

July 6, 2006

To: Rapid City Planning Commission and Rapid City City Council

From: Andrew LeGare and area residents

The following are items of concern and requests in response to the notice of hearing for a variance to the subdivision regulations.

Item #2

Since this proposed development is in a Rapid City water recharge area, we ask that some type of water quality metering be done to storm water drainage and water holding facility. This area has the potential to be very cavernous which could allow a direct pipe, so to speak, to that water supply. It is primarily a limestone formation which would allow quick drainage to that supply. Because of this vulnerability, we are requesting not a 60% right but a 100% right in every part of this subdivision. What I am saying is that this subdivision should be scrutinized in every aspect and best engineering practices be used due to the vulnerability and susceptibility of this area.

Item #3

Rapid Canyon sewer district - does it have adequate funds to maintain and support additional line. Our concern is the financial stability and solvency of the sewer district.

Item #4

Water storage for fire flows and water pressure. We believe that the water system should not be minimized. For example, Fire flows at 1500 gallons per minute for 2 hours plus peak would constitute approximately 200,000 gallons of water storage. We ask not to compromise and to not allow the gallons per minute from the well to be deducted from the 1500 gallons per minute fire flow. Please do not compromise on fire protection.

Item #8

Since the developer is requesting an urban setting for this development, we are requesting that item #8 not be given a variance. The developer should be required to do curb, gutter and street light conduit. There is already a drainage and erosion issue from storm water runoff due to the elevations from Highway 44 on to the Blake road access.

Item #9-10

We are requesting no variance to those because the developer is asking for an urban setting and should be required to do those items - cul de sac, intermediate turn around, 24' paved surface for road, curb, gutter, sidewalk, street light conduit, water and sewer.

Item #11

We ask that you do not allow a variance of the 49' access easement. This needs to be in place for future development. We ask for a stipulation that the Blake Road street

intersection be safe and adequate to access Highway 44. We want to see reconfiguration of the intersection to address the elevation and erosion issues already present.

Item #13

We ask that a geotech report be required for the detention pond for storm water runoff in addition to the items already listed in item 13. We are concerned that there may be caverns allowing direct access to the aquifer.

Item #20, 21 and 22

We ask that the legal entity be set up like a sewer and road district as homeowner associations are not always the best way to handle the issues that need to be dealt with in these items.

Letter of Credit vs Performance Bond

I am not sure I understand how this letter of credit is a better protection to the public or the city than a performance bond. I have understood that a performance bond requires money up front and we request that a performance bond be considered to insure the developer follows thru on all recommendations.

Inspector

We also request that inspections be done on this development to insure the quality be maximized. We are requesting a qualified full time inspector to be on sight due to the fact that the consequences to Rapid City's water supply could be severe and this cannot be compromised.