



## **PLANNING COMMISSION**

Wednesday, September 10, 2025 at 5:30 PM

### **AGENDA**

*Our Vision. To have an infrastructure and city workforce that supports a sustainable, diversified and growing economy. We will partner with others to achieve economic development and other common goals that assure a high quality of living, and excellence in education.*

### **MEETING INFORMATION**

#### **AGENDA**

#### **PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING**

CITY HALL COUNCIL CHAMBERS / 5:30 p.m.

141 Main Street, Dillingham, AK 99576 (907) 842-5212

This meeting will also be available at the following online location:

#### **Join Zoom Meeting**

<https://us02web.zoom.us/j/9204830473?pwd=l0zApvePobiM7BaZXMqdp6McXr2mqg.1&omn=87836614829>

Meeting ID: 920 483 0473

Passcode: 99576

#### **CALL TO ORDER**

#### **ROLL CALL**

#### **APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

- [1.](#) Minutes of August 20, 2025

#### **APPROVAL OF AGENDA**

#### **COMMUNICATIONS**

**Communications to the planning commission**

**Planner's report**

- [2.](#) Planning Department Report August 2025

**Citizen's comments on items not on the agenda**

#### **PUBLIC HEARINGS**

#### **UNFINISHED BUSINESS**

#### **NEW BUSINESS**

- [3.](#) Dillingham Streets and Roads
- [4.](#) Agnew&Beck Contract for 2025 Comprehensive Plan

**COMMISSIONER COMMENTS**

**ADJOURNMENT**



## PLANNING COMMISSION

Wednesday, August 20, 2025 at 5:30 PM

### MINUTES

*Our Vision. To have an infrastructure and city workforce that supports a sustainable, diversified and growing economy. We will partner with others to achieve economic development and other common goals that assure a high quality of living, and excellence in education.*

### MEETING INFORMATION

#### AGENDA

#### PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING

CITY HALL COUNCIL CHAMBERS / 5:30 p.m.

141 Main Street, Dillingham, AK 99576 (907) 842-5212

This meeting will also be available at the following online location

Zoom Meeting ID: 920 483 0480; passcode: 99576 dial 1(719) 359-4580

### CALL TO ORDER

Chair Cade Woods called the meeting to order at 5:30 p.m.

### ROLL CALL

Present: Susan Isaacs; Kaleb Westfall; Cade Woods; Gregg Maxmiller; Jennifer DeWinne; Michael Bennett (arrived after roll call at 5:32 PM); Misa Webber via Zoom.

### APPROVAL OF MINUTES

May 22, 2025 Minutes — Motion to approve by Gregg; seconded by Kaleb; approved without objection.

**APPROVAL OF AGENDA** Motion by Gregg, Seconded by Misa, Vote Unanimous.

Amendment — Add “Comprehensive Plan Update (Agnew Beck)” under Unfinished Business.

### COMMUNICATIONS

#### Planner’s report

Planner’s Report — Received. Highlights: landfill/EPA appropriation phases; brownfields inventory (site nominations requested); AHFC housing programs and grant shortlist; incinerator repairs and equipment; water line extension RFP and process; erosion mitigation concepts. No formal action.

#### Unfinished Business

Comprehensive Plan Update (Agnew Beck) — Cost estimate (~\$46,520) and schedule discussed; Commission supported moving forward and directed staff to transmit to Council for approval and schedule public outreach (e.g., town hall/lunch-and-learn) by late October. No formal action.

**New Business**

City of Dillingham Streets & Roads — Discussed standards, maintenance responsibilities, and communication with residents; consensus to prepare a concise monthly Planning Commission letter for the City Council packet (target: Sept 4). No formal action.

**Commissioner comments**

General comments on improving information flow and coordinating with Code Review Committee; no formal action.

Meeting adjourned at 7:43 p.m.

**ATTEST:**

---

Abigail Flynn, Acting City Clerk

---

Date Approved

**Mayor**  
Alice Ruby

**Acting City Manager**  
Jack Savo Jr.



**Dillingham City C**

Section . Item #2.

Bertram Luckhurst  
Michael Bennett  
Steven Carriere  
Curt Armstrong  
Kaleb Westfall

## MEMORANDUM

**Date:** August 25, 2025  
**To:** Jack Savo Jr., Acting City Manager  
**From:** Christopher Maines, Planning Director  
**Subject:** August 2025 Monthly Report

---

### **Upcoming Planning Commission Activity:**

The Planning Department, in collaboration with the Planning Commission, has begun work on key issues for Fiscal Year 2026. The first of which is Dillingham Streets and Roads.

### **Street and Road Compliance Issue**

Staff has identified a significant municipal code compliance issue regarding street maintenance practices. The city currently maintains various streets without formal acceptance agreements as required by Municipal Code Sections 17.23.090 and 17.23.100, while simultaneously declining to maintain other streets such as Dragnet Drive and Squaw Creek Road. This creates inconsistent treatment of property owners and potential legal exposure.

### **Current Situation**

Our review reveals that no city-maintained street has the required formal inspection and written acceptance documentation mandated by municipal code. The code clearly distinguishes between dedication (automatic upon plat recording) and acceptance (requiring formal city inspection and written agreement). Without following proper acceptance procedures, the city lacks legal authority for current maintenance decisions. This inconsistency affects three categories of property owners:

- Those receiving city maintenance without formal agreements
- Those denied city maintenance despite street dedications
- A theoretical third group that would have properly executed agreements (currently Waskey Road)

### **Legal and Financial Implications**

The current approach violates established municipal code requirements and creates several risks:

- Unauthorized expenditure of city funds on streets without legal maintenance obligations
- Potential liability for refusing maintenance where legal obligations may exist
- Unequal treatment of similarly situated property owners
- Budget planning difficulties due to unclear actual responsibilities

### **Recommended Solution**

Staff recommends a four-phase approach to resolve this compliance issue:

1. Street Inventory and Assessment (6 months): Catalog all city streets, current maintenance practices, construction standards, and legal status
2. Policy Development (3 months): Establish objective criteria and procedures for street acceptance based on code requirements
3. Community Engagement (6 months): Public notification, meetings, and input process for affected property owners
4. Ordinance Adoption (6 months): Comprehensive street maintenance ordinance with clear legal basis for all decisions

### **Requested Council Action**

Staff requests Council direction to proceed with developing a comprehensive Street Maintenance Ordinance that brings city practices into compliance with existing municipal code. This would include conducting the necessary street inventory, establishing clear acceptance criteria, and engaging the community in developing fair, legally defensible maintenance policies.

