends re-adoption of the policy with minor clarifications and amendments:

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the City of Rapid City that the following policies be adopted to regulate the Rapid Creek Floodplain in Rapid City:

- The current requirements of the City of Rapid City Floodplain Development District and Floodway Zoning District not otherwise addressed under this policy shall remain the same;
- The Public Works Department shall install permanent pins and landscaping denoting the location of the 100 year hydraulic floodway boundary at the following locations: Canyon Lake Park, Sioux Park, Roosevelt Park, Memorial Park and at the New York

Street parking lot. This will assist park users and residents in identifying the boundary of the floodway.

- When applying the Flood Hazard Zoning District to private property, the limits of the district shall match the boundaries of the 100 year hydraulic floodway on private properties downstream from the Chapel Lane Road bridge and the boundaries of the 500 year floodplain on all private properties upstream of the Chapel Lane Road bridge.
- When applying the Flood Hazard Zoning District to public property, the limits of the zoning district shall match the boundaries of the 100 year hydraulic floodway on public properties downstream from the Chapel Lane Road bridge and the boundaries of the 500 year floodplain on all public properties upstream of the Chapel Lane Road bridge.
- All proposed uses within the Flood Hazard Zoning District which involve a structure shall be reviewed under the Use on Review provisions addressed in Section 17.54.030 of the City of Rapid City Zoning Ordinance. The technical criteria for reviewing proposed projects on the public property within the Flood Hazard Zoning District shall be the standards for the 100 year storm event. It is the intent of the City to preclude the location of structures within the 100 year Floodway to the greatest degree possible. Camping shall be prohibited in the 100 year floodplain and the 100 year floodway.

Dated this 27th day of September, 2000.

ATTEST:  
s/ James F. Preston  
Finance Officer  
(SEAL)

CITY OF RAPID CITY  
s/ Jim Shaw, Mayor

ATTEST:

\_\_\_\_\_  
Mayor

\_\_\_\_\_  
Finance Officer

(SEAL)

CITY OF RAPID CITY

**Robert F. Corner  
4780 Idlehurt Lane  
Rapid City, SD 57702**

**May 25, 2006**

**Mr. Dion Lowe  
Flood Plain Coordinator  
City of Rapid City  
300 6<sup>th</sup> Street  
Rapid City, SD 57701**

**Re: Request To Revise  
500-Year Floodway**

**Dear Dion:**

**I have reviewed information sent to me by Bob Knecht pertaining to a request sent to FEMA and the City of Rapid City for a revision to the 500 year floodway at lot 1 Knecht Park Subdivision. I previously contacted you by phone to obtain information about this request.**


**I have serious concerns about this requested revision since the area in question is situated directly across Rapid Creek from my home. My concerns include the following:**

- What is the impact on my house and property in the event of another flood due to change in water flow?**
- How is the 100 / 500 year floodway boundary affected on my property (no information seems to be available at this time)?**
- What is the affect on valuation of my property?**
- Is a change in zoning planned in conjunction with the requested revision?**

**It appears this requested revision will increase the potential damage to my home and property in the event of another flood in this area and increase the danger to my family. I lost a family member and our home was destroyed in the 1972 flood, and I don't wish to relive that experience.**

**I am opposed to this requested change in the Rapid City 500-year floodway unless these issues can be satisfactorily answered. Please feel free to contact me with questions at 348-7879.**

**Sincerely,**

  
**Robert F. Corner**

**Robert F. Corner  
4780 Idlehurt Lane  
Rapid City, SD 57702**

**May 25, 2006**

**Mr. Dan Carlson, Senior Flood Mgmt. Specialist  
Federal Emergency Management Authority  
Denver Federal Center, Bldg 710  
Box 25267  
Denver, CO 80225**

**Re: Request To Revise 500 Year Floodway  
Rapid City, SD**

**Dear Mr. Carlson:**

**I have enclosed a copy of a letter I sent to the City of Rapid City concerning a request to revise the 500 year floodway at Lot 1 of Knecht Park Subdivision.**

**My home and my family are most directly affected by this request since my property is situated directly across the creek from the property for which the change is requested.**

**As the letter states, I am in objection to this revision unless the concerns I have are addressed satisfactorily. I believe the current regulations were put into effect for good reason to protect against further property damage and loss of life in the event of another flood.**

