



Citizen Advisory Committee Meeting #5
Location: Rabbit Creek Community Church Auditorium
Date: April 16, 2007 6:00 pm to 8:00 pm

MEETING NOTES

1. Attendance:

Committee

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

Community member(s)

- Robert Regis

Staff

- Thea Bemben – Agnew::Beck
- Heather Stewart – Agnew::Beck

Other

- Jerry Weaver – MOA Planning
- JoAnn Contreras – MOA Planning

1. Introduction – agenda review, introductions (5 minutes)
2. Update on schedule, work completed & in progress (Chris Beck - 5 min)
 - Project Work Group composed of MOA staff and all consultants (LCONs, DCONs). Purpose of these meetings to coordinate among consultants. CAC members are welcome to attend. We will forward agendas to CAC members prior to work group meetings.
3. Improving the Development Review, Approval & Enforcement Process - Jerry Weaver (45min)

- Code enforcement just moved from MOA Planning to MOA Development Services.
- MOA Planning wants to be able to process everything electronically (e.g., receive applications, share data):
 - Data should be compatible with GIS, etc.
 - Can online directory of scanned documents be more comprehensive?
 - MOA Planning does not have the resources to scan, upload, and maintain the many large documents.
- Utility data will probably be integrated and shared as well; Planning dept. unsure.
- Email alert system: sign up to be emailed when an application is submitted for an area. Case report may not have been written yet, but basic information about case included in email. (P&Z Timeline: 45-day process.)
- Who are Hillside developers? – Wide range of cases, not many big subdivisions in Anchorage, but those that are happening are on the Hillside (most undeveloped land is on the Hillside). Anchorage characterized by many smaller developers, although on the Hillside you see a lot of development by one developer (Palmer-Berggren). Large developers brought urban densities to the Hillside.
- One thing heard at workshops: process seems not to be serving neighbors or developers. What does MOA Planning think?
 - If developers have to do one thing more it's cumbersome, but standards are there because community wants them.
 - In process of revamping code to deal with issues that have come up.
- Is MOA taking a regional approach? Does little good if developer A is told “you have to put in sidewalk, curb, etc” and it just dead-ends because developer B doesn't have to. Other communities taking a regional approach – fee in lieu parking example:
 - Fee in lieu hasn't been used in Anchorage, but could be a possibility.
 - CAC talking about a regional approach to drainage issues & LRSAs (centralized or larger LRSA district).
 - MOA approach to drainage: require a significant amount to be contained onsite; developer responsibility for connections and outfall.
 - Hillside became developed under different standards and codes, but Planning is handling these issues comprehensively now in dealing with future development.
 - If PM&E is going to approve drainage ways, they should hold developers' feet to the fire and make it work. But PM&E might be short on staff and that's why it's taking them so long (too long in some cases) to address problems. Much more resources for watershed management on the Hillside.
 - LRSAs cannot do a drainage plan and MOA is continually approving developments that are going to create more watershed. (PM&E is supposed to be looking at that but just don't think they have the staff.)

- Need to think about whether your service area is adequate for your needs (but is it a building permit issue?)
 - Can you drain water from a private property to a roadway? (Used to be we did but it's not allowed now. Debate about this subject because of an issue at Goldenview Park.) When a subdivision is platted, all drainage courses are identified. Elevations are supposed to be identified too, so that they cannot change – focus on this and make sure that happens. (But how does public anticipate this?) Need to make sure City is appropriately approving new development. (How?) Tried to do it internally, but it hasn't happened yet. (Sometimes clearing vegetation changes everything because it allows ground to freeze deeper and changes water, not always just an issue of diverting water.)
 - What does MOA Planning do to educate public about what they have jurisdiction over?
 - “Self-help” online tutorials: <http://www.muni.org/Zoning/SelfHelp.cfm>
 - Planning staff spends time with public on how to be more effective.
 - There are Land Use Permits (limited review) and Building permits (more stringent review – building and safety inspection) required in different areas. Different fee structures for each. MOA Planning will provide a map showing where each type of permit is required. (posted under “Hillside Information” on www.hillsidedistrictplan.com)
 - Could the Hillside make a Hillside Drainage Service area?
 - If you're willing to pay for it, you can get more enhanced service.
 - Ask PM&E to identify drainage boundaries.
 - Not sure if MOA could figure different mill rates for different areas.
 - PM&E standards require a lot of water to remain onsite by minimizing impervious surfaces (minimum 40% non-disturbed area).
 - Does clustering development actually create less drainage problems?
 - Using wells, you're actually adding to surface water by bringing it up from below, so maybe we should be watering lawns with surface water instead of adding to it with well water.
4. Debriefing on Workshop Series 1 (Thea Agnew Bembem - 15 min)
- Generally, good job. Notes exciting and riveting; recaps short and cursory.
 - Things learned:
 - Comments more segmented than expected (geographically specific issues).
 - Design features can change behavior – Elmore designed well because it felt slower, but across Huffman O-Malley same design standards but feels much bigger, faster
 - Land use – extension of water and sewer came up often. Dilemma: people want the rural lifestyle but have to deal with issues that come with development and don't want the solutions either. So from a community view, we're going to have to reconcile this somehow, or we won't be serving the community well in coming up with a final plan.

