



Citizen Advisory Committee Meeting #10

**Location: Training Room (NE corner entry), Planning and Development Center,
4700 Bragaw Street**

Date: July 18, 2007 6:00 pm to 9:00 pm

MEETING NOTES

Committee

- David Lappi
- Carol Fries - absent
- John Reese
- Lori Davey
- Niel Thomas
- John Weddleton
- Chris Hamre - absent
- Connie Yoshimura - absent
- Dee High
- Victor Mollozzi - absent
- Fred Jenkins - absent
- David Beveridge - absent
- Wayne Westberg - absent

Staff

- Chris Beck – Agnew::Beck
- Dan Billman – HDR Alaska
- Bob Butera – HDR Alaska
- Kurt Bauer – HDR Alaska
- Kristi Bischofberger – MOA
WMS

Public

- Russel Autrey – CY Investments

Introductions and Agenda

Chris Beck conducted introductions and presented an overview of the project schedule. Bob Butera provided an overview of the meeting agenda.

White Paper 1: Regulations

Kristi Bischofberger presented an overview of the first white paper that summarizes drainage-related regulations. She summarized the key federal, state, and local regulations and stated that the 2020 Comprehensive Plan is the focal point to defining local drainage regulations and pointed out the sections of 2020 that were pertinent to drainage. She explained Title 21 is the way that the comprehensive plan is implemented and that Title 21 is currently being rewritten. The Design Criteria Manual sets out methodology for drainage design and is codified by Title 21. A revised version of the Design Criteria Manual is currently under review and on hold until August.

Kristi stated that there is presently no planning prior to this Hillside Drainage Planning effort, and no management structure or funding mechanism for dealing with drainage on the hillside. Posed question of “How are we going to create a drainage plan based on regional controls if we do not know if there will be funding to maintain these regional controls?” The drainage plan and the mechanism for management/funding need to converge.

The following comments were made:

- Can we specifically include code that addresses icing/glaciation?
 - Kristi stated that this would likely be included in the “ways to move forward”
- What is stream maintenance?
 - Kristi explained that this includes erosion control, channel rehabilitation, and channel cleaning efforts.
- Why is DCM on hold Until August?
 - The DCM is on hold because of questions from user groups on whether some of the stipulations will work on the hillside and whether the MOA is prepared to implement these criteria,
- Please explain the proposed ‘first flush’ criteria in the DCM.
 - Kristi explained that this proposes to require capture and treatment of the runoff from the first 0.5 inches of rainfall.
- What can we do to reduce or eliminate runoff being conveyed directly to roads?
 - Kristi stated that this is occurring because there is currently no ‘big’ picture management of drainage on the Hillside.
- What is the perforated pipe project being completed on Upper DeArmon Road?
 - Kristi stated that she did not know the specifics of this project but would seek information.

White Paper 2: Maintenance

Bob Butera presented the second white paper that provides an overview of the current maintenance mechanisms for drainage on the Hillside. He presented the breakdown of maintenance by road miles within the study area and stated that LRSAs maintain the largest amount of road miles. He presented an overview of the differences between service areas e.g. LRSAs, RRSA, and Service Areas. Only RRSA and Service Areas have the ability to fund capital improvement projects. He provided a summary of the LRSA interview and noted that the greatest reported problems are located south of Rabbit Creek Road. The following comments were made:

- A comment was made that approximately 80% of Goldenview RRSA annual budget goes towards ice removal.
- It was noted that service areas do not have control over drainage they receive and can do little to mitigate resulting problems.
- Also noted was that service areas do not have the technical expertise to design mitigation measures.

- Lower Furrow Creek was mentioned as an example of failure of a stream to handle increased runoff.
- MOA and DOT&PF method to manage drainage was discussed including that they are based on drainage plans and current zoning.
- Source of problems were mentioned as including loss of natural drainages, septic tank leach fields, groundwater discharges, lack of budget to build adequate roads and associated drainage features and lack of development standards.
- It was suggested that the final white paper include watershed boundaries along with LRSA boundaries so that the two could be compared.

PowerPoint – Development Conditions on the Hillside

Bob Butera presented a brief PowerPoint presentation that showed photos of various historic and present development on the Hillside. Examples showed levels of clearing on individual lots and for road right of ways,

White Paper 3: Development and Runoff

Kurt Bauer presented the third white paper that discusses how development impacts runoff. He began by presenting an overview of the method used to estimate storm water runoff from subdivisions and explained the factors that influence peak runoff. He then presented a summary of the evaluation of development scenarios and runoff. Three scenarios were presented for both ‘small lot’ and ‘large lot’ developments: 1) current development method (no controls), 2) roof disconnects, and 3) roof and driveway disconnects. He noted that the results indicate that current development conditions are likely resulting in large increases in peak flows. He further mentioned that while certain onsite controls should be required, they would not be the panacea because they are often poorly maintained. He recommended consideration of requiring both passive onsite controls and implementing regional controls on a watershed basis. The following comments were made:

- It was noted that the white paper examples showed all storm water runoff directed to roads.
 - It was acknowledged that the examples were ‘worst’ case and that not all homes and driveways drain to roadways.
- The following issues were discussed:
 - Planned versus unplanned drainage approaches – mention of how the current development condition is resulting in unplanned or non-existent drainage controls e.g. no one is ‘looking at what water is doing from top to bottom within the watersheds’.
 - Chronic versus peak flows – the plan should address chronic flows as well as peak flows.
 - Funding, management, and maintenance of regional or watershed drainage controls on the Hillside - It was recognized that further work is required in order to identify, evaluate, and recommend funding, management and maintenance mechanisms for Hillside drainage.

Next meetings

- Aug 20, location TBA
Review draft “goals & options” document