

Summary of Public Comments:

From: Nell Matthews
Sent: Sunday, October 03, 2010 6:32 PM
To: Van McClendon
Cc: Ruth Bell; Kathleen Oleson
Subject: Lake Maumelle development plan
Dear Van McClendon,

Please consider our argument for the choice of the plan for development of Pulaski County land around Lake Maumelle.

Nell Matthews
http://co.pulaski.ar.us/pdf/pl/LWVPC_Lake_Maumelle_plan.pdf

From: Dr Gilbert Caver
Sent: Friday, October 01, 2010 6:53 PM
To: Van McClendon
Cc: vmclendon@co.pulaski.ar.us
Subject:

please save our clean water it is a treasure.

From: Priscilla Pittman
Sent: Friday, October 01, 2010 11:58 AM
To: Van McClendon
Cc: svargas@cg.wrtdesign.com
Subject: Maumelle

I strongly believe we need to protect the Maumelle water shed. It is difficult to believe that in this day and time everyone is not in gear to protect the earth and not fill our pockets with\$! Priscilla Pittman, MSW, MA

From: Craig Provost
Sent: Thursday, September 30, 2010 10:09 PM
To: Van McClendon
Cc: svargas@cg.wrtdesign.com
Subject: Lake Maumelle development

Please consider supporting Alternative Concept 3 for the land development around Lake Maumelle. It would be best if it remained undeveloped. But, if it is to be developed, please make it the most conservative, that is least development possible with minimization of any resulting run-off.

Thank you for your consideration of this important issue to our drinking water in Little Rock, as well as the beauty of the Lake.

Craig J. Provost,

From: Susan Hardin
Sent: Thursday, September 30, 2010 9:49 PM
To: Van McClendon
Subject: Land Use Plan for Lake Maumelle Watershed

Dear Mr. McClendon,

I am submitting public comment for the Lake Maumelle Watershed Land Use Proposal that will be adopted by Pulaski County.

After reviewing the three land use plan concepts while noting that the goal is to have a Comprehensive Land Use plan and associated regulatory controls that "ensure development patterns and intensities protect both the region's water supply and the recreational, scenic, and economic value of the watershed", it would seem the Concept 3 would best meet this goal.

Protection of the watershed is paramount; economic hardships for all of the region would result should there be chemical, pharmaceutical, sewage or other unwanted contamination in the main water supply for all of central Arkansas. Further, my foremost concern for watershed protection would have a greater chance for success with the lesser development envisioned in Concept 3 while making it more affordable to small landowners.

Other positives for Concept 3 are that this plan would comply with the Lake Maumelle Watershed Management Plan and would be easy to administer.

I hope that that Concept 3 will be incorporated into the Land Use Plan.

Sincerely,

Susan M. Hardin, RN

From: BJ Wyrick
Sent: Thursday, September 30, 2010 9:05 PM
To: Van McClendon
Cc: svargas@cg.wrtdesign.com
Subject: Maumelle Land use plan

I strongly support the Alternative 3 Concept. Less density in structures is the key I believe in preserving Maumelle Lake..our water supply.

BJ Wyrick
City Director Ward 7

From: Ruth Bell
Sent: Thursday, September 30, 2010 8:20 PM
To: Van McClendon; Silvia Vargas
Subject: League of Women Voters statement 93010

The League of Women Voters Pulaski County has been a part of protecting the Maumelle Watershed since our representatives served on the Central Arkansas Water (CAW) citizen committee which recommended the development of a watershed management plan. Our representatives then were members of the stakeholder group which developed the Watershed Management Plan approved by CAW. We worked with County staff and elected officials through the process of writing and approving Section 8 of the County's Subdivision Ordinance, and monitored the development of the County's Storm water Management Plan and SET.

Based on those years of "hands on" experience in aligning CAW's Watershed Management Plan with County ordinances we strongly support use of **alternative concept 3** as the basis for the land use plan in the County's part of the watershed.

We support alternative concept 3 because it is:

- Simple to understand
- Easy and economical to administer
- Complies with the Lake Maumelle watershed management plan
- Consistent with Arkansas's accepted land use planning
- Compatible with the area's existing life style
- Affordable for small landowners

Thank you for the opportunity to share our views with you.
Nell Matthews, President
Kathleen Oleson, Ruth Bell, Action Committee

From: Lula Smith
Sent: Thursday, September 30, 2010 5:38 PM
To: Van McClendon
Subject:

As a concerned citizen and a member of the League of Women Voters, I support Alternative Concept 3 in our drive for save drinking water!!!!

Lula Ann Smith

From: Kate Talthoff
Sent: Thursday, September 30, 2010 4:38 PM
To: Van McClendon
Cc: svargas@cg.wrtdesign.com
Subject: Proposed Land Use design

Please see the attached

http://co.pulaski.ar.us/pdf/pl/Comments_on_Land_Use_Kate_Althoff_Sept_2010.pdf

From: Wally Loveless
Sent: Thursday, September 30, 2010 4:11 PM

To: Van McClendon

Subject: Comprehensive land use plan for Maumelle Watershed

Mr. McClendon,

As a representative of the Arkansas Realtors Association I have been involved in issues surrounding the Maumelle Watershed for several years. I am very concerned that the process now underway with Wallace Roberts and Todd, LLC has not been handled in a manner that will serve central Arkansas water users, property owners in the watershed or citizens of Little Rock and Pulaski County.

In reviewing the Scope of Services agreed to by WRT, LLC and Judge Villines I find that there are to be focus groups identified in order to "provide input at key milestones at determined as directed by the Project Working Group". With regard to paragraph 1.1.4 I know of no "stakeholder interviews" that were conducted with stakeholders "identified under focus groups above" which refers to paragraph 1.1.2.