The current system requires immediate attention to ensure legal compliance and equitable treatment of all property owners within the municipality.

### **Planning Department Activity:**

#### **Dillingham Community Action Plan**

The Dillingham Community Action Plan will be seeing its first projects involving the Dillingham City School District. Currently a schedule is being developed for a walking satellite bus group, in which students with chaperones will be dropped off at the local harbor and walk to school in the morning. The aim is to promote healthy walking habits and aid in preventing additional traffic at the school during morning student drop-off. The second project will involve students painting the crosswalks on Seward and D Street in the official school colors and logos. The aim is to give students a sense of ownership and provide pedestrians safer crosswalks that adhere to the natural use patterns.

#### **EPA Landfill Appropriation**

#### **Key Milestone: NEPA Process Complete**

The Planning Office received news that the NEPA Process is complete and that no negative findings were found. We have received several forms that need to be updated on account of the extended delay. The new project start date will be slated for September 1, 2025. We are hoping to have our grant agreement in place before the start of the federal calendar year. I will keep the council posted on updates as they become available.

**EPA Brownfields Inventory Grant**

There are no updates to report this month. Regular updates on project status and milestones will be provided to the council as work progresses through the coming months.

**Benthic GeoScience**

I met with David Oliver with Benthic GeoScience on August 19<sup>th</sup>, 2025. He is currently conducting a feasibility study for a fiberoptic line that is proposed to cross from Kanakanak Beach across the Nushagak River. The meeting was purely informational and I will update the Council as more information is available.

**Rural Professional Housing Grant Application**

The Planning Department has successfully submitted the City of Dillingham's pre-application to the Alaska Housing Finance Corporation (AHFC) for the Rural Professional Housing Grant program. This competitive annual funding initiative is specifically designed to create affordable rental housing for essential rural professionals, including teachers and healthcare workers who are critical to our community's well-being and economic stability.

I will be attending the training on this application on September 3, 2025. The course is all day and will be held in Anchorage. As a cost savings I have elected to attend remotely.

# Planning Commission Policy Options

## Street Maintenance Crisis Resolution

### OPTION A: Grandfather Clause Implementation

**Approach:** Create a grandfather clause for streets developed before current code adoption (1990) or before a specific cutoff date.

#### Proposed Policy:

- Automatically accept maintenance responsibility for all streets currently maintained by the city
- Establish grandfathered status for pre-1990 streets that meet minimum safety standards
- Apply current code requirements only to new subdivisions going forward

#### Pros:

- Legitimizes current maintenance practices
- Minimal disruption to current property owners
- Simple implementation - just codify status quo
- Avoids potential legal challenges from property owners losing services

#### Cons:

- May lock city into maintaining substandard streets indefinitely
- Could be costly long-term without clear standards
- Doesn't address fairness issues (Dragnet Drive, Squaw Creek Road still excluded)
- May violate equal protection if arbitrarily applied

**Council Decision Required:** Whether to create grandfather clause and what cutoff date/criteria to use

---



## **OPTION B: Comprehensive Street-by-Street Evaluation**

**Approach:** Evaluate every street against objective criteria to determine maintenance eligibility.

### **Proposed Policy:**

- Apply consistent engineering and safety standards to all streets
- Formal acceptance for streets meeting criteria regardless of age
- Clear rejection with transition timeline for substandard streets
- Upgrade pathways for streets that don't initially qualify

### **Evaluation Criteria:**

- Right-of-way width compliance
- Surface construction standards
- Safety and sight distance requirements
- Number of lots served (public benefit)
- Emergency vehicle access
- Integration with city street system

### **Pros:**

- Treats all property owners equally
- Based on objective, defensible standards
- Allows upgrade pathways for improvement
- Addresses current inequities (could include Dragnet Drive/Squaw Creek Road if they meet standards)

### **Cons:**

- May require ending maintenance on some currently maintained streets
- Could be expensive if many streets need upgrades
- Time-intensive evaluation process
- May face resistance from property owners losing services

**Council Decision Required:** What standards to apply and transition timeline for changes

---

## OPTION C: Modified Acceptance Procedures

**Approach:** Streamline and modify current code requirements to make acceptance more practical for existing streets.

### Proposed Policy:

- Reduce inspection requirements for streets already in use
- Allow acceptance based on "as-built" condition rather than full code compliance
- Create alternative standards for older streets (reduced width, etc.)
- Fast-track acceptance for streets serving multiple properties

### Modified Requirements:

- Simplified inspection checklist for existing streets
- Reduced right-of-way requirements for established neighborhoods
- Focus on safety and accessibility rather than full code compliance
- Require maintenance agreements rather than full construction compliance

### Pros:

- More flexible than strict code application
- Could bring more streets into compliance quickly
- Recognizes practical limitations of retrofitting existing areas
- Maintains some standards while being realistic

### Cons:

- Creates two-tier system (old vs. new standards)
- May face legal challenges for unequal treatment
- Could set precedent for relaxed standards
- Still requires case-by-case evaluation

**Council Decision Required:** What modified standards to accept and legal framework for different requirements

---

## **OPTION D: Public Right-of-Way Conversion Process**

**Approach:** Create formal process for dedicated public right-of-ways to become city-maintained streets through property owner petition.