**Please feel free to contact me with questions.**

**Sincerely,**

  
**Robert F. Corner**



Robert F. Corner  
4780 Idlehurst Lane  
Rapid City, SD 57702  
605 348-7879

January 10, 2007

Ms. Marljo Camrud  
Federal Emergency Management Agency  
Denver Federal Center  
Bldg. 710  
PO Box 25267  
Denver, CO 80225

Re: Case No.: 06-08-B054R  
Community: City of Rapid City, SD  
Community No.: 465420

Dear Marljo,

It is my understanding that you are the Consultation Coordination Officer for my area. I am contacting you regarding my concerns about the property adjoining my home that is in the 500 year floodplain as designated by FEMA.

I have a copy of the Property Owner's request to revise the FEMA map boundaries for this property. It is my understanding that this in process and that a 90 day appeal period is part of the process. What is the current status of this requested revision?

I previously requested by certified letter (copy enclosed) specific information as to how my adjoining home and property would be affected by the revision being proposed to the 500 year floodplain in the event of another flood similar to the 1972 flood.

Since my request, a considerable amount of fill (1000-2000 cubic yards) has been deposited on the property in the last 5 days. My home and property are adjacent to this parcel on the far side of Rapid Creek against the canyon wall on the outside of a bend in the creek. There is no question this fill will adversely affect my home and property (including bridge access across the Rapid Creek) in the event of another flood similar to the 1972 Rapid City flood as it will increase the height and velocity of the floodwaters on my property. I can e-mail photos of the fill if you wish.

Is FEMA responsible for enforcement of regulations and management of the designated 500 year floodplain, including this issue? If not, what entity is?

I appreciate your anticipated timely response to this letter. As stated in my previous letter, I am opposed to this revision to the 500 year floodplain unless the questions I've raised are satisfactorily answered.

Sincerely,

Robert F. Corner

Enc.

cc: Mr. Dion Lowe, Rapid City Floodplain Administrator (HAND DELIVERED)  
Ms. Jennifer Winters, Michael Baker Jr., Inc.  
Mr. Dan Carlson, FEMA

**Robert F. Corner  
4780 Idlehurst Lane  
Rapid City, SD 57702  
605 348-7879**

**January 11, 2007**

**Mr. Dan Jennissen  
Pennington County Planning Director  
315 St. Joseph St.  
Rapid City, SD 57701**

**Re: Request to Revise 500 Year Floodplain  
Rapid City, South Dakota**

**Dear Dan,**

**I've enclosed a copy of a letter I sent to FEMA and the City of Rapid City stating my concerns about a proposed change to the 500 year floodplain on a piece of property adjoining my home.**

**This property is within the city limits, which you told me falls under the City's jurisdiction.**

**I am furnishing you this for your information and your files. Please contact me with questions.**

**Sincerely,**

**Robert F. Corner**

-----Original Message-----

**From:** Munro, Jim [mailto:[munro.jim@gmail.com](mailto:munro.jim@gmail.com)]

**Sent:** Wednesday, May 23, 2007 10:43 AM

**To:** [planning.commission@rcgov.org](mailto:planning.commission@rcgov.org)

**Subject:** Planned condominium Development

To: Planning commission members

I encourage you to vote to reject the requests for revision of the 500 year floodplain, the rezoning to medium density residential and the Planned Residential Development in Lot 1 of Knecht Park Subdivision, Sections 8 and 17, T1N, R7E, BHM, in Rapid City. Please consider such rejection based on the following two points.

1. Although the developers show that FEMA has approved their plan to raise the property out of the floodplain, the resulting floodplain will be narrower. This narrowing of the floodplain will result in higher velocities of any flood waters passing through the canyon, as well as a steeper gradient to achieve those velocities. i.e. The effect of the development will be to create a partial damming of the canyon, and will cause floodwaters upstream of the development to rise further than they otherwise would, thereby causing more of a threat to other properties in the canyon.
2. The requested change to medium density residential will have a negative impact on the values of surrounding low-density residential neighborhoods. It simply isn't fair to my family and other owners of these nearby properties to rezone this area. We purchased our home in the canyon knowing that the zoning would not allow development of multiple-family structures in the canyon. The three-story structures that are proposed in the current request will produce more traffic, and will raise the noise levels in the canyon, both from the increased traffic and by reflecting highway noise off the buildings up into our neighborhood.