Whatever Public Participation/Public Awareness Program was conducted as stated in paragraph 1.3 was woefully inadequate. I have many misgivings about adopting such a sweeping plan when no one has considered any of the budgetary consequences to the Pulaski County Special School District, Pulaski County government, the city of Little Rock and other entities who derive their resources from real estate tax and sales tax. West Pulaski County can provide the highest amount of real estate tax per homeowner. I have witnessed pressure to over regulate development out of emotion instead of using science to determine the degree to which land in the watershed can be developed without adversely affecting the water quality.

Additionally, we are in an economic cycle that greatly diminishes the need to rush into a land use plan that unreasonably restrict the rights of property owners in the watershed. We may be in an extremely slow development cycle for years. Any restriction made too quickly and without sound reason is a taking of land arbitrarily. I, for one, am not willing sacrifice the rights of property owners without just cause. And in that event the owners should be fully compensated for their loss. I have spoken with several members on the legislative committee of the Little Rock Realtors Association. To a man there is serious concern about the process going forward without a more comprehensive discussion.

It is my understanding that the County has already adopted a Subdivision Ordinance and a Site Evaluation Tool (SET) which provides the regulatory mechanisms appropriate to protect the watershed. At this time there is insufficient information available to me and our legislative committee regarding which Alternative Land Use(s) may be approved, or the manner in which the approved Alternative Land Uses may be implemented through regulatory structures. Accordingly, I will reserve further judgement at this time but it would seem that the Performance Standard option appears to provide the potential for flexible development consistent with the SET. No one representing the Little Rock Realtors Association been authorized to provide our position. I look forward to meeting with the legislative committee and having a chance to provide our council on these issues.

Sincerely yours,

Wally Loveless

Co-Chairman Arkansas Realtors Political Action Committee

Arkansas Realtors Association Legislative Committee member

From: Tim Daters

Sent: Thursday, September 30, 2010 3:58 PM

To: Van McClendon

Subject: Comments on Preliminary Land Use Concepts

Van,

Attached are my comments.

Tim

Timothy E Daters, PE

President

White-Daters & Associates

http://co.pulaski.ar.us/pdf/pl/prelim_land_use_concepts_20100930152907.pdf

From: Jay Chesshir

Sent: Thursday, September 30, 2010 3:48 PM

To: Van McClendon

Subject: RE: Alternative Land Use Concepts in the Lake Maumelle Watershed in Pulaski County

Because of our long-standing work in the Lake Maumelle Watershed research and planning process, the Little Rock Regional Chamber of Commerce appreciates the opportunity to provide preliminary comments regarding the Alternative Land Use Concepts. As we've stated before, the County's efforts to investigate potential zoning in the portion of Pulaski County within the Lake Maumelle Watershed

needs to be carefully tailored to protect our water supply. The growth and development of the Little Rock SMA to the west is a long term process that will progress over many decades based on market conditions which are difficult to predict at this time. Because of the timeframe and uncertainties involved, future development of this important area will require maximum flexibility, within the constraints imposed by water supply protection. The County has already adopted a Subdivision Ordinance and a Site Evaluation Tool (SET) which provides the regulatory mechanisms necessary for water supply protection. At this time, there is insufficient information available regarding which Alternative Land Use Concept should be approved. Also remaining to be determined is which additional regulatory structure, if any, should be utilized to implement an approved concept. Because of the many unknowns that still exist, it is not possible to provide substantive comment at this time beyond the Performance Standard option appears to provide the potential for flexible development consistent with the existing SET.

Jay Chesshir

President

From: Bill Shepherd
Sent: Thursday, September 30, 2010 3:04 PM
To: Van McClendon
Cc: Buddy Villines; Julie Blackwood
Subject: Protecting our water supply
Mr. Van McClendon, CFM
Director,
Pulaski County Planning & Development
3200 Brown Street
Little Rock, Arkansas 72204

Dear Mr. McClendon:

The economic importance of Lake Maumelle as our city's primary source of clean water can hardly be overstated. If we allowed residential development around the lake to pollute it, we would truly be killing the goose that lays the golden eggs. The cost of increased water treatment or of bringing water to central Arkansas from another source would be enormous, and paying the cost would place a huge burden on the city. For this reason there is no viable alternative to safeguarding the good source of water that we already have.

We really ought to prohibit any residential development in Lake Maumelle's watershed, but we are long past the point where we were able to implement such a policy. The challenge to us now is to do the next best thing.

The next best plan is to adopt Alternative Concept 3, which would set aside tracts of vegetated and undeveloped land to buffer the lake from water running off houses and the yards and streets surrounding them. None of us would want to occupy a tall building where the elevators all crashed to the basement every time the electric power went off. By the same token, we don't want a system that would rely on pumps to keep residential runoff out of Lake Maumelle. The notorious example of Dogpatch/Marble Falls in Newton County with its defunct system for handling waste water demonstrates the folly of such an approach.

Please give the future of central Arkansas the chance it deserves by supporting Alternative Concept 3.

Sincerely,

William M. Shepherd

From: Karen Crutchfield
Sent: Thursday, September 30, 2010 2:52 PM
To: Van McClendon
Cc: svargas@cg.wrtdesign.com
Subject: protect Lake Maumelle water
Please vote for Alternative Concept 3 as the option that will best protect our beloved Lake Maumelle water and area surrounding the water. I think this is critical for the future of our area. Thank you.

Karen Crutchfield

From: Chuck Nestrud
Sent: Thursday, September 30, 2010 2:48 PM

To: Van McClendon

Subject: Alternative Land Use Concepts

Van--The attached comments have been submitted on the land use planning activities. Please take these comments into consideration in the review of the Land Use Alternatives.

