

From: Centrline@aol.com
Sent: Thursday, November 14, 2002 2:32 PM
To: marcia.elkins@ci.rapid-city.sd.us; vicki.fisher@ci.rapid-city.sd.us
Cc: randy.nelson@ci.rapid-city.sd.us; proinc@gwtc.net
Subject: 02PL052 Lazy P-6 Layout Plat

Marcia Elkins:

Lazy P-6 recently submitted a revised Layout Plat. This Layout showed a few changes, but they continue to demand that the drainage routing scenario adjacent to their east property line be accepted as they show. They are not willing to negotiate this proposal.

Whether it's road widths, water main sizes or corridor connections, the City has infrastructure system expectations that all applicants must follow. If an applicant refuses to meet any one of these system expectations, the City has for the last 25 years simply denied the applicant's request.

The Engineering Division has indicated for 18 months that this is not the acceptable routing scenario at this location. Lazy P-6 has no intention of providing more calculations beyond the massive amount of work already performed by the City. It believes - de facto - that the drainage should route as shown.

Lazy P-6 wants closure on this Layout at the 11/21/02 Planning Commission. In their opinion there is nothing else to negotiate. They are fully apprised of the risks when they refuse to comply with a system requirement. They are prepared to accept that risk and its outcome.

Lawrence M. Kostaneski, PE for Lazy P-6 Land Company
Centerline

reasonable system connections, and has done so by relying on the utility strategy shown in the 95% draft 5th St plans. If there are other system requirements, the City should make them known.

- Lazy P-6 intends to comply with all competent wastewater disposal regulations.
- Lazy P-6 has learned that the City plans to use only existing, natural drainage channels as the conveyance strategy for the South Truck Route Drainage Basin Plan. If true, this is a "secret" decision. On 6/04/01 and again on 10/24/01, Lazy P-6 advised City staff in writing of its acceptance of several major components of the current DRAFT plan, including the recognition that additional metering dams may need to be placed on their property. Do the alleged "approved" 5th St. plans reflect this strategy change? Currently they show a channel along the south side of Catron Blvd., which Lazy P-6 also recognized, reserving 50 ft. of private ground for this purpose. Lazy P-6 has also identified areas for future metering in anticipation of this strategy. The current DRAFT Basin Plan is a technically reliable document that only needs an update to account for the land use changes. While there may be a need for more or somewhat larger metering elements, there is no chance that the current facilities will disappear. Therefore Lazy P-6 plans to use the current draft plan as direction, recognizing that any construction plans submitted subsequent to Layout Plat will require detailed storm water management strategies, both short and long term. It continues its objection, however, to having drainage channels artificially routed onto its property without its concurrence. (Why would Lazy P-6 or anyone else worry about "Master Plans" in the face of this kind of activity?)
- Considering the amount of tax dollars spent on City contour mapping, it is ludicrous to prohibit their use. Supplemented with field data obtained at critical locations or in critical areas, they are a perfectly acceptable design tool. Only in heavily wooded or radical terrain areas does the mapping become less reliable than might be desired. Lazy P-6 plans to use this existing data, supplemented as noted.
- City staff is apparently oblivious to the massive grading projects undertaken in conjunction with recent land development. Thorough geo-technical analysis is admittedly a must, but once this is obtained there is rarely any geologic obstacles that cannot be overcome by adhering to the geo-technical recommendations. Lazy P-6 intends to follow this strategy as well.
- Fire hydrants are located at the intersections of paved, public roads with hydrant spacing as required. Is there some special "fire apparatus access" requirement not anticipated by current criteria?

Thank you for your consideration

Lawrence M. Kostaneski, PE
For Lazy P-6 Land Co., Inc.