- When you fracture bedrock to lay sewer, you change drainage patterns. So sewer is not a quick, clean, fix. (Hillside has already experienced an example of a whole lot caving in and sloughing onto the road.)
 - Did people give reasons why they did or did not want sewer? Mostly, those who did not want sewer fear increasing density and losing rural character. A valid fear, more so for undeveloped property than for developed property, although over the long term you might have more infill development.
 - Transportation – many comments about how many developments are coming in and their impacts to roads, drainage, infrastructure (mostly Rabbit Creek area). Seeing a three-fold increase in people served with new developments coming on.
 - Residents will not go to ARDSA because it means paying more and receiving less service. ARDSA probably wouldn't want to bring these roads in because they are so substandard.
 - Major roads often state roads. Developers can be required to contribute to neighborhood but not collector-road status.
 - Could a super-LRSA be created to get more resources? Become a rural road service area to get more capital funding? For example, right now S. Goldenview LRSA taxes at 1.8 mils and is spending a disproportionate amount on ripping ice and drainage problems (\$80,000 of \$140,000 budget). If the LRSA can spend on improving the roads and put a decent surface on them, roads will become less expensive to maintain, and as area develops more people will pay into it.
 - An LRSA can only grade and plow. An RRSA can make capital improvements. An RRSA can get state matching grants and other potential funding sources, but cannot get those as an LRSA.
 - House Bill 185 would allow LRSA to annex other parcels/subdivisions that primarily use LRSA roads for access, but would only annex if it makes economic sense.
 - Land use – much interest in trail systems, connectivity and creating new trails. Didn't go into detail about where these trails would be, more at the level of connectivity of trail system. Access to Chugach also important.
 - How much does it cost to build a trail? \$100-150/foot with no amenities (benches, bridges, etc), or \$500,000 a mile.
5. Update on Household Survey (Thea Agnew Bembem, CAC reps – 15 min)
- Using survey to collect attitudes on development more than as data collecting tool to find out where the different issues are
 - Concern that using Census tracts as geographic units will average out the variation in sentiment. – Zoning districts better.
 - How to convey that there are tradeoffs in the survey? – Probably use scale to find groupings of attitudes; preference groups to expose inconsistencies.

- If survey doesn't capture tradeoffs Hillsiders are willing to make, we need to make sure it happens in later workshop or some other venue.
 - Draft to come out this/next week. Will be sent to CAC as pre-test group.
6. Scope of summer work (Chris Beck - 15 min) - POSTPONED
7. Discuss Draft Emerging Themes (Chris Beck - 30min)
- Intentionally left out urban-rural boundary – believe it will be much more complicated than originally thought.
 - Goals will probably be different depending on what part of the Hillside. The Hillside will probably have to be divided into subdistricts, but unsure how those will be defined right now.
 - Clustering development is a good idea but often hasn't been done very well – would have to be accompanied with recommendations to develop in a way that preserves open space and serves drainage and other ends.
 - Ought to look at Pedestrian Plan.
 - Concern about goals being feel-good statements that aren't easy to implement.
 - Lot of trade-offs in this list – discussion to continue after CAC has had more time to look over the Emerging Themes.
8. Photo library – request for Hillside photos (Heather Stewart - 5 min)
9. Introductions of members of the public (10 min)
10. Wrap-up (5 min)
- Assignments
 - Public introductions will henceforth occur at beginning of meeting
 - Heather will specify CAC meetings on Monday or Wednesday in announcements
 - Jerry Weaver will get CAC a map of areas requiring Land Use Permits versus areas requiring Building Permits
 - Heather to post link to MOA Pedestrian Plan (now available on Muni website)
 - CAC to take a closer look at Emerging Themes document and narrow down which things are most important; other things willing to let go of
 - Heather to send CAC a word version of the Emerging Themes document so they can edit
 - Heather to send CAC email about Photo Library request for images
 - Next meeting – Monday, May 21, 2007