Charles R. Nestrud

<http://co.pulaski.ar.us/pdf/pl/DOC090810.pdf>

http://co.pulaski.ar.us/pdf/pl/2010-08-27_Final_Letter_to_Van_McClendon.pdf

From: Barry Haas

Sent: Thursday, September 30, 2010 1:54 PM

To: Van McClendon; Silvia Vargas

Subject: Comments on Pulaski Co. Land Use Plan

Dear Van & Silvia,

Citizens Protecting Maumelle Watershed appreciates the opportunity to offer comments on the Pulaski County Land Use Plan options currently being considered. We have been involved in the protection of Lake Maumelle since an effort was made in early 2005 by the watershed's major private landowner to strip Central Arkansas Water (CAW) of its power of eminent domain, CAW's only tool at that time to protect Lake Maumelle from eminent threats to water quality. We have remained steadfast since then in working with CAW officials, Pulaski County officials and state regulators to ensure the long-term protection of this resource which is vital to about 400,000 central Arkansans both for economic and public health reasons.

Alternative Concept 3 is strongly supported by Citizens Protecting Maumelle Watershed as a low impact development option that offers the best long-term protection for Lake Maumelle. We endorse it because it is based on the conservation design approach which encourages preservation of undeveloped land through incentives. It is relatively easy to understand, easy to administer, and is consistent with the Lake Maumelle Watershed Management Plan and with accepted land use planning in Arkansas.

The Lake Maumelle Policy Advisory Council, which met over a period of about 18 months, drafted the Watershed Management Plan that was unanimously adopted by the CAW Commission in February 2007. That consensus of roughly 22 stakeholder groups, ranging from large and small landowners in the watershed to conservationists, water users and recreationalists, established the conservation design approach as the best option for watershed development. Alternative Concept 3 implements that aspect of the Watershed Management Plan. It is a conservative management approach that will best allow for future modifications if they are found to be needed.

We support Alternative Concept 3 as being the best option to ensure the long-term protection of this vital resource. Central Arkansans value their high quality, low cost drinking water and want to keep it that way.

Sincerely,

Citizens Protecting Maumelle Watershed

Barry Haas, Spokesman

From: Clark, Richard B

Sent: Thursday, September 30, 2010 10:58 AM

To: Van McClendon

Cc: 'svargas@cg.wrtdesign.com'

Subject: WATER

Dear Director McClendon ,

The most important of our resources is clean water . We have the one time opportunity to keep our drinking water in Lake Maumelle of a high quality. We do not want to be forced to use increasing amounts of chlorine, and to build more expensive plants to do this.

WE DO WANT TO FOLLOW THE ADVICE OF TETRA TECH WHICH WAS : CONTROL THE DENSITY OF WATERSHED DEVELOPMENT TO KEEP THE DRINKING WATER OF A HIGH QUALITY !

WE TAXPAYERS PAID ABOUT \$ 1.400,000 TO TETRA TECH FOR A SCIENTIFIC STUDY OF LAKE MAUMELLE AND ITS WATERSHED. LET'S TAKE THE TOP ADVICE WE PAID FOR !!

WE WANT LAKE MAUMELLE'S WATERSHED PROTECTED BY AN EFFECTIVE USE PLAN . We support alternative Concept 3 , a low impact development option.

Thanks for your help.

Dr. & Mrs. Richard B. Clark

From: Martin Maner
Sent: Thursday, September 30, 2010 10:47 AM
To: Van McClendon
Subject: Land Use Plan

Van, As Director of Watershed Mgmt for CAW I prefer that a minimum amount of undisturbed land be part of the SET, (the performance based concept WRT had) of 30%; that in the interest of flexibility, that the LID "sliding scale" be used throughout the Pu Co portion of the watershed; and that there be prohibitions of those activities or land uses that would be considered incompatible with a water supply use such as a land fill, hazardous disposal site, confined animal facility, such as chicken houses, etc etc.
Martin

From: Joan McEwen
Sent: Thursday, September 30, 2010 10:34 AM
To: Van McClendon; svargas@cg.wrtdesign.com
Subject: central Arkansas drinking water

I support Alternative Concept 3 as best protecting Lake Maumelle. Clean and uncontaminated drinking water is one of the true gems of Central Arkansas, currently. Please maintain this outstanding factor of being in Central Arkansas. Please hold true to the state slogan "The Natural State" and keep our drinking water free from unnatural contaminants.

Sincerely,

Joan E. McEwen

From: Sherry Phillips
Sent: Thursday, September 30, 2010 9:43 AM
To: Van McClendon
Cc: svargas@cg.wtdesign.com
Subject: Protect Our Water

Dear Director Van McClendon,
Please Do not let Pulaski County goverment regulate any portion of Lake Maumelle water shed.
Please protect our Drinking Water.
Please support The Alterniative Concept 3.
I am in support of The Alterniative 3(low impact development that is long term Protection for Lake Maumelle.
Please do not let the developers ruin our water, and destory our land.
We need to keep our high quality of drinking water, and keep the cost down.
Please support The Alternative Concept 3.
Thank you for your time.
Concerned citizen,
Sherry Phillips
8 Powder Horn Court
Little Rock, Arkansas

From: Bill Saunders
Sent: Thursday, September 30, 2010 9:25 AM
To: Van McClendon; Voyles, Robert; Daters, Tim; Crawford, Marie; Hymel, Stephanie; Charles, Nathan; Bohannon, Tad; Malone, Walter; Bell, Ruth; Horn, Connie; Moreland, Debbie; Plowman, Norvell; Francis, Andrew; Kemp, Hal; Nestrud, Chuck; Long, Jonathan; Guillet, Vince; Althof, Kate; Wells, Kathy; Barry Haas; Eddie Powell; Reed, Doris; Laster, Ed; Holt, Barry; Bell, Harlen; Clark, Nancy;

