



Hillside District Plan Workshop Notes Public Workshop Series 3 – April 23

General Comments/Introduction

- Why change anything?
- These are our homes and you're not going to assess us \$50,000 so you can make money....
- You don't even maintain the trails on the Hillside now, and you want to add more?
- Why don't we send people to the Valley and leave us alone?
- Would you address how much this planning process is costing the taxpayers?
 - About \$1.8 million; the bulk of these costs is not the land use planning; it's the technical studies
- If all these changes go through (implementation), how much is it going to cost?
- Ice building up – isolated incidents? Haven't seen them all over the Hillside... (some disagreement expressed from other individuals, listing a number of areas experiencing problems)

Land Use

- Lower Hillside
 - Buffers would need to be bigger as density increases
 - Show base case – no change alternative – on map
 - Accessory dwelling units are not included in build out estimates – accessory dwelling units are allowed in any zoning district except R-1 & R-1A
- Southeast Hillside
 - Down zoning R1A great idea
- Commercial
 - Wouldn't shop at country store – too expensive, hang out for kids, go out of business and be an eye sore
 - Might become another Abbott Town Center
 - If we do nothing these parcels will remain residential – yes
 - Rabbit Creek – nothing along the road, hill is too steep. Keep zoning it as on the Old Seward Hwy, and do a commercial master plan around Potter Marsh
 - No bike rental places, no food establishments because of proximity to Bird Learning Center and Wildlife Refuge
 - Tie commercial in Bear Valley to section 36 as a way to raise funds for parks

Land Use Alternatives

- Lower Hillside
 - PUD would be detrimental – no increase in zoning is needed because Hillside already met the 4-6000 unit quota set by 2020
 - Move water/sewer boundary west to Lake Otis to DeArmoun, then to Seward and then south
- Southeast Hillside
 - Adding development standards to what is in Title 21 is a good idea
 - Making roads go through lower density areas will bring more traffic on quiet streets
 - Southeast line should be brought to DeArmoun Road for drainage management by watershed
- Commercial
 - Would be very difficult to maintain residential around commercial area if it were successful
 - Country store is “camel’s nose under the tent”
 - Bear Valley – too steep – Rabbit Creek too steep – Old Seward – might be OK?
 - Old Seward / Rabbit Creek is very congested already – can’t handle commercial
- SE Hillside
 - I’d like to see the whole pink area down zoned for fewer people to come in
 - Appreciate effort for increased regulation
- Commercial
 - Why not build commercial activities for birders near the boardwalk not up at Rabbit Hutch area
 - More activity at Potter Marsh parking lot would help reduce vandalism
- Vegetation standards
 - Agree with development standards but wonder about fire
 - Concern about poor roads
 - People resist road widening because they don’t want their “property” developed (R.O.W.)
 - Nice compromise – lower above, increase below
- Commercial development on the Hillside (neighborhood store)

Why not say:

There is no support on the Hillside at this time for commercial development. People on the Hillside are satisfied with the present distance and difficulty of obtaining supplies. If in the future citizens’ demand develops for commercial development, and commercial development solves a real problem (i.e. traffic) then the assembly can address it. For now, no new commercial.