Please vote to reject the proposals for development of the property along Jackson Blvd in Knecht Park Subdivision.

James M. Munro

5320 Normans Roost Rd.

Rapid City, SD 57702

605 721-6815

605 484-2282 (cell)

[munro.jim@gmail.com](mailto:munro.jim@gmail.com)

-----Original Message-----

**From:** Keith or Jan Catron [mailto:keithcat@rapidcity.com]

**Sent:** Wednesday, May 23, 2007 10:16 AM

**To:** mayorinfo@rcgov.org; CouncilGroup@rcgov.org; planning.commission@rcgov.org

**Subject:** Proposed Knecht Park Subdivision

Dear Mayor, Council Members and Planning & Zoning Commission Members,

We are writing to oppose changing the land use designation for Knecht Park Subdivision. Our interest in this issue is we are neighboring homeowners and frequent users of Braeburn Dog Park.

We oppose the change because we do not believe any residential development should be located in this area. It would not be safe. No matter what designation the City or FEMA chooses to make on paper, flash floods are unpredictable and can happen. This area was destroyed in the 1972 flood and the City & FEMA must remember the lessons learned 35 years ago.

This proposed change is in conflict with the City's policy of keeping structures out of the floodplain. The skeletal remains of home foundations in this area are a reminder of why there is a floodway in Rapid City. Don't disregard the memorial value of a land use designation that helps us remember the tragedy of the 1972 flood.

It would be very inappropriate for the City to allow a large development in an area of floodway and single family homes. Allowing a development this large on this site would set a precedent that the floodplain is open for business, as long as the developer can haul in a mountain of fill.

The people, that did not die in the flood of 1972, that used to have homes in this area were evicted or forced to sell their land because it was too dangerous to live there. What has changed?

Sincerely,  
Keith & Jan Catron  
5873 Magic Canyon Road  
Rapid City, SD 57702  
605-342-3864

-----Original Message-----

From: Linda Lea M. Viken [<mailto:llmv@vikenlaw.com>]  
Sent: Thursday, May 24, 2007 7:00 AM  
To: [planning.commission@rcgov.org](mailto:planning.commission@rcgov.org)  
Subject: Floodplain condominium development

Commissioners

We write to oppose any development on the Braeburn Park floodplain on West Highway 44. Our home is the closest upstream residence to the proposed condominium development project. Our creek side home is surrounded by remnants of foundations and fireplaces which are all that remain of the family dwellings destroyed in the 1972 flood.

Permitting the proposed condominium site to be built up using 50,000 cubic yards of earth must necessarily change the flow of Rapid Creek at flood stage. The water backed up by this fill and the five three story buildings proposed for the site will surely inundate our home and those of our neighbors upstream from this ill conceived project.

We accept the severe floodplain restrictions placed on the use of our home and property. We cannot add any structure, even an outbuilding or garage. We cannot increase the footprint of our home because of the floodplain restrictions. We have both the ability and desire to increase the size of our home, but we forfeit that opportunity to increase our property's value in order to comply with the city's need to keep the floodplain free of obstructions.

It is grossly unfair to us as upstream property owners and to the many members of the public who make frequent recreational use of the parkland created following the 1972 disaster for the Commission to permit a developer to operate in a way which puts us all at risk for the loss of our homes and our cherished creek environment. We urge the Commission to deny the proposed rezoning.

Linda Lea and Jeff Viken  
4760 Trout Court  
Rapid City, SD 57702

07RZ014 / 07CA009

Dear Members of the Rapid City Council,

We respectfully ask that you not support the planned zoning changes for Braeburn Addition and the subsequent condominium development proposed for this area. As life-long residents of this city, we vividly remember the night of June 9, 1972 and have taken pride in the decision our leaders have made to restrict development in the floodplain. It is disheartening to think this proposal would even be made. With respect for those who lost their lives in this area and for the safety of all Rapid Citians, we hope you will firmly oppose the re-zoning request.

Thank you in advance for your consideration.