### **Proposed Policy:**

- Property owners can petition for city acceptance of dedicated streets
- Requirements: majority property owner support, meet minimum standards, pay for upgrades
- City retains discretion to accept or reject based on budget and priorities
- Clear timeline and cost-sharing arrangements

### **Process:**

1. Property owner petition with majority support
2. Engineering assessment and cost estimate
3. Public hearing and Planning Commission review
4. City Council acceptance decision
5. Performance guarantee or upfront payment for any needed improvements

### **Pros:**

- Gives property owners pathway to city maintenance
- Property owners bear cost of bringing streets to standard
- City maintains control over acceptance decisions
- Could resolve inequities through property owner initiative

### **Cons:**

- May be too expensive for most property owners
- Creates potential for neighborhood divisions over costs
- Administrative burden for petition process
- No guarantee of acceptance even if standards met

**Council Decision Required:** Cost-sharing formula and acceptance criteria for petitioned streets

---

## OPTION E: Hybrid Approach with Multiple Pathways

**Approach:** Combine elements from multiple options to address different categories of streets.

### Proposed Policy Framework:

- **Category 1:** Currently maintained streets meeting basic safety standards → Automatic grandfather acceptance
- **Category 2:** Dedicated rights-of-way not currently maintained → Evaluation-based acceptance with upgrade requirements
- **Category 3:** Substandard streets → Property owner petition process with cost-sharing
- **Category 4:** Private streets/easements → Remain private with clear maintenance agreements

### Implementation:

- Phase 1: Automatic acceptance of qualifying currently-maintained streets
- Phase 2: Evaluation process for unmaintained dedicated streets (Dragnet Drive, Squaw Creek Road)
- Phase 3: Petition process for remaining streets seeking city maintenance

### Pros:

- Addresses different situations with appropriate solutions
- Minimizes disruption while solving inequities
- Provides multiple pathways for property owners
- Allows prioritization of resources

### Cons:

- Complex to implement and explain
- May still create unequal treatment
- Administrative burden of multiple processes
- Potential for confusion and disputes

**Council Decision Required:** Which categories to create and criteria for each pathway

---

## **OPTION F: Status Quo with Clear Policies**

**Approach:** Formalize current practices through proper legal procedures without major changes.

### **Proposed Policy:**

- Formally accept all currently maintained streets through retroactive inspection process
- Clearly designate all other streets as private maintenance responsibility
- Establish formal maintenance agreements going forward
- No new city street acceptances except through full subdivision process

### **Implementation:**

- City engineer inspects and documents all currently maintained streets
- Formal acceptance resolutions passed for each street
- Clear notification to all other property owners of private maintenance responsibility
- Codify current maintenance practices with legal backing

### **Pros:**

- Minimal disruption to current situation
- Simple implementation
- Provides legal basis for current practices
- Low cost and administrative burden

### **Cons:**

- Doesn't address fundamental inequity issues
- Leaves Dragnet Drive/Squaw Creek Road situation unresolved
- May not satisfy legal requirement for equal treatment
- Locks in potentially arbitrary decisions

**Council Decision Required:** Whether to formalize status quo or pursue changes

---

## **PLANNING COMMISSION DIRECTION NEEDED**

### **Primary Questions for Commission Decision:**

1. **Which option(s) should staff develop into detailed proposals?**
2. **Should grandfather provisions apply to currently maintained streets?**
3. **What standards should be used for evaluating street acceptance?**
4. **Should property owners have a petition pathway for street acceptance?**
5. **How should transition timeline be structured for any changes?**
6. **What community engagement process should be used?**

### **Recommended Commission Action:**

- Select preferred option(s) for detailed development
- Provide guidance on evaluation criteria and standards
- Direct staff on community engagement priorities
- Set timeline for bringing recommendation to City Council

## Executive Summary

The City of Dillingham faces a significant municipal infrastructure crisis that has been decades in the making. Despite having clear subdivision code requirements for street acceptance and maintenance responsibilities, the city has been operating under an inconsistent and legally problematic approach to road maintenance that directly contradicts its own municipal code.

**The core problem:** The city maintains some streets without formal acceptance agreements while refusing to maintain others, claiming they "are not city roads" - creating an arbitrary, unfair, and legally indefensible system that violates the city's own regulations.

## The Current Crisis

### Inconsistent Maintenance Practices

For decades, Dillingham has been maintaining various streets throughout the community without following the formal acceptance procedures required by **Municipal Code Section 17.23.090**, which clearly states:

"The city shall approve the quality and installation of all improvements which will be dedicated to the city... The city shall inspect all improvements to insure that the requirements of this chapter are met."

Meanwhile, **Section 17.23.100** explicitly requires formal written acceptance before the city assumes maintenance responsibility, stating that performance guarantees remain in place "until the city notifies the bank in writing of its acceptance of the required subdivision improvements."

### The Legal and Financial Exposure

This inconsistent approach creates multiple serious problems:

#### 1. Legal Liability

- The city may be maintaining streets it has no legal obligation to maintain, exposing taxpayers to unnecessary costs
- Conversely, the city may be refusing to maintain streets where it does have legal obligations
- Inconsistent treatment of similarly situated property owners creates potential equal protection violations

#### 2. Financial Uncertainty

- Unknown scope of actual maintenance obligations makes budgeting impossible
- Property owners lack clarity on their rights and responsibilities
- Potential liability for past maintenance decisions made without proper authority

### 3. Code Compliance Failure

- Current practices directly violate the city's own subdivision regulations
- Undermines the integrity of the planning and development process
- Creates confusion for future subdivisions and development

## Root Causes of the Problem

### Historical Development vs. Modern Code

Many of Dillingham's streets were developed before the current comprehensive subdivision code was adopted in 1990 (**Ordinance 90-03**). The code establishes clear procedures for:

- **Preliminary consultation** (Section 17.07.010)
- **Construction plan approval** (Section 17.07.060)
- **Formal inspection and acceptance** (Section 17.23.090)
- **Performance guarantee release** (Section 17.23.100)

However, streets developed before 1990 never went through these procedures, creating a "grandfathered" category that the code doesn't explicitly address.