Water & Wastewater

- Concerns were voiced about the data these studies are based on
- Neighborhood onsite systems have been/are being constructed in Big Lake, Chugiak
- Mound systems?/leach-field possible?
 - Not advised due to climate conditions
 - Onsite systems run pretty well in Alaska
- Who makes decisions about these alternatives?
 - Assembly, Planning Team will make recommendations in the Hillside District Plan, so give feedback to determine what those recommendations are
- How far down does the neighborhood onsite system discharge? 100 ft underground? Is it treated by then?
- Can you quantify “significant” cost of AWWU? \$150,000? \$50,000?
 - Depends on specifics of individual sites
- Some questions about reservoirs
- Preference voiced that water be treated and returned to the ground. Don’t think AWWU is appropriate.
 - Dissenting opinion from the group likes AWWU; best system
- Can we draw on that map where we want the boundary to be? Why can’t it go to the Seward Highway? How many people do we need to support moving the boundary to Seward Highway to make that happen?
- Most people in the group preferred a base-case, “no change” alternative (~80%)
 - Of the remaining ~20%, preferences for neighborhood onsite systems versus sewer extension was fairly evenly split.
- Are most private wells confined systems or aquifers?
 - Most are confined systems on the Hillside
- Tell us more about the Big Lake system: how does it work?
 - It’s currently under construction; Chugiak has one that’s been operating a while
- Would you want one of these systems if you lived on the Hillside?
 - Yes, but I’d want a groundwater study done first.
- At Tallus West Subdivision, all septic systems failed, lots were too small, required larger treatment areas...
 - Not ideal for built-out subdivisions
 - Ideally owned and managed by a professional company, not a homeowner’s association
- Do you have to have secondary treatment with the Advantec systems?
 - Regulations are fuzzy on that in Anchorage
- How is Biocycle different from Advantec?
 - In the Biocycle system, effluent comes in, is displaced by new; Advantec has a timer and won’t switch until the timer tells it to.

- There are also some differences in drainfield set-up between the two systems
- “Discharge treats to a lower level” – does that mean cleaner or dirtier?
 - Dirtier
- So neighborhood systems would help keep density low...
 - Probably
- We’ve been told that if AWWU brings in one utility, it brings in both utilities
 - That’s the standard practice.
- So if the boundary moves, that doesn’t mean that sewer will necessarily come in; it just means it could come if the majority of the neighborhood votes for it?
 - Yes
- So you’re extending a main down Elmore; could property owners along there tap into it?
 - Yes, but then you pay into it
- Does AWWU have the ability to serve water but not sewer?
 - Have to have the potential to do both; if the line doesn’t move to Elmore, those property owners can’t get water.
- Could you give a better idea of the cost of extending AWWU sewer?
 - If you’re close, it’s maybe \$1.13 per square foot
 - If you’re far away, it’s maybe \$2 to \$3 per square foot
 - So it depends on how far you are from the system
 - Private development depends on how much you can build it for
- We hear about a nitrate problem west of Elmore. Would sewer ever be forced upon us because of a public health emergency?
 - If the State were to determine that a public health emergency existed, yes. Peter’s Creek is an example of that happening; a gas station leak into house wells forced it. Don’t recall how the costs worked out in that case.
- If city water and sewer comes into your area, does the owner pay for it only if they hook up to it or regardless?
 - Depends. If your neighborhood votes yes, you have to. If a private developer hooks up downstream, you can hook up for free within 3 years.
- If your lot is cut by the road twice, do you pay for it coming and going?
 - That would depend on lot size, frontage, etc.

Drainage

- The pilot plan should include text stating the need to coordinate with Fish and Game (Steve Albert) to ensure adequate fish passage for all new stream crossings.
- The new management entity should have the ability to enforce the pilot drainage planning elements (it is perceived that MOA is not currently enforcing existing requirements). Concern was stated that we would be creating something with no authority. It was also stated that developers should be held accountable for their actions.