Bart Swanson and Mary Weber Swanson  
4519 Steamboat Circle  
Rapid City, SD 57702  
605-341-5414

----- Original Message -----

**From:** [dildml@netzero.net](mailto:dildml@netzero.net)

**To:** [mayor@rcgov.org](mailto:mayor@rcgov.org)

**Cc:** [bill.okrepkie@rcgov.org](mailto:bill.okrepkie@rcgov.org) ; [bob.hurlbut@rcgov.org](mailto:bob.hurlbut@rcgov.org) ; [deb.hadcock@rcgov.org](mailto:deb.hadcock@rcgov.org) ;  
[karen.olson@rcgov.org](mailto:karen.olson@rcgov.org) ; [lloyd.lacroix@rcgov.org](mailto:lloyd.lacroix@rcgov.org) ; [malcom.chapman@rcgov.org](mailto:malcom.chapman@rcgov.org) ;  
[mike.schumacher@rcgov.org](mailto:mike.schumacher@rcgov.org) ; [ron.kroeger@rcgov.org](mailto:ron.kroeger@rcgov.org)

**Sent:** Wednesday, May 23, 2007 4:45 PM

May 21, 2007

Dear Mayor & Council Member:

We are writing to register our objection to the proposal that would change the land use designation for Knecht Park Subdivision. This is of interest to us as we live just around the corner and it is an enjoyable walk to the Braeburn Dog Park and Canyon Lake Park.

We are opposed to a development of this size in an area that could be unsafe due to the possibility of flooding. The logistic of evacuating on short notice the number of people this development would house would be a nightmare. It doesn't make sense to deliberately put people and property in that type of a situation when the risks are known.

A number of people that owned homes in The Knecht Park Subdivision, Braeburn Park and Camp Dakota lost their lives in the 1972 flood due to their inability to get to safety. Many of them delayed leaving and then because of age, physical limitations and/or transportation were unable to make it out on time. We need to remember the lessons learned 25 years ago and retain the present Flood Hazard District zoning.

The proposed rezoning is in conflict with the City's intent to limit the location of structures within the Floodway to the greatest degree possible. This large of a development greatly increases the traffic in the Braeburn Park area and the increase of slow traffic entering the highway could be a real problem. Also access to this development for southbound traffic could be a potential hazard unless the highway is restructured to include a turning lane.

A number of structures with parking lots have already been located on the City's floodway. We need to preserve our park areas especially those that act as a buffer for Rapid City against flash floods.

Sincerely,

Marty & Deb Larson

1N 07E SEC 18 RAPID CITY CAMP DAKOTA LOT A OF LOT 13

---

07RZ014 / 07CA009

-----Original Message-----

**From:** Rob Corner [mailto:robc@hills.net]

**Sent:** Wednesday, May 23, 2007 5:23 PM

**To:** marcia.elkins@rcgov.org

**Subject:** Floodway Development

Rob Corner  
4780 Idlehurst Lane  
Rapid City, SD 57702  
Phone: 342-5308  
Email: [robc@hills.net](mailto:robc@hills.net)

May 23, 2007

Re: Proposed Floodplain Development

Dear Marcia,

I appreciate you returning my call regarding the proposed floodplain development adjacent to and across the creek from my house. I am following up our conversation to provide more information on my opposition to this plan.

I'm sure you're aware that the proposed development plans include over 50,000 cubic yards of earth fill, five 46-foot tall buildings with six condominium units each, and approximately 120 parking spaces.

I am adamantly opposed to approval of this plan due to the increased potential for serious damage to my home and property, and loss of life, when another flood similar to the one in 1972 occurs. Our family home ½ mile upstream was destroyed, and my mother killed in that flood. Dozens of homes in the Braeburn area adjacent to this property in 1972 were destroyed with many lives lost.

No engineering study can contradict what happened in this area in 1972. There is no question that this proposed development will adversely impact my home and property (including bridge access across Rapid Creek) in the event of another flood as it will concentrate the flow of floodwater toward my house, and will increase the height and velocity of the floodwater on my property (it received significant damage in the 1972 flood and the adjacent houses were destroyed).

Rapid City and FEMA designated this area as floodway to keep development out, and protect lives and property. My family was not allowed to rebuild our home in Magic Canyon because of the adopted regulations, and they should not be revised or lessened.