Stodola, Zabelle; East, Lindsey; Bell, Linda; Link, Ann; Pfeifer, Jim; Anaya, Faith; Ferguson, Rick; McNeil, Doug; Spencer, Trey & Charlotte; Moreland, Gary & Lucy; Johnston, Mike; Thaden, John; Andrews, Alice; Jones, Beverly; Hooks, Glen; France, Carolyn; Ebel, Susan; Wilmoth, Suzanne; Burkett, Vicki; Sauer, Lucy; Johnson, David; Walker, Robert; Bourne, David; Annie Abrams; Robert Eck; Don Brandes; Jay Chesshir; Jasmin Moore; Jordan Johnson; Bill Shepherd; Carroll Strickland; Sandra Brown; Allen Engstrom; Ron Copeland; Randall Neill; brath@aristotle.net; Chris Baker; Gary Boyle; Lawrence Dupree; Don Castleberry; Ray Vogelpohl; Kathy Lewison; Julie Blackwood; Dawne Benafield Vandiver; Doug Reed; Donna Massey; Joy Pensinger; Mary Louise Williams; Phil Stowers; Bob Johnson; Patricia Dicker; Wilandra Dean; Karla Burnett; Angela Hadley; Maner, Martin; Rich, Graham R.; Sherman D. Smith; Bozynski, 'Tony; Buddy Villines; McKenzie, Jim; John Fernsler; Silvia Vargas; Mark White; Jeff Hirt; Jim Cranor; Maciej Jastrzebski; Robert Rhyne; Toland, Channon

Cc: Silvia Vargas; ktalthof@aol.com; Barry Haas

Subject: Re: Alternative Land Use Concepts in the Lake Maumelle Watershed in Pulaski County

Dear Van and colleagues: As you know, I've followed your process for getting us to this point, and now believe that 'ALTERNATIVE CONCEPT THREE' IS OUR BEST OVERALL, EASIEST TO EXPLAIN (AND IMPLEMENT!) way to go. Thks! Wm Saunders, Mbr: Citizens Prot'g Mau;melle W'shed

From: Johnston, Mike H.

Sent: Thursday, September 30, 2010 7:48 AM

To: Van McClendon

Subject: RE: Alternative Land Use Concepts in the Lake Maumelle Watershed in Pulaski County
Van,

I am both an owner and resident and have been for 50+ years. Lake Maumelle was built the year I was born and I have driven past it to work my whole life so I have seen the evolution of the lake which in the 60's, 70's and part of the 80's hardly ever got muddy after a heavy rain. When logging got profitable the lake changed. Now after even a small rain event the upper end and the south side of the lake pore silt and mud into the lake, not to mention seeing "GREEN WATER" from a certain Golf Course. But we don't talk about that, do we.

Seems like the biggest contributor to the silt/sedimentation problem in the lake are the timber companies. What actions (if any) are being considered to reduce the silt problem. Seems like there needs to be some joint collaboration between CAW, Pulaski County and the timber companies to reduce this. One solution might be staggered logging of not more than a 100 acre tract at a time in a particular area (say 400 acres), or strip logging of a 300' wide swath leaving 300' feet to be harvested the next year. Biggest problem here is getting everyone wanting to do the right thing.

Here's another thought, have land owners set areas of their property aside as GREEN UNDISTURBED BUFFER ZONES and remove taxes on the property set aside. Now that's what you call an incentive.

But in all fairness, if you want to control the use of someone's land, BUY IT at a fair market price. CAW seems to have a big problem understanding what Fair Market Price is.

Also wondering what new taxes or fees for improvement districts will be imposed on the property owners? I'm sure they're headed our way.

Hope there's some info here you will consider.

Michael H. Johnston, PLS
Unit Manager/ Survey, Little Rock
JACOBS, North America Infrastructure
10816 Executive Drive, Suite 300
Little Rock, AR 72211

From: Hildie Terry

Sent: Wednesday, September 29, 2010 9:50 PM

To: Van McClendon

Cc: svargas@cg.wrtdesign.com

Subject: Please Protect Lake Maumelle Watershed!

Dear Sir:

My husband and I are very concerned about saving the Lake Maumelle watershed in order to ensure that our drinking water is kept from any chance of pollution by building multiple housing units near the lake, The run off from pesticides and herbicides will harm both young and old as it builds up in our bodies and also to the fetuses of babies yet unborn. We believe that clean water is the right of every citizen in the USA.

PLEASE VOTE FOR ALTEWRNATIVE CONCEPT 3!!

Sincerely, Hildegarde & Mick Terry, Citizens Pulaski County

From: Bruno Kirsch

Sent: Wednesday, September 29, 2010 7:46 PM

To: Van McClendon
Subject: Comments on land use alternatives are attached

Van,

see attachment... keep up the good work.

Bruno Kirsch
http://co.pulaski.ar.us/pdf/pl/Land_Use_Letter.pdf

From: Sara
Sent: Wednesday, September 29, 2010 5:06 PM
To: Van McClendon
Cc: svargas@cg.wrtdesign.com
Subject: No Development in the Lake Maumelle watershed
Mr. McClendon,

I do not support development in the Lake Maumelle watershed. Central Arkansas is fortunate enough to have one of the best and most affordable drinking waters in the country. Any but the most conservation-oriented development would undermine our drinking water system. The developers have repeatedly tried to make an end run around the desires of the people in this regard and they have thus far repeatedly failed. I certainly hope they fail again this time. No amount of money lining the pockets of developers or expensive housing is worth the price the rest of us would have to pay with regard to our water system. Green space is not a bad thing!

Thank you for your consideration,
Sara Israel

From: Dottie Funk
Sent: Wednesday, September 29, 2010 4:06 PM
To: Van McClendon
Cc: svargas@cg.wrtdesign.com
Subject:
Dear Mr McClendon, et al,

Every day we hear and read about some part of the world going into crisis over water. The possibility that there might not be enough clean, pure drinking water for all is real and the water resources continue to dwindle to crisis levels.