- The bounds of the Hillside District Region named Southeast Hillside (Map 1.6A of the Hillside District Plan Alternatives, A Framework for Public Discussion April 2008) should be moved to mirror watershed bounds.
- When the public were asked during the April 23rd drainage break-out session if they believed that new development should be required to include runoff controls they unanimously raised their hands yes. When asked if they believed there were drainage problems on the Hillside they unanimously raised their hands yes. When asked if they believed that drainage on the Hillside was currently being managed adequately, they unanimously raised their hands no.
- When the public were asked during the April 24th drainage break-out session if they would support a new district and pay fees (\$3 - \$10 per month), they unanimously raised their hands confirming their support. When asked if they would prefer a new entity that managed roads and drainage or drainage only, all but one of the attendees wanted a new entity that would manage both roads and drainage. One attendee stated that although they agreed with the concepts presented, they would have to see how it would really work.
- A concern was raised about nitrate loads from new land use practices noting that elevated nitrates have been observed in Potter Marsh. The attendee stated the need for piped storm drain systems to separate runoff from the stream systems. The water quality elements of the plan were discussed along with a summary of Anchorage's NPDES program.
- Would the city set the rates? Answer: The MOA has no money to establish a new management entity. The rates would be set based on the drainage plan for the watershed but the new management board would have ultimate say in the rates.
- We should define what a watershed is – that it is based on topographic conditions, not political boundaries.
- How is the tax money spent that is currently collected by the MOA from Hillside residents? Answer: a portion of the fees is submitted to road service areas and a portion pays for governance.
- It was stated that new development is held to a high standard but there was concern about older developments located on steep slopes that discharge runoff from paved surfaces directly onto roads.
- It was asked if any of the proposed drainage planning elements could be implemented without creation of a new management entity. It was explained that yes, runoff controls could be required, stream setbacks and drainage easements could be secured, and a flood hazard study could be conducted for the recommended segment of Little Rabbit Creek. It was explained that construction of existing system upgrades and regional controls to mitigate runoff from new development could not, however, be implemented without a new management entity.
- Does this plan consider water quality controls to be included with existing system upgrades? It was explained that no, the plan does not include retrofitting the existing drainage systems to include water quality controls.

The proposed regional controls for future development runoff do, however, include a water quality component.

- Does the current Title 21 include stream setbacks or onsite control requirements? Answer: yes, Title 21 includes stream setbacks although the plan proposes slightly different setback widths and no, runoff controls as proposed in the pilot plan are not in Title 21.
- Who will review runoff controls requirements for new development? Answer: MOA at land use permit level, with new management entity enforcement.
- The pilot plan presents a drainage approach for the Little Rabbit and Little Survival Creek watershed. What about the rest of Hillside? Answer: it is recommended that drainage plans be prepared for all Hillside watersheds and that a plan will be prepared for the Potter Creek watershed this year.
- What development/activities would be allowed in stream setbacks? Answer: that would be up to the management entity and residents of the watershed.
- Attendees stated they would like to review the draft pilot watershed drainage plan and asked when/how it would be made available.

The following attendees stated their willingness to provide public support of the proposed management approach and provided contact information:

Judy Eledye - 349-8309

Collin Neary - collin47@gmail.com

Bill Hiatt – 345-7602 hiatt@alaska.net

Dave Lappi – 345-2745 lapres@gci.net

Dick Jablonowski – 345-0263 dickj@gci.net

Kevin Doyle - 952-0051

Transportation

- Why change anything?
- The cost! How much is this whole thing going to cost?
- The Hillside is a unique area; it is not Eagle River.
- What if the Knik Arm Crossing happens? Will all of this growth on the Hillside even occur?
- Concern about the grade of roads in the area
- Individual was not excited about extending cul-de-sacs
- Individual would like to join RSA. He buys the gravel and maintains his road, but others use it too. He'd like to somehow share that cost.
- Dust abatement is a priority
- Where are the major trailheads?
- Where can I find all of the technical documents?
- How are LRSAs funded?
- Alternative 2b: Aren't drainage problems caused by roads?
- Individual likes Alternative 2a: Everybody uses the major roads—drainage problems are much more local. (The possibility of varying fee structure by watershed was explained and discussed).

- Now I'm on a through road? At the first meeting, there wasn't a road there? How does that happen?
- What is the Municipality's agenda? Are they going to cram all these roads down our throats?
- Independent design of roads
- Why can't all of this happen as needed?
- Regulation without compliance– it rings hollow.
- Individuals just didn't know that all of this growth was going to happen.
- Is down-zoning a possibility?
- This is an awful lot to take in at once.
- There aren't many people here.
- People are only going to vote on this once.
- The whole city would vote to support Chugach access.

