

Rabbit Creek Community Council Board Meeting, Minutes for Thursday, January 10, 2013

Co-Chair Nancy Pease opened meeting at 7:00 pm

Board Roll Call: Present: Keith Guyer, John Isby, Gail Smith, Mike Kenny, Nancy Pease, Pat Hansen, Jeff Vaughn, David Sterling. Excused: Joan Diamond, Pat Abney, Dick Tremaine

Minutes: Motion by Guyer and Smith to approve Dec.12, 2012 minutes. Passed, no objection.

Treasurer's Report: Checking: \$322.55, Savings: \$294.12; \$616.67 total. Approximately 67 members.

18 to 21 people in attendance, but less than 20% of members present; continued as board meeting.

Mike Kenny – 164th ave water going into Little Survival Creek

- Bill Peterson Woodridge Homeowner Assoc
- They asked for comments
- RCCC concerned about Downstream homeowners will be paying for maintenance
 - Frank DesRoches, of CRW in attendance for update and answer questions, 646-5616.
- Homeowner Assoc questions, by M Zidek, submitted on 95% completion of design drawings
 - Draft bid documents are available
 - Handed out questions
 - Residents want one traffic lane open all times
 - Full fish passage design will be part of design along Virgo
 - Mike Kenny motion to move discussion to next meeting February, P Hansen 2nd. Passed.
 - Bid documents comments to be issued in 6 weeks.
 - Mr Oswald PM&E was told to move forward in certain manner
 - Bid time in April
 - Feb meeting: request LRSA & audio conference for absent Woodridge residents
- Request for Potter Highlands subdivision- Dave Grenier, LandTec
 - Request for plat time extension (original 18 months) and variance on common driveways.
 - Changes for single driveway on downhill side to enter onto Potter Valley Rd at 6 of 11 lots, large lots to 6.5 acres due to significant wetlands.
 - Redesign from original common access driveways
 - About 3 additional driveways, min 14' wide
 - Location to be approved by traffic eng, set onto plat
 - Paved driveways on the lot by homeowner
 - Grade 10% or less.
 - Public hearing Feb 4th
 - No motion, no comments.
- Goldenview Drive update by Frank DesRoches, PE, CRW Engineers
 - P&Z held non-public hearing this past Monday
 - Dick Tremaine spoke to P&Z Chair before the meeting and provided RCCC's letters,
 - P&Z accepted context sensitive design--urban lighting at intersections; rural elsewhere.
 - Speed limit in limbo now posted 35, design field will be 45 mph. set by traffic dept to 85th percentile. Not set. Design will start in a couple months.
 - Design stays the same
 - Lots of work into drainage facility with curb and gutter, ditches, comp culverts.
 - Study done on drainage, on website. Little Survival/Little Rabbit Creek Drainage. Will follow those recommendations.
 - Urban collector so they need to stay at urban design, curb and gutter. 8' path
 - Assembly must pass design. Design to go all through this year.
 - RCCC to look into building community support with legislature for funding