### Lack of Systematic Street Inventory

The city appears to lack a comprehensive inventory of:

- Which streets have been formally accepted for maintenance
- Which streets are maintained without formal acceptance
- Which dedicated streets are not maintained
- The construction standards and condition of each street
- The legal basis for current maintenance decisions

### Absence of Clear Acceptance Policy

While the code requires formal acceptance, it doesn't provide guidance for:

- How to handle pre-1990 streets
- Criteria for accepting existing streets that meet or don't meet current standards
- Process for declining to accept substandard streets
- Timeline for resolving the status of existing streets



## Impact on Property Owners and Community

### Unfair Treatment

Property owners face dramatically different outcomes based on arbitrary factors:

#### **Group A:** Owners on city-maintained streets without formal agreements

- Receive free city maintenance despite unclear legal obligation
- May have built to lower standards than current code requires
- Benefit from taxpayer-funded services without meeting current requirements

#### **Group B:** Owners on non-maintained dedicated streets

- Must privately maintain roads despite dedicating right-of-way to city
- May have met historical standards that were adequate when built
- Effectively subsidize Group A's maintenance through tax payments

#### **Group C:** Owners on formally accepted streets

- Followed proper procedures and met full code requirements
- Receive appropriate city maintenance
- Treatment consistent with code requirements

### Economic Development Impacts

This inconsistency undermines economic development by:

- Creating uncertainty for new subdivisions about actual requirements
- Generating distrust in city development processes
- Making infrastructure planning and budgeting unpredictable
- Potentially deterring investment due to unclear municipal obligations

## The Legal Framework for Resolution

### Existing Code Provides the Foundation

The current municipal code actually provides the framework for resolving this crisis:

#### **Formal Acceptance Process (Section 17.23.090)**

- City has authority to inspect and accept qualified improvements
- Acceptance triggers maintenance responsibility
- Process can be applied to existing streets that meet standards

### **Exception Road Framework (Section 17.07.090.E)**

- Provides model for streets where city accepts right-of-way but not maintenance
- Requires clear notification to property owners
- Establishes ongoing private maintenance responsibility

### **Vacation Authority (Chapter 17.15)**

- Allows city to formally abandon streets it should not maintain
- Provides due process for affected property owners
- Transfers maintenance responsibility back to adjacent owners

## **Recommended Path Forward**

### **Phase 1: Comprehensive Street Audit (6 months)**

#### **Street Inventory and Assessment**

1. Create comprehensive database of all city streets including:
  - Legal status (dedicated, easement, fee simple)
  - Construction history and standards
  - Current maintenance practices
  - Property owner information
  - Connection to utility systems
2. Engineering assessment of each street:
  - Compliance with current construction standards (Chapter 17.19)
  - Structural condition and maintenance needs
  - Public safety and access requirements
  - Integration with overall street system
3. Legal analysis of each street:
  - Formal acceptance history
  - Subdivision approval documents
  - Performance guarantee status
  - Deed restrictions or covenants

### **Phase 2: Develop Acceptance Criteria and Policies (3 months)**

#### **Establish Clear Standards**

1. Create objective criteria for street acceptance based on:
  - Structural adequacy and safety
  - Compliance with minimum standards
  - Public necessity and benefit
  - Integration with city street system
  - Available city resources
2. Develop formal acceptance procedures for existing streets:

- Inspection protocols
- Community notification requirements
- Property owner input process
- Appeal and review mechanisms
- 3. Create non-acceptance procedures for substandard streets:
  - Clear notification to property owners
  - Transition timeline for ending city maintenance
  - Resources and assistance for private maintenance
  - Option for property owners to upgrade streets for acceptance

### **Phase 3: Community Engagement and Legal Process (6 months)**

#### **Public Transparency and Input**

1. Community meetings to explain the situation and proposed solutions
2. Individual notification to all affected property owners
3. Public comment period on proposed acceptance policies
4. City Council consideration and adoption of formal policies

#### **Legal Documentation**

1. Formal acceptance resolutions for streets meeting criteria
2. Non-acceptance notifications for substandard streets
3. Maintenance agreements where appropriate
4. Updates to city asset inventory and budget

### **Phase 4: Code Amendments and Ordinance Adoption (3 months)**

#### **Codify the Resolution**

1. Amend municipal code to address existing street acceptance
2. Create clear procedures for future acceptance decisions
3. Establish maintenance standards and responsibilities
4. Adopt comprehensive street maintenance ordinance listing:
  - All city-maintained streets
  - All private-maintenance streets
  - Clear legal basis for each designation

#### **Implementation Timeline**

1. Immediate cessation of maintenance on non-accepted streets (with reasonable notice)
2. Gradual transition for affected property owners
3. Annual review and update process
4. Clear procedures for future street dedication and acceptance

# **Proposed Ordinance Framework**

## **New Municipal Code Chapter: "Street Maintenance Responsibilities"**

### **Section 1: Comprehensive Street Inventory**

- Official listing of all city-maintained streets
- Legal basis for each street's acceptance
- Annual update requirements

### **Section 2: Acceptance Criteria for Existing Streets**

- Objective standards for evaluating existing streets
- Formal acceptance procedures
- Community input requirements

### **Section 3: Non-Acceptance Procedures**

- Clear notification requirements
- Transition timelines
- Property owner responsibilities
- Appeal process

### **Section 4: Ongoing Maintenance Standards**

- City maintenance obligations for accepted streets
- Property owner obligations for non-accepted streets
- Emergency access requirements
- Utility access provisions