Management and Financing Mechanisms (and General Comments)

- So you might be paying \$150 per year for a \$300,000 home; this doesn't include any kind of water and sewer?
 - Correct. Please keep in mind the service area would be for the whole Hillside, but there are only two places in the Hillside District where extending sewer is under consideration
- You mentioned a “do-nothing/no change option,” what happens if that goes through?
 - It's not accurate to say that there is a “no change” option. Development will continue whether the MOA changes Municipal policy or not. We see the ideas presented in this Framework document more as constraints on development than as “pro-development” policies
- This all makes sense on paper, but it means nothing without compliance. We've lived through this public planning process and then been scammed by corrupt government officials and developers getting away with not following the plans we've worked with the Muni to create in the past. Now we're paying for developments that have no accountability for their impacts (drainage, roads, visual, etc.). I don't know why we would want this density or ability to densify. It changes forever the character of the Hillside – we need know whether the (Knik Arm) bridge will open up land across the Inlet and depress home prices/values on the Hillside...
- This is all a lot to take in at one time. For the area you're covering, there are not many people here tonight. There's a big attitude on the Hillside that it doesn't matter what we want; the city is going to do whatever it wants.
- In the '80s, everyone thought the city would keep growing and we'd have so many people, but then it didn't grow that fast. Why not wait to zone for higher density later if/when there is a compelling need to do so?
 - Regarding funding: (One CAC member said) I'm all for it; I'm tired of passing the hat. Dividing up the Hillside District into separate service districts is not a good idea; keep all the services bundled together because

- people are only going to vote once. Make sure the service area boards are large enough to be representative of the whole Hillside.
- I would also vote a one-time bond to put in place a permanent fund for trails.
- Regarding possible Chugach Access bond issue or service district (whole city)
 - Large majority: good idea; rest no comment
- It's important to remember that a local control board means we don't choose to spend money needlessly. Hillside residents will decide what to spend their money on. So many problems don't get fixed because LRSA's don't have the authority to fix them (if it requires making capital improvements).

Wrap-up

- Drainage: tossed out the concept of an area-wide drainage service area – good idea
 - Concerns about enforcement (based on current enforcement problems)
 - Concerns about how overall boundaries would be established.
- Everyone is worried about roads. Let's be specific about what this plan is proposing – how to fund and administer?
 - Angry about impacts from recent development; connectivity and road maintenance – do developers down the line pay?
 - Cost comparison with existing service areas
 - Chugach access is important – how to get into the Park?
 - Good experience with CBERRSA
 - Mistrust is very real and ingrained, we've done a lot of work to try to overcome that, but it's still there
 - Most said keep all services in one service area, but some thought it better to separate them and go incrementally
 - Good coordinate with other regulatory agencies
- Concern about boundary movement and increasing density
 - Neighborhood onsite systems were presented as alternative for the Furrow Creek area, but these are probably not the best option for that area because it doesn't seem to have adequate undeveloped land to serve as a drain-field for the systems. These might be a good alternative for the Rabbit Creek Heights area, where there is more undeveloped land that could be used as a drain-field.
 - The idea of having a Groundwater Protection Plan was presented – we should be studying our water more and doing a better job of tracking trends in our water quality. Groundwater rehab is expensive and sometimes impossible; it's much better to detect potential problems and address them in advance.
- Participants expressed interest in better understanding the alternatives for the Lower Hillside area
 - Regarding commercial development – concern about traffic in the Lower Rabbit Creek area