- New business
 - Park dedication is council priority. Do inventory of parks and then get them dedicated. Some are HLB land. HLB might want transfer land to other uses.
 - Capital projects.
- Bottom of agenda is RCCC homepage
- Title 21
 - 10 to 11 years being rewritten with details .
 - In 2010 assembly adopted provisionally (PAT21), then Coffy hired to tweak; now there is a final
 - Hillside District Plan adopted 2 years ago
 - Hearings start next Tuesday with 2nd on Jan 29th.
 - Revisions from handout with votes by 8 board members and Straw Poles of 18 people present
 - Revision 1
 - Stream set back to stay at 50' for entire MOA, not at 25' with specifics for 50' for HDP.
 - **Vote; Board 7 for, 1 opposed; Straw pole 12 for __opposed**
 - Trails for outer 35' wide buffer at 50' from Centerline to outside dimension, but do not put in the drawing as it may not represent accurate situations
Vote: Board 7 yes, 1 no; Straw Pole 13, yes, 2 no
 - No snow piles at creeks and developments like lawns in outer 15' of 50' setback.
Vote: Board not allow: 6 for and 1 no; Straw Pole: 14 for and __ opposed
 - Revision 2 Pedestrian Facilities on both sides of all streets in urban district
 - Chair recommend sidewalks on both sides of roads
Vote Board yes 7 no 1; Straw pole yes 11, no 3
 - Revision 3A 21.07.040.D.2.f Discourage cut-thru traffic & use 'shall' not 'should' in language.
 - Example is Buffalo Street between Rabbit Cr
 - **Vote Board yes 6 no 2; Straw 12 yes, 5 no.**
 - Revision 3B - Trail dedication 21.07.040.D. Delete/modify language to avoid losing dedication on the excuse there may be a better trail, in the future. Pease: "Bird in the hand."
 - **Vote 6 yes, 1 No; Straw yes 14, no 3.**
 - Revision 3C Retain deleted PAT21 language for paths connections on long roads/cul-de-sacs
 - **Vote: Board 6 yes No 1; Straw 12, yes, 3 no.** (21.07.060.E.2.h.i-iv)
 - Revision 4 part 1, Add language for paths on local streets for streets not shown on HDP map
 - **Vote board yes 6, no 2**
 - Revision 4 part 2 - 21.080.00.D
 - For trail access to Chugach State Park leave the minimum easement width at 20' wide access ways, as in the PAT21
 - **Vote board board yes 7 no 1; straw yes 14, no 1**
 - Revision 5 or 11? Subdivision standards for steep slopes
 - New code would allow in bedrock 15' walls with 8' flat, repeating without limit on heights
 - Vote for limit on height of cuts in 25' ROW.
 - **Vote: yes 7 no 1; Straw yes 13, no 1**
 - Mike Kenny moved P Hansen 2nd for adoption of original PAT adopted 2 years ago.
 - Overturned 12 years and 10,000 hours of testimony
 - Assembly does not really know what they are voting on. They have not read the changes.
 - **Vote: Board yes 7 no 1; Straw yes 13, no 3**
 - Pease moved & Smith 2nd requesting statement in Title 21 on its conflicts with HDP & other neighborhood plans and that goals/policies of those specific plans can't be overridden. Lots of areas on Title 21 that conflict with HDP goals/policies.
 - **Vote board yes 6, no 1, abstain 1 ; Straw yes 11, no 3**

Announcement: REI 10:15 community meeting on Title, Jan 12th.

Adjourned at 9:00 pm .

SUBMITTED BY MIKE ZIDEK, WOODRIDGE SUB
JAN. 10, 2013

Following are comments on the 95% design for the 164th Avenue & Betty Street Area Drainage Improvements dated December 2012. These were prepared by CRW for the Municipality of Anchorage. This is PM&E project number 11-21.

1. General: What is the return interval and design discharges for the Little Survivor Creek culvert, storm drain pipes, and ditches?
2. General: Provide documentation that the proposed Little Survivor Creek culvert, storm drain pipes, and ditches are adequate for the design conditions. If the local homeowners are expected to maintain these drainage facilities, they have a right to convince themselves the design is acceptable.
3. Sheet C1, Typical Section B: Ensure the subdrain ditch is in the correct vertical location. Are geotech data available to justify this location?
4. Sheet C1, Typical Section B: Add impermeable material to the ditch berm on the left if seepage through the berm is unacceptable.
5. SD Sheets: Ensure the storm drain inlets are adequate during the design event, especially on the steep slopes. Consider high capacity inlets and/or close inlet spacing to limit bypass.
6. Sheet SD4: Riprap class I & class II is too small on these steep slopes that vary from 12% to 31% if the discharge is more than minimal.
7. Sheet SD4: Why is the proposed culvert slope 12%? I understand that the existing culvert slope is much less than this.
8. Sheet SD4: If the existing culvert is hydraulically and structurally adequate, consider leaving this in place and stabilizing the outlet. If the substrate detention baffles are to improve fish passage, consider retrofitting the baffles into the existing culvert. This could be significantly cheaper than a new culvert.
9. Sheet SD5, Detail 3: Increase the channel bottom width so it is equal to or larger than the 87" culvert span. Ensure the culvert outlet channel hydraulic opening can adequately handle the culvert design discharge. Ensure the riprap will be stable with no channel widening during the culvert design discharge. Provide the minimum distance the riprap must be keyed into the undisturbed soil.
10. Sheet SD5, Detail 4: Define the spacing on the substrate detention baffle.
11. Sheet SD6, Detail 3 and 4: Ensure the riprap will be stable with no channel widening during the design discharge. Class I riprap seems much too small with the road slopes up to 11.7% shown on sheet R1.