### **Section 5: Future Street Development**

- Reaffirmation of existing subdivision code requirements
- Clear acceptance procedures for new streets
- Performance guarantee requirements
- Exception road procedures

## **Benefits of This Approach**

### **Legal Compliance and Risk Reduction**

- Brings city practices into compliance with municipal code
- Eliminates arbitrary and inconsistent treatment
- Reduces legal liability and financial exposure
- Creates defensible, objective decision-making process

## **Financial Clarity and Budgeting**

- Clear understanding of actual maintenance obligations
- Predictable budget requirements for street maintenance
- Elimination of unaudited maintenance commitments
- Fair allocation of costs between public and private responsibility

## **Community Transparency and Fairness**

- Equal treatment for all property owners
- Clear communication of rights and responsibilities
- Objective, consistent application of standards
- Public input on major policy decisions

## **Economic Development Benefits**

- Clear, predictable development requirements
- Restored confidence in city planning processes
- Improved infrastructure planning and coordination
- Enhanced property values through certainty

## **Conclusion**

The City of Dillingham's inconsistent street maintenance practices represent a significant municipal crisis that requires immediate, comprehensive action. The current system violates the city's own code, creates unfair treatment of property owners, and exposes the city to substantial legal and financial risks.

However, the existing municipal code provides the legal framework necessary to resolve this crisis. What's needed is the political will to conduct a comprehensive audit, develop fair and objective policies, engage the community in the solution, and codify the results in clear, enforceable ordinances.

The path forward is challenging but straightforward: audit all streets, apply consistent standards, formally accept appropriate streets, clearly designate private maintenance responsibilities for others, and codify these decisions in municipal ordinance. This approach will restore legal compliance, ensure fair treatment, provide budget clarity, and create a solid foundation for future development.

The cost of action is significant, but the cost of continued inaction - in legal liability, community distrust, and municipal dysfunction - is far greater. Dillingham must act decisively to resolve this decades-old problem and restore integrity to its infrastructure management.

# Dillingham Streets and Roads: Standards, Construction, and Maintenance

*Complete Reference for Street Development and Maintenance Responsibilities*

## Table of Contents

- 1. [Overview](#)
- 2. [Street Classification & Standards](#)
- 3. [Construction Requirements](#)
- 4. [Road Maintenance Responsibility](#)
- 5. [Exception Roads & Private Maintenance](#)
- 6. [Performance Guarantees for Streets](#)
- 7. [Street Naming Requirements](#)
- 8. [Street Vacation Process](#)
- 9. [Reference Tables](#)

---

## Overview

This guide covers all aspects of street and road development in Dillingham subdivisions, focusing on construction standards, city acceptance procedures, and maintenance responsibilities.

**The key principle: dedication of right-of-way does not automatically mean city maintenance responsibility.**

### Critical Distinction:

- **Dedication** = Transfer of right-of-way to public use (automatic upon plat recording)
- **Acceptance** = City assumes maintenance responsibility (requires formal inspection and written acceptance)

---

## Street Classification & Standards

### Street Types and Right-of-Way Requirements (Section 17.19.050)

#### A. Arterial Road

- Right-of-Way: 100 feet (public dedicated)
- Improved Width: 26 feet
- Purpose: Major traffic movement, primary utility corridors

**B. Collector Street**

- Right-of-Way: 60 feet (public dedicated or easement)
- Improved Width: 26 feet
- Purpose: Main access routes to arterials, major utility corridors

**C. Major Local Streets**

- Right-of-Way: 60 feet (public dedicated or easement)
- Improved Width: 24 feet
- Purpose: Primary residential access to collectors/arterials

**D. Minor Local Streets**

- Right-of-Way: 50 feet (public dedicated or easement)
- Improved Width: 20 feet
- Purpose: Residential access to major local streets

**E. State Highways**

- Subject to appropriate state standards
- Not governed by city subdivision requirements

**F. Private Access Streets**

- Easement: Minimum 50 feet
- Improved Surface:
  - Up to 6 lots: 12 feet
  - Up to 10 lots: 14 feet
  - More than 10 lots: 20 feet
- **Maintenance Requirement:** Right-of-way maintained 10 feet on either side of finished surface

---

## **Construction Requirements**

**General Design Standards (Section 17.19.060)****Street Location Considerations:**

- Integration with existing and planned street systems
- Conformance to topographical conditions and natural features
- Public convenience and safety
- Compatibility with proposed land uses

**Street Layout Requirements:**

- Major streets properly integrated with existing system
- Minor streets conform to topography for efficient drainage/sewer systems
- Street names cannot cause confusion with existing names
- Dead-end streets longer than 150 feet prohibited
- Half streets prohibited

**Geometric Design Standards (Section 17.19.080)****Curves:**

- Streets  $\geq 100'$  ROW: Minimum 300' centerline radius
- Other streets: Minimum 200' centerline radius
- Deflection  $> 10^\circ$ : Curve required

**Reversed Curves (S-curves):**

- Minimum 100' straight section between curves
- Exception: If curve radii  $\geq 300'$

**Sight Distances (Section 17.19.080.D):**

- Minor/Major Local Streets: 125 feet minimum
- Arterials/Collectors: 225 feet minimum

**Grades (Section 17.19.100.J):**

- Arterial/Collector streets: Maximum 6%
- Other streets: Maximum 10% (unless exceptional topography approved)
- All streets: Minimum 0.5%

**Cul-de-Sac Standards (Section 17.19.060.F)****With Community/City Utilities:**

- Maximum length: 600 feet
- Minimum turnaround diameter: 60 feet

**With On-site Systems Only:**

- Maximum length: 1,300 feet
- Measurement: Centerline from near side of intersecting street to farthest point