- Why is commercial needed? There are pros and cons...
- Support expressed for commercial in the Bird TLC area: it would help with vandalism, would be closer to Potter Marsh visitors/users
- Why did commercial even come up? Is our voice really being listened to?
- Is it possible to change zoning on Chuck's Backhoe so it cannot be commercial anymore?
- Can't we be more specific in the Hillside District Plan that the [Southeast] Hillside is supposed to be low-density?
- You're going to take comments, come up with something, present it to the Assembly. The Hillside has been predominantly rural; if we don't want higher density and you know that, then if you don't represent us and say "hold density where it is," then you are supporting higher density. If you don't stop it, you support it.
- The area being "sacrificed" to development is mostly R-6 and the people who purchased there purchased because it was R-6, so aren't you being disingenuous with those people? You've got a lot of residential businesses in there that don't want a residential development with all its construction popping up next door.
- It's still possible today to use a Planned Unit Development (PUD) to develop at a higher density on the Hillside.
 - Can we do an overlay district banning PUDs on the Southeast Hillside?
- We have some commercial uses and operations on the Hillside right now, so when we say "no commercial," does that mean none at all on the Hillside? No more additional commercial than what we have now? Are certain types of commercial uses ok? It would be helpful to understand more exactly what people do and don't want on the Hillside...
 - We don't have a say regarding grandfathering...
 - R-6 is commercial residential, but very specific about allowable commercial activities
- Could we get summaries of the discussions with other stakeholders on the website?



Hillside District Plan Workshop Notes Public Workshop Series 3 – April 24

General Comments/Introduction

- No comments recorded; group went straight to break out sessions

Land Use

- General
 - Enforcement is critical
 - Could some vacant land be purchased or reserved for parks
 - Would vegetation retention be enforced? covenants, development review
 - Limit light pollution
 - Downzone areas that are not conducive to development
 - Consider building height restrictions
- Commercial
 - “Commercial - It’s like a cancer – no one can control it”
 - Road is not safe on Rabbit Creek
 - Rabbit Creek area is already close to Huffman Carrs
 - Keep it closer to Old Seward
 - Curve by Sierra Way (Bear Valley area) is very dangerous – should not be attracting kids across the street
 - Expansion of church on Rabbit Creek was opposed by community council
 - Use plan to establish standards for commercial development across Hillside
 - Old Seward / Rabbit Creek – must be compatible with march and Bird Treatment Center
- Conservation Subdivisions/Land Use Alternatives
 - Encroachment of open space from utilities and landowners extending back yards – how do you enforce open space in conservation subdivisions?
 - Large lawns affect watershed
 - Wildlife corridors cutoff by fences
 - Set maximum building foot prints
 - Avoid big house, small lot
 - Check 2020 – says limit possible increase in density to areas west of Lake Otis
 - People bought land relying on R-6 zoning, not fair to change
 - Use accessory units to reach 2 DUA, and meet need for growth that way
 - Define use boundaries using watershed boundaries (little Rabbit Creek)
- Buffers in Conservation Subdivisions
 - No buffers needed, don’t need more regulations

- Exact opposite: need bigger buffers than what is shown
- Commercial
 - Bear Valley – would be great to see a place to shop, would be great to not have to drive all the way to Carrs on Huffman
 - Fine if they don't get too big
 - Get 1 or 2, can't stop them
 - Not a Stop & Go, 7-11, ok if it was a family owned, well thought out, in terms of architecture
 - Assembly will always cave in and expand commercial – once door is opened, won't be contained
 - Out of eggs? – borrow from neighbors
 - Stores lead to burglaries, kids hang out at schools, unsafe road crossings
- Other existing non residential uses
 - Church signage cut back (size is enough)
 - Problem with signs, churches on O'Malley, on Hillside
 - More invisible commercial is ok
 - The place does not fit – screen them
 - Old fire station
 - Get something attractive on land already zoned commercial
 - Better off not allowing commercial in first place
 - Want zoning to stick; if commercial was there, if low density was there should stick
 - Commercial – push to next plan – not needed now
 - Maintain R.O.W.S. for trails, trail on Rabbit Creek Road