Please do everything you can to hold our water quality to the highest level possible. For so long we have been thankful for this highest of all quality standards and we citizens hope those of you in power will continue to persevere and not lower those standards.

In order to keep these high standards, please utilize all the wonderful ideas in Alternative Concept 3.

As you know, it is going to be cheaper to keep the water clean than to treat it later and clean it up. This will not only affect our health, but it will make water more expensive to drink. What will happen to the poorest of the poor when it gets to that point? Morally we must keep it at an affordable level for them, as for ourselves.

Please tax us. We'll pay to keep that water clean on the front end. Please don't buckle under pressure to allow our standards to decline.

Sincerely,
Dottie and Frank Funk

From: dana durst
Sent: Wednesday, September 29, 2010 3:52 PM
To: Van McClendon; svargas@cg.wrtdesign.com
Subject: Public Comment on Maumelle Land Use Plan

TO: Director Van McClendon and Pulaski County Planning and Development

FROM: Dana Durst Lawrence

I am writing you to support the Alternative Concept 3. I would prefer

that ALL the land in the watershed be bought and left as is, but I know that is currently untenable, so I am supportive of Alternate Concept 3 as a compromise.

As a long-time Little Rock resident, I lived and worked in Washington, D.C. from 1993 through 1997. During that time, I used the local water supply as I had always used the Little Rock water - for drinking and all other purposes. To my shock and dismay, one evening I was watching the local D. C. news and found that over 10,000 people in the District had been sickened by the water supply and a boil order had been issued (as it had been several times before). The water supply of the nation's capitol was in deep trouble, and evidently had been for some time. I switched to bottled water for drinking and toothbrushing at home and quit drinking water at restaurants. After days of uncertainty, the D.C. water company had to be taken over by the Environmental Protection Agency.

Little Rock has consistently had one of the highest rated public water supplies in the country, for both cleanliness and taste. It is one of the few things left in my urban environment that I simply NEVER have to think or worry about. Please, do all you can to protect our water, without selling out to profit for developers or increasing the cost to the city of processing our water. In addition, the constant threat of developers' or homeowners' mistakes or toxic accidents cannot be ignored.

I could talk at length about my passion for clean drinking water that is as untreated as possible, but I'm sure you understand that already. If you need to hear more details about why my family and I support Alternate 3, please let me know.

Sincerely,

Dana Durst Lawrence

From: Moreland, Lucy M.

Sent: Wednesday, September 29, 2010 12:22 PM

To: Van McClendon

Subject: RE: Alternative Land Use Concepts in the Lake Maumelle Watershed in Pulaski County
Hi Van,

I like almost everything and can live with the requirements. One thing I would like to see is larger tracks (10 acres or more) directly along the tributaries. Also, can there be regulations to existing mobile homes where septic systems are shared or stacked together in a small area. (Underwood Road and Tram Road) What is the area considered Little Italy and how far are the boundaries of that community, 113 to the bottom of Wye Mt on the 300 East? I would like to see this area as a green beltway community. I have 75 acres in this area and would like to see it remain as green as possible with larger track home sites. Other than that, I am good.

Lucy

From: Jim McKenzie [mckenzie@metroplan.org]

Sent: Wednesday, September 29, 2010 2:48 PM

To: Van McClendon

Subject: Re: Alternative Land Use Concepts in the Lake Maumelle Watershed in Pulaski County

Vann,

Good work so far. My one comment is that there should be height restrictions on ridge tops so that building height cannot break the tree line.

Jim McKenzie

From: Bell Linda

Sent: Thursday, September 23, 2010 9:07 PM
To: Van McClendon
Cc: svargas@eg.cortdesign.com
Subject: Lake maumelle

I am most concerned with protecting Lake Maumelle as our source of clean, unpolluted drinking water. I want the Central Arkansas Water to have all the support necessary to keep our water pure-and to not allow building around this lake that could ultimately foul our water. Linda K. Bell

From: Zabelle Stodola
Sent: Thursday, September 23, 2010 4:28 PM
To: Van McClendon
Cc: svargas@cg.wrtdesign.com
Subject: Protecting Lake Maumelle Drinking Water

Dear Director McClendon:

As you know, a Land Use Plan is currently being developed to help regulate development in the portion of Lake Maumelle within Pulaski County. I am aware of the possibilities being considered and strongly support Alternative Concept 3. I hope you do too. Concept 3 seems to offer the best protection for the lake, the major source of drinking water for central Arkansas. Alternative 3 does not depend on man-made structures (always unpredictable) to protect water quality. Instead, it is modeled on conservation and rewards for protecting undeveloped land. Additionally, Alternative Concept 3 complies with the Lake Maumelle Watershed Management Plan.

I hate to think that decisions could be made that would favor short-term development over long-term conservation and protection. I am sure you are hearing from pro-development interests who are lobbying heavily for a Land Use Plan that would allow them as much leeway as possible. Instead, I hope you agree that the Natural State's water quality is too precious to be compromised and that the best protections are offered by Alternative Concept 3.

Sincerely,

Zabelle Stodola

From: Silvia Vargas
Sent: Friday, September 03, 2010 12:06 PM
To: Van McClendon; John Fernsler; Mark White
Subject: RE: response letter

Van,
Attached is the latest and hopefully "final" version of the response letter. I am sending it in .pdf format for release to DSW and others (as you see fit), but I am also providing the Word original in case you need to make any additional changes before it goes out.