## Intersection Requirements (Section 17.19.090)

### Angles:

- Intersections as close to 90° as possible
- Minimum angle: 60°

### Corner Rounding:

- Property lines rounded with minimum 20' radius

### Separation:

- Opposite street intersections: Minimum 150' separation (centerline to centerline)
- Prefer 3-way over 4-way intersections

### Maximum Streets per Intersection:

- Two streets maximum unless Planning Commission approval

### Intersection Sight Distances:

- Local roads: 200' minimum from intersecting road centerline
- Collector roads: 275' minimum
- Arterial roads: 415' minimum

### Grades Near Intersections:

- Local streets: Maximum 5% within 50 feet of intersection
- Collector streets: Maximum 3% within 100 feet

## Road Maintenance Responsibility

### City Acceptance Process (Section 17.23.090)

#### Key Requirements:

- A. "The city shall approve the quality and installation of all improvements which **will be dedicated to the city**"
- B. "The city shall inspect all improvements to insure that the requirements of this chapter are met"

## When City Assumes Maintenance

### Standard Process:

1. Subdivider constructs streets to full city standards
2. City inspects completed improvements
3. City formally accepts improvements in writing (Section 17.23.100)
4. Performance guarantees released
5. City assumes maintenance responsibility

**Timeline:** City acceptance required before performance guarantee release

## What City Maintains After Acceptance

### Accepted Streets Include:

- Road surface and subsurface
- Drainage structures and culverts
- Street signs and traffic control devices
- Right-of-way maintenance

### City Does NOT Accept:

- Streets that don't meet construction standards
- Exception roads (see below)
- Private access streets
- Streets not formally inspected and accepted

## Exception Roads & Private Maintenance

### Exception Road Authority (Section 17.07.090)

#### Eligibility Requirements:

- Subdivision creates 4 lots or fewer
- Subdivision has never before been granted road standard exception
- Required findings of fact can be made

#### Required Findings (Section 17.07.090.C):

1. Exception won't be detrimental to public welfare or injurious to other property
2. Road doesn't provide only/most practical access to adjacent future development
3. Strict application of road standards would cause undue and substantial hardship

## Private Maintenance Agreements (Section 17.07.090.E)

### Mandatory Requirements:

- **Plat notation required:** "That the road granted the exception does not conform to the road standards of this title"
- **Deed restrictions required:** Must be attached to all subdivided lot deeds
- **City position stated:** "the city, while accepting the dedication of the right-of-way, does not accept responsibility for road improvement or maintenance"

### Ongoing Obligations:

- Property owners responsible for all road maintenance
- City has no obligation to improve, plow, grade, or repair
- Property owners must maintain road access for emergency services

## Prohibition on Future Subdivision (Section 17.07.090.D)

**No Additional Lots:** "No subsequent subdivision of lots or tracts included in the original subdivision granted an exception to road standards shall be permitted unless the road granted the exception is constructed to conform to the standards required by this title."

## Performance Guarantees for Streets

### Guarantee Requirements (Section 17.23.100)

#### When Required:

- If street improvements not completed before final plat approval
- Guarantee amount equals city's cost estimate for all required street improvements

#### Guarantee Methods:

#### Performance Bond (Section 17.23.100.C.1):

- Surety bond approved by city
- Amount equal to improvement cost estimate
- 2-year completion deadline
- Full release upon city acceptance

**Bank Deposit/Certificate of Deposit (Section 17.23.100.C.2):**

- Funds held in trust for city
- Subdivider earns interest
- 2-year completion deadline
- Release upon city written acceptance notice

**Guarantee Release Process**

**Step 1:** Subdivider completes street construction **Step 2:** City inspects improvements **Step 3:** City formally accepts improvements in writing **Step 4:** Guarantee fully released **Step 5:** City assumes maintenance responsibility

**If Subdivider Fails:**

- City uses guarantee funds to complete improvements
- Subdivider charged for any cost overruns
- Any remaining funds returned to subdivider

**Street Naming Requirements****Naming Standards (Section 17.28.010)****Duplication Prohibited:**

- Cannot duplicate existing street names in spelling OR sound
- Different suffixes (Ave, St, Ct) do NOT avoid duplication
- Different directional prefixes (N, S, E, W) do NOT avoid duplication

**Grid System Integration:**

- Streets crossing base line or meridian receive directional designations (N, S, E, W)

**Continuity Requirement:**

- Extended streets must continue existing names when following same alignment

**Naming Process Options****Option 1: During Subdivision**

- Subdivider proposes names on preliminary plat
- Names approved as part of plat process (Section 17.23.050.B)

- Subdivider installs signs before city acceptance

## **Option 2: Post-Dedication Naming (Chapter 17.28)**

### **Who Can Initiate:**

- Any property owner along the street
- Planning Commission
- Planning Director

### **Application Requirements (Section 17.28.020):**

- 51% petition from adjoining property owners
- Three name options (preferred + 2 alternates)
- Map showing street location
- Appropriate fee
- 15-day advance submission

### **Approval Process:**

- Planning Commission public hearing
- 10-day notice to adjoining owners
- State recording of approved name
- Applicant pays for all street sign costs

## **Sign Installation Requirements (Section 17.23.050)**

### **Standards:**

- Alaska Traffic Manual compliance
- Metal construction per State Sign Code
- Stop signs at all collector/arterial intersections
- Subdivider responsible for installation cost

## **Street Vacation Process**

### **Vacation Authority (Section 17.15.010)**

#### **Who Can Petition:**

- The state
- The city
- Public utility

- Owners of majority of land fronting the area to be vacated

**Vacation Process (Sections 17.15.020-17.15.030)**

**Application Requirements:**

- Petition filed with Planning Commission
- Copy of existing plat showing proposed vacation
- Existing buildings and distances from lot lines

**Public Process:**

- Public hearing within 60 days
- Notice posted 5 days in advance
- Certified mail notice to affected non-petitioning owners (7 days prior)