Water & Wastewater

- Why is this discussion part of the Hillside District Plan? Why is water and wastewater service not being looked at by the MOA outside this plan, with a separate ordinance or policy? How does the Groundwater Protection Plan fall into the rest of the Hillside plan?
 - Recommending the Groundwater Protection Plan as an ongoing program/effort to manage the resource (groundwater)
- The Hillside plan seems to be more about land use; this (Groundwater Protection Plan) is a great recommendation though.
- Some proposed developments will contribute a lot to groundwater problems, nitrates, etc., so aren't you exacerbating these problems on the Hillside by increasing density? Why not keep it to one dwelling unit per acre?
- I don't see the data that shows there's a problem, so why are we spending so much money on a Groundwater Protection Plan? Why not do studies to see if there really are any problems?
- I can't believe people are not mentioning groundwater – what about individual wells? Are you testing those?
 - Only upon sale of the house

- But your data don't show if those wells have been grouted – if you grout the wells you can fix the problem...
 - Sort of; you still want to know what's causing elevated levels of nitrates or other indicators and prevent contamination
- What is the logic/reason for extending the allowable sewer boundary to Elmore?
 - It's pretty much a land use question: if you increase density, how do you want to serve the area? What type of technology do you want to use?
- So if you don't increase the density, it's not an issue?
 - Correct
 - The current way that people on larger lots keep and fertilize lawns can cause the same amount of contamination as denser developments.
- Isn't it skewed by all the new development?
 - Yes
- What are the top 5 problems with groundwater today?
 - There are no real "problems" with groundwater on the Hillside
 - There is an upward trend in nitrate levels – this is not a problem, just something to watch right now.
 - There are a few isolated cases of arsenic, manganese, etc. but not a district-wide issue
- So, collecting the data doesn't mean there are problems or will be problems, but we don't know if we don't collect the data...
 - Correct
- If you have an individual onsite system, don't you have to have it monitored for a dollar a day?
 - Yes
- Why wouldn't you have each house pay a dollar a day to monitor a neighborhood system?
 - You could certainly do that – the point is that someone should monitor the system; how you configure that is up to your neighborhood/homeowners association.
- What are the sizes of the lots? Is there someone who oversees these systems?
 - Yes
- I've seen these systems, but problems getting the money together to get them installed, monitored, then torn out when they fail and then have to be removed
 - That's why you can't get away with not paying for sewer – if you don't pay your sewer fees, you can get a lien placed on your property, foreclosed upon, etc.
 - That's why we don't want AWWU on the Hillside
- Are you suggesting these neighborhood systems for new development or challenged areas already developed?
 - They are much easier and less expensive to install on undeveloped or partially-developed subdivisions because of the need to reserve a large drain-field (which might be impossible if the subdivision is fully

developed/built out). Also, you might have to tear up and replace streets, etc. in order to install the pipes, which makes it much more disruptive and expensive.

- Are you recommending neighborhood onsite systems for challenged areas?
 - We're not making recommendations at this time.
- What are you recommending for depth up here (for the onsite systems)?
 - 18 inches, similar to what they do in Minnesota
- There seem to be divergent opinions on deep versus shallow trench – what are your thoughts?
 - Below 18 inches, there is not much air circulation, so the deeper you go beyond that, the faster and easier they fail.
- I've been on septic for 35 years; I must be in real trouble...
 - Not necessarily. It depends on your soils. Some areas of the Hillside have soils that drain well and those onsite systems rarely have problems, others have poor soils that drain either too fast or too slow. Maintenance is also a factor – if you've been properly maintaining your system, you won't have as many problems.
- How is there air transfer when soils are frozen?
 - The shallow trenches work in northern Minnesota, where the soil actually gets colder for longer periods of time than in Anchorage
- How is the cost of increased sewer distribution assigned and paid for, etc.?
 - There are three ways that can happen...
- So if a change of zoning forces increased density, we have a choice whether sewer is extended?
 - Clarification: the land use alternative currently being proposed would not “force” density; it would more clearly allow an increase in density that technically already exists through the Planned Unit Development process. Developers could conceivably develop to a higher density right now through that process, but they tend not to use PUDs. It's not clear how extensively the proposed land use alternative (which also makes higher density allowable through a PUD process) would actually be used. The PUD process has a fairly extensive review process and enough conditions placed on it that most developers find it too time-consuming (and therefore expensive) to use.
- Can you show us where the water/sewer boundaries are right now? So a school like this one (Goldenview Middle School) is not on public water and sewer? Are other schools on public water and sewer?
 - Goldenview is, Huffman is not, though they are having trouble with their septic system
- This plan seems very pro-development; right now areas that are on septic are not being developed/re-developed because the challenges are too great.
- I don't see this study answering all questions that Anchorage 2020 states (see Policy #80). I want to see all three systems evaluated according to those criteria.