Silvia Vargas, AICP, LEED® AP
Planner
Sr. Associate
WRT / Wallace Roberts & Todd, LLC
6619 South Dixie Highway, #348, Miami, FL 33143

<http://co.pulaski.ar.us/pdf/pl/WRTresponseletter-final.pdf>

From: Ann Link
Sent: Sunday, September 26, 2010 6:47 PM
To: Van McClendon; svargas@cg.wrtdesign.com
Subject: PROTECTING THE MAUMELLE WATERSHED

I urge you to implement Alternative Concept 3 in order to protect our Maumelle watershed. This simple to understand, easy to administer plan complies with the Lake Maumelle Watershed Management Plan and is consistent with accepted land use planning in the State of Arkansas. The beauty and water quality of our lake ought not to be compromised or destroyed by developers for the benefit of a relatively small number of homeowners. Once the builders have left the scene, it will be those left behind who must cope with the maintenance and repair of man-made structures intended to protect water quality.

From: Jim Pfiefer
Sent: Sunday, September 26, 2010 6:21 PM
To: Van McClendon
Subject: Maumelle Watershed

I support alternative number three.

Jim Pfeifer

From: Holly Greenfield
Sent: Wednesday, September 29, 2010 11:06 AM
To: Van McClendon
Cc: svargas@cg.wrtdesign.com
Subject: Drinking Water and Land Use

Dear Mr. McClendon,

My husband and I have just moved to Arkansas from Toledo, Ohio, and were pleased to find that Little Rock has some of the best and most affordable drinking water we've ever encountered. We are also struck by the natural beauty of our new state--Arkansans are fortunate to have so many diverse ecological zones within driving distance, and such a good park system to help protect and preserve them.

We are concerned that overdevelopment may threaten both natural resources and water quality in Arkansas; in particular, we are worried about potential development surrounding Lake Maumelle. After looking over the development options on the Pulaski County website, we would like to urge you to consider going with Alternative Concept 3; this plan seems to us the most likely to preserve both water quality and the long-term health of the ecosystem around Lake Maumelle.

As new residents of Arkansas, we are excited about becoming part of the state's economy and growth--but we want that growth to be carefully considered and worked as much as possible into the natural ecology of the state. AC 3 offers the best balance between development and preservation, humans and the environment we need in order to survive in the long-term. We strongly support Alternative Concept 3, and we hope you will as well.

Thank you,

John and Holly Greenfield

From: Faith Anaya
Sent: Monday, September 27, 2010 12:54 PM
To: Van McClendon
Subject: Protecting the Maumelle Watershed
Dear Mr. McClendon,

I am a Little Rock resident and homeowner and would like to let you know that I support Alternative Concept 3 to help protect one of our most valuable resources, Lake Maumelle.

Too many homes and a complicated administration structure would put our water at risk. We need a plan like Alternative Concept 3 that is simple, easy to administer, that complies with the Lake Maumelle Watershed Management Plan and is consistent with accepted land use planning in Arkansas.

Thank you for all your hard work on this project. Our clean water is an integral part of the quality of life here in Little Rock.

Faith Anaya

From: Kathy Wells
Sent: Tuesday, September 28, 2010 10:52 AM
To: CLRN WEB site
Cc: DNA WEB site; Van McClendon
Subject: Coalition urges strong protections for our drinking water in county land-use plan
Coalition of Greater Little Rock Neighborhoods
An Advocate of Quality City Neighborhoods
<http://groups.yahoo.com/group/LRNeighborhoods>
Treasurer Allan Ward
6609 Sherry Dr., Little Rock, AR 72204

President Kathy Wells
Box 777, Little Rock, AR 72203

September 28, 2010

Van McClendon

Director
Pulaski County Planning Department
via email

Dear Van,

Members of the Coalition of Greater Little Rock Neighborhoods strongly support the greatest protection possible for our drinking water - Alternative Concept 3 in the current proposed Land Use Plan for the Maumelle Watershed. Our community benefits the most when our drinking water is clean, abundant and cheap. This fuels economic development, as well as a high quality of life. And, it tastes great! Let's keep it that way.

From the Watershed Management Plan consensus onward, we have found the best tools for protection are undisturbed land, especially on the slopes, high or very high in character.

Man-made structures allow more units for developers to sell, but we are extremely wary about relying on good maintenance of what developers build for the next 50 years. The day some protective engineering fails, and Lake Maumelle water flunks some federal quality test, all water customers will pay the bill for an expensive new treatment plan to clean out the pollution.

Alternative Concept 3 would apply principles of conservation design, which rewards a developer for preserving undisturbed ground, by providing more units to sell. The more ground kept undisturbed, the more units to sell. This approach fits with Arkansas land-use and planning practices, and it is easy to administer. We appreciate our county government is moving into a new role with the creation of this Maumelle Watershed Land Use Plan, and we respect this new burden on our public servants.

These development regulations are also a burden on property owners in the Maumelle Watershed, and this should be kept to a minimum. Alternative Concept 3 should accomplish that.

Yours Truly,
Kathy Wells
President

From: Glen Hooks
Sent: Tuesday, September 28, 2010 11:10 AM
To: Van McClendon
Cc: svargas@cg.wrtdesign.com
Subject: Comment: Lake Maumelle Land Use Plan
Good morning—

It is my understanding that you are collecting public comments concerning the Lake Maumelle Land Use Plan. I'm writing this morning to convey my strong support for Alternative Concept #3.

I have been involved with various public processes surrounding Lake Maumelle for many years, serving as a member of both the citizens' group that recommended a Watershed Management Plan and then later as a member of the citizens' group that wrote and recommended the Watershed Management Plan adopted by Central Arkansas Water. In addition, I helped lead a citizens' group that worked to defeat legislation that would have imperiled Lake Maumelle.

All of these experiences have helped me understand one thing very clearly: Lake Maumelle is a fragile and important resource that must be protected. If we are to allow development within the Lake Maumelle watershed, then that development must be low-impact and well-planned. I support Alternative Concept #3 because it focuses on low-impact development, and also because it greatly encourages the preservation of undeveloped land. Finally, I am strongly in favor of Alternative Concept #3 because it complies with the Watershed Management Plan. That Plan cost a great deal in both money and citizen involvement, and I do not want to see it relegated to the bookshelves.

