



CENTERLINE

520 Kansas City Street ♦ Suite 307
Rapid City, South Dakota 57701
PH: 605-341-3193 FX: 605-341-3358
centrline@aol.com

Plum Creek Oversize Request

TO: Dan Coon, P.E.
FROM: Lawrence M. Kostaneski, PE
DATE: July 20, 2005

RE: 04-104 Plum Creek Subdivision Ph 2: IDPF Funding Request – Oversize reimbursement request
CC: Plum Creek LLC, Growth Management, Public Works Dept.

Message: Dan, please reference your letter dated July 15, 2005.

Plum Creek acknowledges your response and offers the following rebuttal to the items listed.

Item 2: The key point to consider, which I tried to explain to you at our July 1 meeting, is that the location of Minnesota Street was chosen by the city. This location coincided with a SDDOT access plan for the SE Connector. The result of this joint government agency decision is a road grade that requires an extraordinary amount of embankment. Furthermore, the private land adjacent to this proposed intersection is severely impacted since it also requires excessive embankment to capture any potential revenue. Plum Creek believes that the city has some responsibility to offset the significant cost of this location decision.

Item 10, 11: The magnitude of the storm sewer crossing is a direct result of two circumstances – the massive embankment needed as explained above, and the need to transfer storm flows from upstream property through downstream property. This latter fact is fundamental to every drainage basin strategy in Rapid City. To boil the issue down to extra length based on a typical section appears to miss the point.

Item 14, 15, 16: I'm not exactly sure what your comments mean, but Plum Creek is responsible for a 3 lane asphalt collector class street. The city is requiring a multi-lane concrete arterial street. If you're suggesting that the city wants a partial width arterial for 500 feet, Plum Creek would observe that this seems short-sighted in this particular instance. Moreover, the formula for reimbursement should reflect not only the width, but the pavement material as well.

Item 20: All of the excessive quantities and costs are certainly reflected in professional services fees.

Since there is considerable difference in the interpretation of both extraordinary costs and basic infrastructure classification and function, Plum Creek asks that you place this item on the July 26, 2005 Public Works Committee agenda.

Your prompt attention to this request is appreciated. Please call with questions. Thanks.

END