**City Street Vacations:**

- Planning Commission recommendation to City Council
- City Council has 45 days to act or consent is assumed

**Title Transfer After Vacation (Section 17.15.040)**

**General Rule:** Title attaches to bordering lots in equal proportions

**Exceptions:**

- Original boundary lines maintained if dedicated by different persons
- Public squares vest in city
- Fair market value paid to city if street acquired for consideration

---

**Reference Tables**

**Street Standards Summary**

Classification	ROW Width	Improved Width	Minimum Sight Distance
Arterial	100'	26'	225'
Collector	60'	26'	225'
Major Local	60'	24'	125'
Minor Local	50'	20'	125'
Private Access (1-6 lots)	50' easement	12'	N/A

Classification	ROW Width	Improved Width	Minimum Sight Distance
Private Access (7-10 lots)	50' easement	14'	N/A
Private Access (>10 lots)	50' easement	20'	N/A

## Curve and Grade Standards

Street Type	Min. Curve Radius	Max. Grade	Min. Grade
Streets $\geq$ 100' ROW	300'	6% (Arterial/Collector)	0.5%
Other Streets	200'	10% (Local)	0.5%

## Intersection Sight Distances

### Intersecting Road Type Required Sight Distance

Local Roads	200' from centerline
Collector Roads	275' from centerline
Arterial Roads	415' from centerline

## Construction Specifications (Section 17.19.100)

Component	Requirement
Gravel Depth	Minimum 18" compacted
Compaction	95% compaction
Road Slope	2% from centerline to shoulder
Shoulder Slope	3:1 (horizontal:vertical)
Backslope Ratio	2:1 (horizontal:vertical)
Minimum Culvert Size	18"

## Maintenance Responsibility Matrix

Street Type	Right-of-Way Owner	Maintenance Responsibility
Standard Streets (Accepted)	City	City
Exception Roads	City	Property Owners
Private Access Streets	Private Easement	Property Owners
State Highways	State	State
Unaccepted Dedicated Streets	City	Subdivider/Property Owners

## Key Takeaways

1. **Dedication ≠ Maintenance:** Dedicating right-of-way does not automatically mean city maintenance responsibility.
2. **Formal Acceptance Required:** City must formally inspect and accept improvements in writing before assuming maintenance.
3. **Exception Roads Stay Private:** Roads granted standard exceptions remain private maintenance responsibility permanently.
4. **Performance Guarantees Protect All:** Guarantee system ensures streets get built properly and protects city, buyers, and subdividers.
5. **Standards Are Mandatory:** Streets must meet full technical standards to qualify for city maintenance acceptance.
6. **Private Streets Require Agreements:** Property owners must maintain private access streets and exception roads.
7. **Future Development Restricted:** Exception roads cannot serve additional lots unless upgraded to full standards.



# EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

## Dillingham 2025 Comprehensive Plan: Evolution, Timeline, and Path Forward

### Project Timeline and Financial Overview

**March 2023:** City of Dillingham contracts with Agnew::Beck Consulting for comprehensive plan update at \$65,000 (separate housing study contract also executed) **2023-2024:** Partial completion of comprehensive plan update including community engagement and technical analysis

**Total Expenditure to Date:** \$13,780 from original approved contract  
**Contract Status:** Original contract for \$65,000 expired  
**Current Proposal:** \$46,250 to complete 2025 comprehensive plan update  
**Total Project Investment:** \$59,030 (\$13,780 spent to date + \$46,250 proposed)  
**2025 Budget Allocation:** \$60,000 budgeted for plan update—proposed completion cost remains under budget

### Planning Commission Financial Context

The Planning Department allocated \$60,000 in the 2025 budget specifically for this comprehensive plan update. The proposed completion cost of \$46,250 keeps the project under the budgeted amount of \$13,750. This represents responsible fiscal management while completing a statutorily required planning document.

### Substantive Changes from Previous Plans

#### Strategic Reorganization and Enhanced Focus

The 2025 plan represents a fundamental restructuring from the 2010 version:

#### From General Aspirations to Specific Implementation

- 2010 plan contained broad goals with limited implementation pathways
- 2025 plan provides detailed action items with specific implementation notes and responsible parties
- New emphasis on measurable outcomes and annual progress reporting

#### Integration of Recent Studies and Assessments

- Incorporates 2020 Dillingham Waterfront Strategic Plan findings
- Integrates 2020 Curyung Tribal Transportation Safety Plan recommendations
- Builds on 2022 City Services Assessment findings

- References separate housing study data for evidence-based housing strategies

### **Housing: From Secondary Concern to Primary Crisis**

**2010 Approach:** Housing mentioned as part of general land use goals **2025 Approach:** Housing elevated to crisis-level priority requiring immediate coordinated response

#### **New Elements:**

- Recognition of critical housing shortage (0.7% ownership vacancy rate)
- Specific strategies for workforce housing to address recruitment/retention challenges
- Collaborative housing coalition approach involving multiple stakeholders
- Direct link between housing availability and economic development capacity

### **Economic Development: From Recovery to Strategic Diversification**

**2010 Context:** Plan developed during fisheries crisis and economic uncertainty **2025 Context:** Plan recognizes recovered fisheries while pursuing strategic diversification

#### **Key Shifts:**

- Fishing industry treated as stable foundation rather than recovery target
- Tourism development elevated with specific infrastructure and marketing strategies
- Workforce development aligned with regional initiatives (Bristol Bay Career and Technical Education Program)
- Local food production and energy independence as economic resilience strategies
- Recognition of emerging renewable energy opportunities (Nuyakuk Hydroelectric Project)

### **Infrastructure: From Basic Maintenance to Asset Management**

**2010 Approach:** Reactive approach to infrastructure needs **2025 Approach:** Proactive asset management with lifecycle planning