I was born in Central Arkansas, have lived here my whole life, and am now raising two sons here. Nothing is more important to me than their health, and that depends largely on high-quality drinking water. Thank you for doing your part to ensure safe drinking water for my family, and for all of Central Arkansas in the years to come. Please support Alternative Concept #3.

Many thanks,

Glen Hooks
Regional Director (Southeastern U.S.)
Sierra Club's Beyond Coal Campaign

From: beverly jones
Sent: Tuesday, September 28, 2010 11:47 AM
To: Van McClendon
Subject: Maumelle Watershed

My family supports Concept 3 which is also supported by Citizens Protecting Maumelle Watershed.

From: alice andrews
Sent: Tuesday, September 28, 2010 11:56 AM
To: Van McClendon
Cc: Silvia Vargas
Subject: Continue providing high quality drinking water for Central Arkansas

Van McClendon, Director
Pulaski County Planning and Development
Little Rock, Arkansas

Dear Director McClendon,

I wish to respectfully ask that you support Alternative Concept 3 in order to adequately protect our Lake Maumelle drinking water supply for Central Arkansas. As I understand the plans, Alternative Concept 3 would utilize a conservation design that rewards preservation of undeveloped land, of which there is a great acreage surrounding Lake Maumelle. This plan is in compliance with the Lake Maumelle Watershed Management Plan and consistent with Arkansas land use planning. It is low impact and should be simple to administer.

It is difficult to place a value on having an abundant and safe drinking water supply like we have now. It tastes good, unlike the water in most other states. The amount of development proposed or planned around Lake Maumelle will undoubtedly lead to run-off problems with undesired chemicals and nutrients entering the lake and will cause increased costs for treatment and poor taste. Therefore, supporting Alternative Concept 3 is the best way to protect our drinking water in the long term.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment.

Alice B. Andrews

From: John Thaden
Sent: Tuesday, September 28, 2010 12:11 PM
To: Van McClendon
Cc: Silvia Vargas
Subject: Lake Maumelle Watershed Land Use Plan
Dear Mr. McClendon:

How delightful to see on a recent auto trip through Texas several refueling stops selling bottled Little Rock municipal drinking water. I have received water reports for our reservoirs for years now and feel so grateful to be living in a community that cares about its water quality, consistently meeting and exceeding water purity standards. These successes are not created out of nothing; most credit goes to Pulaski County for maintaining these watersheds in relatively pristine, low-development conditions.

As a Class 1 Wastewater Treatment Plant Operator (I volunteer as facility operator of the intermittent gravel filter-based sewage treatment facility of the Humane Society of Pulaski County), I know how much care and work goes into consistently delivering acceptable quality water at the outfall of a pollution point source. I can only believe it must be immensely more challenging to consistently manage pollutants of more disperse origin, such as overnitrogenized, pesticide- and herbicide-laden runoff from residential lawns.

I am not at all convinced by what I have read and heard of the plans being promoted for commercial and residential development of this precious land that adequate steps have been described to fully safeguard Lake Maumelle. I really worry here that a profound mistake may be made that will gravely impact the future of the county.

I do heartily endorse Alternative Concept 3 and strongly urge the Pulaski County Planning Board and Quorum Court to approve this thoughtful, science-based plan.

Sincerely,

John Joseph Thaden, Ph.D.
Assistant Professor of Geriatrics
College of Medicine
University of Arkansas for Medical Sciences

From: Barry Haas

Sent: Tuesday, September 28, 2010 12:19 PM

To: Van McClendon; Silvia Vargas

Subject: Comments on Lake Maumelle Land Use Plan- Approve Alternative Concept 3

Dear Van & Silvia,

I am writing in strong support of Alternative Concept 3 in the current draft of the Pulaski County Land Use Plan. Alternative Concept 3 best represents the consensus approved by the Lake Maumelle Policy Advisory Council, a group of about 22 stakeholders including large and small developers along with conservationists and water users, that drafted the Watershed Management Plan (WMP). The WMP was unanimously approved by the Central Arkansas Water Commission in February 2007 and to its great credit Pulaski Co. government has been implementing some of the protections contained in the WMP.

The WMP endorsed a conservation design approach as preferred over a performance based approach, although it allows both. Alternative Concept 3 best meets the WMP's goal of protecting Lake Maumelle's water quality for the long term. Alternative Concept 3 is reasonably simple and offers incentives to developers who choose to take advantage of low impact development options that would increase the amount of undisturbed land. It would also be the easiest and least costly for Pulaski Co. to administer over the years as they will not have to constantly be checking and rechecking to see if man-made structures are performing as designed.

I like the use of 'character areas' in both Alternative Concept 3 and 2, but I think Alternative Concept 3 is the best approach at this early stage of protecting the Lake Maumelle watershed from potential overdevelopment. It would be much easier over the years to amend the Land Use Plan from Alternative Concept 3 down to Alternative Concept 2 rather than the other way around if a higher level of protection is needed due to water quality degradation being detected beyond what is anticipated using today's science.

As someone who served on the Policy Advisory Council and who has also been involved in the formation of a roughly 1,500 acre suburban water improvement district (which I currently serve as chair) on the western boundary of Little Rock, I've gained enough knowledge to know that such a vital resource as Lake Maumelle that is essential to 400,000 central Arkansans deserves the highest level of protection possible. Lake Maumelle is a health benefit as well as an economic benefit to our communities and our entire state. Let's keep it that way!

Sincerely,
Barry Haas

From: Bourne, David E.

Sent: Wednesday, September 29, 2010 8:57 AM

To: Van McClendon

Cc: svargas@cg.wrtdesign.com

Subject: comments

I support Alternative Concept 3, for its lesser impact on our drinking water and ease of management. Thanks.

