

Mitchell Creek Neighborhood Meeting on May 25, 2021 Q & A

1. I wanted to know what the Mitchell Creek floodplain is?
 - a. The floodplain is identified within mapping available on the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA). Simply, a floodplain is defined as and an area of land prone to flooding and within the FEMA mapping as an area that would flood in the event of a 0.2% annual chance flood hazard or 1% annual chance of flooding with an average depth of 1 foot or less. While this risk is low, the City could potentially see it occur twice in a year, or not within a lifetime.
2. I would like FEMA to tell us why they did not reconsider the information submitted by Scot Knutson, a registered professional engineer, based on a 4-year post fire time, when in fact the LOMR was Issued January 28, 2019 and published 16 years after the fire.
 - a. Scot's submitted information was considered by FEMA and could not be substantiated or correlated with the data provided. FEMA never gave a detailed explanation of why it could not be accepted, but it's likely that they would have needed at least an aerial survey to calculate the vegetated and non-vegetated areas.
 - b. Also, as we can see from the Grizzly Creek fire and current conditions remnant from the Coal Seam Fire, it is difficult to reestablish vegetation, particularly in the steep slope and poor soil areas. Actual revegetation rates are probably much lower in our dry climate.
3. Who has the power to use and accept incorrect input numbers into an equation that FEMA is using to include us in a Flood Plain. Is this Legal? How is this up for interpretation?
 - a. It is not up for interpretation; these are the accepted and approved numbers by FEMA. An evaluation would have to be completed by a licensed engineer and a Letter of Map Revision (LOMR) filed with FEMA to revise any of the adopted hydrology, hydraulics, and mapping.
4. I would like FEMA to also address how inaccurate the study is related to how the water would flow if the flood occurred. One site visit would help a FEMA Engineer plainly see how incorrect the maps are. Have they ever visited the site? Are they solely relying on the LiDAR system for getting elevation information? If this is the approved method, then 16 years should be the time used in the equations?
 - a. FEMA has been to the site and they will be returning this year during this process. When elevation concerns were raised, they did bring surveyors to the site and took sections of the channel by hand.
 - b. FEMA does not rely solely on LiDAR, however it is an important component. They must consider the best available data when these calculations and mapping are made, which would include recent development plans. Unfortunately, since much of this area was developed in the county or prior to the requirement of development permits or decent cataloging of this information, much of it was not

available. FEMA also had surveyors collect channel information for areas where elevation concerns were raised.

- c. See the answer to Question 2 above about the timeline and acceptance of mapping information.
5. This is not logical, and we are suffering with this inaccurate report which results in property owners being included in a Flood Plain that is not accurate.
 - a. Without additional information, survey, and analysis from a Licensed Engineer, it is difficult to say that this mapping is inaccurate. To be revised, a Letter of Map Revision would have to be filed and accepted by CDOT.
 6. Also, with the City Engineer support the previous points in an effort to get the correct model done with the correct input variables.
 - a. This point is confusing, but the City does not believe this mapping is incorrect but has pursued this funding in an effort to mitigate the impacts residents could see in a flood event. There is no guarantee that this effort will remove any property from a floodplain or hazard area, but this process is a first step to see what can be done.
 7. Will the City be holding additional public meetings? We would like to know if we will incur additional insurance costs so that we can plan for them.
 - a. The City does not intend to hold another public meeting until the evaluation and design is complete. The intent of this effort is to mitigate hazards, not increase risks to property owners. Until construction is completed for any improvements identified in this process and a LOMR filed and accepted by FEMA (if applicable) that removes a property from a floodplain or hazard risk, they would be required to carry the same insurance.
 8. When is floodplain insurance required? Who would notify a property owner?
 - a. Floodplain insurance is required when your property improvements are within an area defined as the 0.2% annual chance risk flood hazard or within an area defined with a Base Flood Elevation.
 - b. A lender will notify a homeowner, or if the property does not have a lender associated, the Certified Floodplain Manager for the jurisdiction will also notify a property owner. The City has not completed this notification, as the City Council has not formally reviewed and adopted the mapping.
 9. Can you send the power point slides with the aerial overlay and LOMR floodplain limits?
 - a. The power point is available on the Mitchell Creek Meeting Page. This image is also available on that page.
 10. Is the undersized Center Drive box culvert causing the split flow?
 - a. This is one of the contributors to the split flow. Much of the CDOT system is undersized as well.
 11. Is Mountain Mobile Home Park west of Center Drive in the new floodplain limits?
 - a. There appears to be a small area of that property within the flood area:



12. I'm wondering if Colorado Parks and Wildlife can provide any additional funding since they might be interested in improving the culverts as a means of allowing trout to migrate upstream.
 - a. This is a possibility. The City will have to consider wildlife impacts for the construction of any improvements and are always pursuing additional grant opportunities.
13. The attached FEMA study 2017 has reduced flow rate by about 14 percent in our area. Have the reduced flow rates been incorporated in the current LOMR?
 - a. The current mapping revisions underway for the Colorado River and Roaring Fork River will consider the reductions. The LOMR for Mitchell Creek does not.