- How long has the Big Lake neighborhood system you talked about been in place? Why did they choose to use that system there?
 - A neighborhood system was used because the subdivision has small lots, and it's currently still in construction
- So we don't know how well this system is working?
 - It's too early to tell.
- Who is managing the Eagle River/Chugiak system?
 - [didn't catch answer]
- If those lots on the Lower Hillside currently have onsite systems and good land, under the land use alternative that allows an increase in density, developers will have a smaller financial restriction with neighborhood systems than AWWU, so allowing neighborhood systems could accelerate development?
 - Correct
- We have no system/program in place for managing onsite systems
 - That's why we recommend training in the report
- Are these mutually exclusive options (AWWU versus the community/neighborhood onsite systems)?
 - AWWU decided that if the neighborhood onsite systems go into an area, then AWWU doesn't want responsibility for bailing them out if they fail. So AWWU will pull back the boundary if the neighborhood systems go into an area.
- So a developer could conceivably not have a choice between AWWU and neighborhood systems – they would have to go with whatever we decide through this plan?
 - Correct.
- When the allowable sewer boundary is moved, how is that decision made?
 - AWWU will draw a line around the subdivision
 - You can have a subdivision on sewer and one with neighborhood systems side by side.
- I prefer for neighborhood systems because competition keeps the cost down.
- CAC member: I live in Furrow Creek and I think it's a moot question. I doubt you have enough room for a drain-field. Soils in the area are bad – many onsite problems exist in the area. I seriously question how appropriate the area is for neighborhood systems.
- So if a developer pulled together enough lots to redevelop at a higher density under the land use alternative being proposed for the Lower Hillside, tried the neighborhood system and it didn't work, what happens then?
 - The Assembly can amend the AWWU service boundary today for a particular development; it can overrule AWWU's policy of not serving areas with neighborhood onsite systems.
- Is this the bulk of the plan? Are there other provisions?
 - As far as AWWU goes, yes, this is it.
- In the supplemental report, you made recommendations to change regulations for septic, several of which make septic on the Hillside much more expensive...

- That happened when I bought my lot – the previous owners had to buy an Advantec system.
- What concerns me about the regulations is the blanket requirement to use a particular system.
- What about the rest of the Hillside that has problems with septic?
 - The AWWU Master Plan is only concerned with serving existing customers. If a development on the Hillside and within the allowable service boundary asks us to extend services, we might choose to do so, but beyond that situation AWWU has no plans to extend service to the Hillside.
- I live in the Potter Creek area and am served by Potter Water; is AWWU ever going to merge with Potter Water?
 - No. It's not worth our while to buy them out.
- Great. They're looking at a rate increase of 250%, making it more expensive than AWWU.
 - Sorry about that, but taking over Potter Water would negatively affect our existing ratepayers.
- So what about expansion to Goldenview?
 - That expansion is being drive by a private development, not AWWU. They've asked us to build out to serve them
 - AWWU is trying to better serve its existing customers.
- Are you satisfied with Potter Water service?
 - The water is ok; it's just getting expensive.
- Who are AWWU customers?
 - Brian pointed on a map.
- So when you say you serve ratepayers, that includes all AWWU customers throughout the Anchorage Bowl?
 - Yes, that includes flatlanders.
- Would each one of the homes with the neighborhood systems have their own well for water?
 - They could, but they may need to have public water.
- The big issue is not one technology over another – it's what do we want Anchorage to be like? I read this document, and all I'm seeing is develop, develop, develop – why not conserve? Make parks? Wildlife corridors, etc.? I don't care if it's privately owned – just pay more money and buy out the landowners.
 - I think most of us agree with that.