From: Robert Walker

Sent: Wednesday, September 29, 2010 5:26 AM

To: Van McClendon

Subject: Lake Maumelle drinking water

Dear Director McClendon,

I urge the adoption of the strongest possible safeguards for my drinking water.

I support Alternative Concept 3.

I want low density development which will protect my drinking water without the use of manmade structures which will ultimately, at some point, fail.

from
Robert Charles Walker

From: Johnson, David
Sent: Tuesday, September 28, 2010 9:28 PM
To: Van McClendon
Subject: Lake Maumelle

Van, I've heard from constituents of mine, and I agree fully with them. All of us want to ensure quality drinking water in Central Arkansas for the long term, and we urge you to lend your support to Alternative Concept 3.

Senator David Johnson

From: Lucy Sauer
Sent: Tuesday, September 28, 2010 9:20 PM
To: Van McClendon
Cc: svargas@cg.wrtdesign.com
Subject: Lake Maumelle: Please support Alternative Concept 3

Director Van McClendon,

For years I have been following the concerns about development of the Lake Maumelle Watershed. As a concerned citizen, and as a family practice physician with a strong interest in preventive medicine and environmental health issues, I urge you to support Alternative Concept 3. It seems crucial for our children and generations to come that we do everything in our power to protect the quality of our drinking water.

Thank you.

Sincerely,
Lucy H. Sauer, MD

From: Vicki Burkett
Sent: Tuesday, September 28, 2010 9:03 PM
To: Van McClendon
Subject:

I am in support of Alternative Concept 3-----Protect Lake Maumelle and my drinking water.
Ridgefield Cove, Little Rock, Arkansas 72223

Victoria K. Burkett , 19

From: Suzanne Wilmoth
Sent: Tuesday, September 28, 2010 8:44 PM
To: Van McClendon
Cc: svargas@cg.wrtdesign.com
Subject: one citizen's thoughts about the Lake Maumelle watershed
Dear Mr. McClendon,

I am writing in regard to the Land Use Plan for the Lake Maumelle watershed area. I have read through the document on the Pulaski County website (<http://www.co.pulaski.ar.us/pdf/AltLandUseConcepts.pdf>), and even though I'm no dummy cannot make complete sense out of it. So what I would like to say is that I am in favor of the most conservative plan, the plan has the best odds of protecting this most precious and vital resource from any compromise by development.

The most we can do to keep humans away from the perimeter of Lake Maumelle is what we should do, because given the opportunity people choose short term benefit over long term values. Let's follow the precautionary principle: better safe than sorry. Please count my vote toward the most conservative plan from the viewpoint of those of us who rely on Lake Maumelle as our water source.

Thanks.

Suzanne Wilmoth

From: Susan Ebel
Sent: Tuesday, September 28, 2010 6:22 PM
To: Van McClendon
Subject: in support of alternative concept 3

Dear Director Van McClendon,

I am writing in support of alternative concept 3. Please consider that the quality of water in Lake Maumelle is outstanding and should be kept that way. Allowing more development is short sighted and will in the long run put the quality of our water at risk. I believe there are a few developers that are more interested in their own gain than the public good. You can bulldoze down the trees and replant them but you cannot make water once you destroy it.

Thank you for your time,
Susan Ebel, MD

From: Carolyn France
Sent: Tuesday, September 28, 2010 3:11 PM
To: Van McClendon
Cc: svargas@cg.wrtdesign.com
Subject:

Mr. Van McClendon & the Pulaski County Planning & Development Commission,
I am a citizen of Pulaski County and get my water from Lake Maumelle. I don't understand how some developers have so much input on the land use plan around Lake Maumelle. It seems to me that you are there to protect our water, not the developers pocket book.

I feel strongly that Alternative Concept 3 should be adopted to protect the water for our children and grandchildren.

I thought this matter was settled sometime ago. Then I read that you are still deciding what to do with the water shed. I hope this time you will decide to protect the Lake Maumelle water shed, close the discussion and stand by the citizens that pay for and use Lake Maumelle water.

Thank you for your time and consideration.
Carolyn France

From: Mark White
Sent: Tuesday, September 28, 2010 2:07 PM
To: Karla Burnett
Cc: Van McClendon; 'Silvia Vargas'; 'John Fernsler'
Subject: WRT Team response to letter from Chuck Nestrud

Karla –

I am sending the following letter today in response to a letter you received from Mr. Nestrud –

Mark

Mark White
White & Smith, LLC | Planning and Law Group

http://co.pulaski.ar.us/pdf/pl/WS_Response_to_Nestrud.pdf

From: Barry Holt
Sent: Tuesday, September 28, 2010 1:27 PM
To: Van McClendon
Subject: Do Not Allow Our Drinking Water to

I have lived in Pulaski county for over forty years and one thing that has always has been a given is that we have great drinking water that other places don't! I ask you could we please keep this standard for the next generations. If you open the door now for a few companies to profit and endanger our drinking water you do not understand the environment we live in today. Please do not vote to allow a few too profit at the expense of others.

I understanding the environment because of being the manager of the largest importer wild sustainable Fin fish in the US we have our fish checked by MSC (Marine Steward Council) which allow wild caught fish to be available for the next generations So, why then

would we not have good drinking water for Pulaski County?

Regards

Barry Holt

From: Ed Laster

Sent: Tuesday, September 28, 2010 12:47 PM

To: Van McClendon

Cc: svargas@cg.wrtdesign.com

Subject: Lake Maumelle Water

Dear Director Van McClendon and Director Van McClendon,

As a resident of Pulaski County I am very concerned about the quality of water from Lake Maumelle. I urge you to accept Alternative Concept 3 as the best means of protecting the water within this watershed.

Thank you,

Ed Laster