It is completely inappropriate to allow a large development such as this in an area of floodway and single family homes. It is an example of "spot zoning" at its' worst. Additional concerns include increasing traffic in the area of my home and the Dog Park twenty fold or more, and devaluation of my property.

Please contact me with questions, or you'd like additional information concerning my opposition to this poorly conceived plan.

Marcia, thank you for your time.

Sincerely,

Rob Corner



-----Original Message-----

From: Ray Burnett [<mailto:rgburn@hills.net>]  
Sent: Thursday, May 24, 2007 4:06 PM  
To: [planning.commission@rcgov.org](mailto:planning.commission@rcgov.org)  
Subject: Knecht Park Subdiv.

Dear Mayor, Council Members, and Planning and Zoning Commission Members,

I am writing to oppose changing the land use designation for Knecht Park Subdivision. I am a 34 year resident living immediately across Hwy 44 from the proposed Subdivision.

I almost died in the 1972 flood when I was on my way to see a pregnancy patient at the old Bennett Clarkson Hospital. As I was going through the 'gap' my pickup truck was hit by a 4 foot wall of water and swept back several blocks until, fortunately the rear wheels caught on the elevated railroad crossing. The people in the two cars in front of me all perished in the flood.

Floods such as the 1972 flood are very unpredictable. From our history, we should expect to see Rapid Creek floods in the future. Placing the lives of 30 families in the flood plane is inappropriate. We have already had too much development in the floodplain and this subdivision further sets a precedent for future such developments.

In addition to danger to life and property there are also the future problems with increased traffic and the Braeburn Dog Park. Traffic on west Jackson and Hwy 44 is already heavy with people going to work in the morning and returning in the afternoon. It is the major artery for the subdivisions along Hwy 44, Chapel Valley, Park Drive, and a large portion of SW Rapid City. This proposed subdivision can only add to the traffic problem. How long will it be before the 30 families in the Knecht Park Subdivision are complaining to the city about the dogs barking starting at 6am every morning and wanting the Dog Park closed.

Recently it was reported that Rapid City is having trouble with contamination of Rapid Creek due to storm runoff. Further, it was stated that west Rapid Creek meets EPA standards down to the water plant. Below the water plant the creek does not meet EPA standards. This proposed subdivision with its large black top parking pad, lawns and fertilizers, and elevation above the creek, will be another runoff abuse to Rapid Creek.

Thank you for taking the time to peruse my letter. I hope you will agree to not allow the above rezoning request.

Dr. Raymond Burnett

5300 Normans Roost Rd  
Rapid City, SD 57702  
605 343-3421  
email: [rgburn@hills.net](mailto:rgburn@hills.net)

----- Original Message -----

**From:** [Shirley Frederick](#)

**To:** [Jim Shaw](#) ; [City Council](#)

**Sent:** Friday, May 25, 2007 2:40 PM

**Subject:** condos in floodplain

Dear Mayor Shaw and City Council:

Several weeks ago I noticed construction activity in the flood plain upstream from the westside dog park. More recently I learned that this part of the floodplain is being developed for condos, and added dirt will change the land from 100-year flood designation to 500-year designation. Here are my questions:

In 1972 didn't the city strike a deal with the federal government that the city would create and maintain the flood plain in return for federal aid?

Has permission to proceed with this development been granted? By whom? Under what authority?

When did the floodplain concept change from protection of lives and property to development by anyone who has enough dirt?

At what point will Rapid City residents be informed about this change in the rules and have an opportunity to publicly state their concerns?

I'd appreciate any information you can send me.

Shirley Frederick  
3411 Idlewild Court  
Rapid City  
348-0208

-----Original Message-----

**From:** Janet Sohl [mailto:ljr@rap.midco.net]  
**Sent:** Monday, May 28, 2007 9:51 PM  
**To:** planning.commission@rcgov.org  
**Subject:** Opposed to Condo Development

Dear Members of the Rapid City Planning Commission,

We are opposed to the proposed condominium development in the floodplain west of the Braeburn Dog Park on Highway 44. I was in Rapid City in 1972, living with my parents on West St. Anne Street, one block from Meadowbrook School. Part of the neighborhood that I grew up in was devastated by that flood. The flood-torn part of that neighborhood is now part of Meadowbrook Golf Course. People my family knew were killed there as well as in parts of the canyon upstream of the proposed development. In 1972 my grandfather lived in Cleghorn Canyon and listened to roar of the waters and grinding of boulders all night long. His pasture was left gouged 6 to 8 foot deeper and littered with cars. The road up Cleghorn was washed out in several places, homes and cars were washed away, and one woman lost her life.