#### **Enhanced Elements:**

- Comprehensive assessment of deferred maintenance needs based on 2022 City Services Assessment
- Integration of GIS and asset management software already implemented
- Financial planning for equipment replacement cycles
- Recognition of climate change impacts on infrastructure longevity
- Specific attention to coastal erosion threats to wastewater lagoon

## **Governance: From City-Centric to Collaborative Regional Approach**

**2010 Approach:** City of Dillingham as primary implementer **2025 Approach:** Regional hub model with extensive partnerships

### **New Coordination Mechanisms:**

- Formalized protocols with Curyung Tribe and Alaska DOT&PF
- Regional energy collaborative participation through Bristol Bay Native Corporation initiative
- Bristol Bay economic development coordination through BBNA CEDS process
- Enhanced state and federal agency partnerships

## **COVID-19 Pandemic Response Integration**

The 2025 plan uniquely incorporates lessons learned from the 2020-2023 pandemic period:

### **Organizational Resilience:**

- Recognition of staff recruitment/retention challenges exacerbated by pandemic
- Emphasis on cross-training and operational redundancy
- Enhanced digital communication and public engagement tools

### **Community Health Systems:**

- Strengthened coordination between city and health providers
- Recognition of housing's role in public health emergency response
- Enhanced emergency operations and communication protocols

### **Economic Recovery:**

- Understanding of tourism industry vulnerabilities and recovery strategies
- Recognition of supply chain disruptions affecting local businesses
- Enhanced focus on local economic resilience

## **Implementation Realism and Capacity Assessment**

The 2025 plan demonstrates more realistic assessment of implementation challenges:

### **Financial Constraints Acknowledged:**

- Recognition that many strategies require external funding
- Emphasis on grant-writing capacity and partnership development
- Prioritization of projects based on available resources

### **Staffing Limitations Addressed:**

- Specific attention to recruitment and retention challenges
- Emphasis on regional collaboration to share implementation burden
- Recognition of need for outside contractors for specialized tasks

### **Phased Implementation Approach:**

- Waterfront improvements organized into clear Phase 1 and Phase 2 projects
- Transportation improvements coordinated with existing agency planning
- Housing strategies designed for collaborative implementation

### **Value Proposition for Completion**

**Fiscal Responsibility:** Completing the plan for \$46,250 utilizes 77% of budgeted funds and avoids waste of \$13,780 already invested.

**Legal Compliance:** Fulfills Alaska State Statutes requirement for comprehensive planning and provides foundation for land use regulations.

**Grant Eligibility:** Many federal and state funding programs require current comprehensive plans as application prerequisites.

**Regional Coordination:** Provides framework for participation in regional initiatives already underway (energy collaborative, transportation planning, economic development).

**Performance Management:** Establishes baseline and metrics for measuring municipal progress and service delivery improvements.

### **Critical Implementation Considerations**

**Immediate Priorities:** The plan identifies several crisis-level issues requiring immediate attention regardless of plan completion:

- Housing shortage affecting workforce recruitment
- Wastewater lagoon erosion vulnerability
- Downtown revitalization needs
- Staff recruitment and retention

**Resource Requirements:** Successful implementation will require:

- Sustained grant-writing capacity
- Enhanced regional partnership development
- Community engagement and volunteer coordination
- Technical assistance for specialized projects

**Monitoring and Adaptation:** The plan establishes annual review processes but will require:

- Realistic timeline adjustments based on actual capacity
- Flexibility to respond to changing federal/state funding opportunities
- Integration with other municipal planning processes

Dillingham Comprehensive Plan Update Scope & Cost Estimate, Submitted to City of Dillingham by Agnew::Beck Consulting		Shelly Wade Principal		Meg Friedenauer Senior Associate		Holly Smith Associate		Savannah Alfieri Design Associate		Total
Period of Performance: <b>Sept 2025 - Feb 2026</b> Date of cost estimate: <b>08/18/25</b>		hours	rate	hours	rate	hours	rate	hours	rate	
			\$230		\$150		\$145		\$140	
Task										
<b>1. Project Administration (Sept 2025 - Jan 2026)</b> Includes ongoing check-in meetings with City Project Manager, regular reporting and general coordination to keep the project moving forward.		12	\$2,760	24	\$3,600	12	\$1,740	0	\$0	\$8,100
<b>2. Update Draft Comprehensive Plan and produce maps (Sept - Oct 2025)</b> Includes updating the draft Comprehensive Plan using information gathered to date. Release draft plan for Planning Work Group review.		12	\$2,760	56	\$8,400	56	\$8,120	12	\$1,680	\$20,960
<b>3. Public Review Process, Final Plan Revisions and Adoption (Oct 2025 - Feb 2026)</b> Including working with City staff to release and receive feedback on a Public Review Draft Comprehensive Plan, revising the draft plan based on review and comments, and preparing and submitting the final plan to the City of Dillingham for the approval process. Expenses **		12	\$2,760	44	\$6,600	44	\$6,380	8	\$1,120	\$16,860
<b>TOTAL ***</b>		36	\$8,280	124	\$18,600	112	\$16,240	20	\$2,800	\$46,520

## EXCLUSIONS + TERMS

\*\* Expenses - Include costs for equipment and services required in the normal performance of the contract. Costs for services required to produce informational, advertising or meeting materials are included in this budget; however, costs for printing, mailing or otherwise distributing these materials, or for paid advertising or other public notices are not included in this budget and would be paid for directly by client, as needed. Digital versions of all final materials will be submitted in an organized manner to the client for future editing, use and reproduction. Rights to final versions of all materials are transferred to the client upon conclusion of the project. A::B reserves the right to use any and all project materials for educational and marketing purposes. A::B reserves the rights to any draft or conceptual materials developed in the course of the project, or other materials specified in the terms of the contract.

\*\*\* A::B reserves the right to move budget between tasks, staff and subcontractors so long as costs do not exceed the total budget. This estimate is good for 90 days from the date of the estimate.