Drainage

- See notes from 5.23.08

Transportation

- Discussion about Elmore Road
- How are the roads currently funded?
- Lighting? Individual was afraid of too much light pollution. However, the lighting on Elmore Road is currently inadequate.
- Individual thinks Hillside residents ought to take control of state roads.
- What about the liability?
- The term “alternatives” was explained and discussed. “Do we need this connection or don’t we?”
- What specifically counts as a trail?
- Seward Highway: there is a need for a north-bound off-ramp on DeArmoun Road.
- Elmore and Rabbit Creek intersection discussion: What will happen if (when) Elmore goes through?
- Legacy point secondary road (circled on map). Individual was told repeatedly that this road would not be going through; it is not possible. This disagrees with source plat mapping. More research about this connection is necessary.
- Reduce speed limits on primary roads
- #14, #11 Don’t put it in. Individual is afraid of speeding traffic. These roads are not in a LRSA and the individual feels that trucks and construction in this high, swampy area would have a severe impact. Noise was also a big concern.

Management and Financing Mechanisms

- So is the \$1million for all options?
 - That is just an explanation of how mill rates are levied. The actual cost of the service district would depend on a combination of what projects it chooses to fund, administration costs, etc.
- How would the all-in-one service area work? Would it be able to bond?
 - It would have a local board, like Eagle River. Yes, it would be able to bond.
 - Basically it would have the same abilities as the MOA, but with Hillside control.
- Does Eagle River (CBERRSA) cover all of Eagle River or just the highlands or lowland?
 - All

Wrap-up

- Transportation:
 - Trail access, maintain and preserve, how to deal with privately owned land
 - Road connectivity – has to happen as neighborhoods develop incrementally, traffic as collectors
 - To protect State funding, need road maintenance

- Drainage:
 - Majority of people would pay \$3 to \$10 a month to deal with drainage.
 - Stronger drainage standards, area-wide service area/district is wanted and should include conveyance outside streams
 - Retro-fixes as well as restrictions on developers
 - Majority wanted combined roads and drainage service area
- Water/Wastewater:
 - Difficult to impart all information, it's a complex topic and difficult to give feedback
 - Why planning? Why not ordinance material? Can plan and implement ordinance.
 - Higher density means higher impacts; want to keep all low
 - Should perhaps have separate chapters for water and wastewater
 - Skepticism about groundwater protection plan – fear mongering; don't want to pay for something when we don't know what it is or why it is needed
 - It can be costly to deal with groundwater quality – how far to go?
 - Would you have a well on every lot with neighborhood onsite systems? – Depends
 - Land Use issue came up: Why does this planning effort seem to be pushing development?
- Land Use:
 - No commercial wanted; if it must exist, make it blend
 - Don't put the cart before the horse – have the infrastructure in place before development and make it fit existing character
 - Don't want more density: 1 to 1.25 acres preferred
 - Don't want to move the allowable sewer service boundary
 - Some areas are already zoned commercial. Some are ok with commercial – not everyone says no.
- There is a sense that the outcome of this planning process is pre-determined. But if you look at prior iterations of planning documents for this plan, you can see changes, and I've been to several meetings with this planning team. What seems to be on offer here is some self-determination for us. These guys are responsive, they do listen.