No residential development should take place anywhere in the flood plain as stated in the Rapid Creek Floodplain Policy. The approval of this development would violate that policy and, in effect, render it useless, setting an unfortunate precedent for more incursions into the floodplain.

I was pleased to learn that Mayor Shaw, in 2000, signed a resolution continuing a Rapid Creek Floodplain Policy, stating the following:

“...When applying the Flood Hazard Zoning District to private property, the limits of the district shall match the boundaries of the 100 year hydraulic floodway on private properties downstream from the Chapel Lane Road bridge and boundaries of the 500 year floodplain on all private properties upstream of the Chapel Lane Road bridge.

When applying the Flood Hazard Zoning District to public property, the limits of the zoning district shall match the boundaries of the 100 year hydraulic floodway on public properties downstream from the Chapel Lane Road bridge and the boundaries of the 500 year floodplain on all public properties upstream of the Chapel Lane Road bridge...”

I attended a city council meeting for another matter several months ago when the council voted to uphold this resolution and denied a request for a building permit to be issued for a garage to be built within the floodplain, I believe, above the Chapel Lane Road bridge. Surely this proposed condominium development amounts to more than a simple garage's incursion into that floodplain. And, incursions into the 500 year floodplain are going on with the construction of the new Cleghorn hatchery buildings and perhaps with a proposed water treatment plant for Jackson Springs. A worst case scenario can be visited by the inclusion of a condominium development, the fish hatchery buildings, the water treatment facility, and a lot of water rushing down a narrow canyon.

This development does not belong in the floodplain. Please reject this request.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,  
Jan and Lloyd Sohl  
3901 Wonderland Drive  
343-0959

-----Original Message-----

**From:** Chris G Jaeger, BlackHills OBGYN [mailto:cgj@blackhillsobgyn.com]

**Sent:** Wednesday, May 30, 2007 1:33 PM

**To:** planning.commission@rcgov.org

**Subject:** Knecht Park Subdivision

RE The proposed condominium development by the Dog Park.

Allowing development in the flood plain is a dumb idea. By constricting the creekway with tons of dirt on one shore will only serve to intensify any flooding that will occur at a later date. Eventually it will all give way and end up in Canyon Lake along with 30 or so lives that are proposed for this area. It also will set a precedense for all developers to start eying property along the creek.

Please do not allow this to happen. The flood plain is there for a reason. It serves to beautify Rapid City and keeps people from inhabiting areas that were not meant to be inhabited. Do not buy into the developers idea that this is a hardship for the land owner. They purchased the land knowing full well that it was flood plain.

Chris G Jaeger Administrator for BlackHills Obstetrics & Gynecology LLP

-----Original Message-----

**From:** Lems, Casey [mailto:Casey.Lems@usd.edu]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, June 12, 2007 10:46 AM  
**To:** councilgroup@rcgov.org  
**Subject:** Proposed Development in Braeburn Addition

Hello,

I just want to voice my opposition to Bob Knecht's proposed apartment building in the Flood Plain. I know you've probably received emails voicing every opinion that I have, so I will keep it short and just say that I'm very much against this project.

Thank you for your time,  
Casey Lems  
Sr. Computer Support Specialist  
University of South Dakota  
Rapid City, SD  
Med School: 605-394-5105  
Nursing School: 605-394-5485  
[casey.lems@usd.edu](mailto:casey.lems@usd.edu)

07RZ014 / 07CA009

----- Original Message -----

**From:** [Rippentrop Kay](#)

**To:** [Council Group](#)

**Sent:** Friday, June 15, 2007 11:27 AM

**Subject:** citizen request

**Wayne Johnson called - 342-3745 - asked that I let all Council members know of his opposition to building apartments in the floodway.**

**Kay**