

LUPC SUBDIVISION RULE REVIEW

Technical Issues Tabulation Sheets

Preliminary Feedback from Meeting #3

February 25, 2015

Jeff's Catering, Brewer

The following sheets contain notes from the preliminary feedback on two technical issues (soils mapping and investigation, and maximum road grade) that the LUPC received during Stakeholder Meeting #3. Stakeholders will have the opportunity to comment on the accuracy and completeness of the notes from Meeting #3, and to provide additional feedback on these topics during the afternoon session of Meeting #4.

LUPC Subdivision Rule Review
 Technical Issues
 Preliminary Feedback from Meeting #3

SOIL INVESTIGATION AND MAPPING	
1. Should the intensity of the soil survey for a subdivision be determined on the basis of developed vs. undeveloped area, density, or a combination option?	
<p style="text-align: center;">Initial Responses</p> <p>Intensity should be up to the landowner, soil scientist, or design engineer Intensity should be based on site characteristics not development or density Highest intensity surveys should be done at the building permit stage Need higher intensity for road placement, siting building envelopes Proximity to sensitive areas should be considered NRCS mapping is more accurate and field verified now, should be used more NRCS and wetland map should be used for planning purposes, rezoning Class A is not necessary for residential development Class B sufficient for road placement and building envelopes DEP waives soil survey if geotech survey done for structures, roads Use higher intensity if soil limitations shown on NRCS map Include waiver provisions for soil mapping Use NRCS map for undeveloped areas, but have field verified by C.S.S. (Class C) Need admin appeal process if staff asking for more than necessary on a project</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Additional Discussion and Comments</p> <p>when wetlands map available, well-drained soils; not with shallow, wet, steep slopes or close to waterbody</p>
2. In what type of project or area within a project should Class C or D soils surveys be allowed?	
<p style="text-align: center;">Initial Responses</p> <p>Use NRCS map for undeveloped areas, but have field verified by C.S.S. (Class C)</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Additional Discussion and Comments</p>
3. Which of the options for consideration would work best for the UT?	
<p style="text-align: center;">Initial Responses</p> <p>Plumbing code requires 1 test pit LUPC should adopt DEP model DEP criteria have been in place for some time, make sense Reasonable to ask for more test pits where limitations exist Test pits don't take a lot of time Documentation required by DEP should be modified, its overkill</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Additional Discussion and Comments</p> <p>Test pit summary log and one soil description is sufficient. Soil description isn't needed for every test pit</p>
4. If number of test pits reduced to one, in what situations would requiring a written certification by C.S.S. provide a reasonable alternative?	
<p style="text-align: center;">Initial Responses</p> <p>Any certification has to be done by site evaluator not C.S.S. Code requires site evaluator to verify that soil area is sufficient for disposal bed Stamped site evaluation is guarantee that soils are sufficient in area</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Additional Discussion and Comments</p>
5. What soil conditions or designs would necessitate additional test pits to ensure there are adequate soils to accommodate the disposal bed?	
<p style="text-align: center;">Initial Responses</p> <p>LUPC should adopt DEP model</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Additional Discussion and Comments</p>

LUPC Subdivision Rule Review
 Technical Issues
 Preliminary Feedback from Meeting #3

MAXIMUM ROAD GRADE	
1. Will the possible option under consideration for maximum road grade work for the UT and does it address the original issue identified?	
Initial Responses	Additional Discussion and Comments
Research should include fire code standards for northern states Should winter conditions of snow/ ice be considered A lot of places may be seasonal use only, but no guarantee Can require seasonal use by deed covenant Need to adjust standard for Maine's climate conditions Should "Code of the West" like document be created Look to see if Carrabassett Valley has standards for road construction Road standard should at least consider fire code requirements Makes more sense to design for fire code requirements near service centers	Notify new owners what life is like in remote areas Remote areas will likely be too far, fire trucks won't reach the area in time anyway