

MATANUSKA-SUSITNA BOROUGH

350 E Dahlia Ave., Palmer, Alaska 99645

CHAIRPERSON

Joshua Cross

MSB STAFF

Kim Sollien



BOARD MEMBERS

Jennifer Busch

Cindy Bettine

Emily Dodge

Dan Elliott

Antonio Weese

Transportation Advisory Board

Minutes

REGULAR MEETING

9A.M.

January 24th, 2020

I. CALL TO ORDER; ROLL CALL

Meeting called to order by Chair Josh Cross at 9:10am. Present Jennifer Busch, Cindy Bettine, Dan Elliott, Scott Adams, Antonio Weese.

Guests: Eileen Probasco, Jamie Taylor, Alex Strawn, and Mike Shields

II. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Motion by Cindy Bettine, as amended moving the SCM discussion to the first staff report; seconded by Dan Elliott. *Motion passed unopposed*

III. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

a. December 19th, 2019

IV. AUDIENCE INTRODUCTION/PARTICIPATION

Mike Shields, from the RSA board

V. STAFF/AGENCY REPORTS & PRESENTATIONS

a. Eileen Probasco (MSB) Subdivision Construction Manual Update

Eileen Probasco and Jamie Taylor presented a draft resolution to support the Draft SCM.

Eileen also presented a draft schedule of the SCM review, approval and adoption. TAB members discussed the SCM development process. Scott Adams and Cindy Bettine provided comments for discussion (summarized below).

Eileen and Jamie responded to questions.

Motion-Cindy Bettine motioned to further discuss the SCM, and to summarize the boards list of concerns, questions, and edits, and to draft a new resolution of support for the SCM with the inclusion of the TAB amendments; Jen Busch seconded

Motion passed unopposed

Motion- Cindy Bettine motioned, to move the driveway permit discussion the next meeting; Dan Elliott seconded

Motion passed unopposed

Motion- Dan Elliott motioned to hold a special meeting March 21st, amended to March 24th, to discuss the SCM; seconded by Antonio Weese

Motion as amended passed unopposed

SCM comments by TAB Members

Scott Adams Comments

1. A04.1(b) - recommend making it clear who is responsible for calculating the ADT. Section 15 discusses how to calculate the ADT. Suggest revising the first sentence in A15 to read, "The applicant shall use the following formula to determine..." and moving the entire A15 section ahead of A04.
2. A05 - first sentence abruptly ends.
3. Table A-1 footnote 2 - suggest adding the word "minimum" at the beginning of the sentence before ROW.
4. Table A-1 - Suggest having two rows for shoulder width. One for paved shoulders, one for gravel shoulders. Include 2 foot gravel shoulders for Residential classification. For the Sub-collector and Collector classification, suggest 2 foot paved followed by 2 foot gravel shoulders.
5. A13 - Recommend adding the MUTCD as governing reference that shall be followed.
6. C02.5(c) - The DOT&PF successfully builds roads where they limit the horizontal layers of uncompacted material to 8" Why are we increasing that to 24"? We are setting up the taxpayers to pay the bill for repairing these roads that will settle and require increased maintenance after they are constructed and before the design life is reached. Recommend following the DOT&PF requirement of 8" horizontal layers.
7. C02.5(e) - the 90% and 95% compaction requirements are too low and are not what is typically done in an engineered road design. Suggest changing these to 95% and 98%, respectively, of the Modified Proctor.

8. C02.5(f) - 2 inches of asphalt over 2 inches of base course seems thin for a collector. This section is more for a driveway. I would expect to see something in the range of 3.5 - 4 inches of HMA over 4 inches of base course. Suggest revisiting this so that the taxpayers are not paying to rehab roads prior to the end of their design life.

9. Figure C-1 - same as #8 above. The typical structural section for the roadway will be driven by existing geotechnical conditions which will vary at each road location. Suggest requiring a geotechnical investigation with recommendation for each site.

Cindy Bettini's Comments

1. The goal of the SCM is to promote a safer transportation system but it would appear they have left out accommodations for non-motorized
2. Can we ask for roads to be designed offset from the center line so we would have room to offer at least one 4ft shoulder on one side
3. The SCM seems to have a residential focus. What about commercial development, don't we also need standards for them that are different than residential?
4. Design deviation paragraph needs to be firmer.
5. Is there a way to offer a benefit an incentive to a developer who is willing to put in a pedestrian pathway?

FYI) Title 43.20.281 of the MSB code allows a developer to have smaller lot size if they are dedicating public opens space. Maybe language for non-motorized pathways can be included in that clause.

b. Kim Sollien (MSB): Assembly Meeting update Jan 7th, 2020

- i. MOU between MSB and DOT - This MOU was signed by the Assembly at the February 4th meeting
- ii. Ordinance for the MPO and Earmark Funding - These MOA's and the funding appropriations were adopted by the Assembly at the February 4th meeting. Staff will ask the MSB Law Department to draft a memo about forming an MPO and we will invite them to give a presentation at the April meeting.

Capital Improvements Discussion (CIP)

Motion- by Cindy Bettine, to discuss the CIP at the next meeting on Feb 24th; seconded by Antonio Weese

Motion passed unopposed

Staff will provide the CIP nominations and the resolution from 2018 submitted by TAB for review at the meeting on the 24th.

VI. New Board Member Discussion
Laquita Chmielowski and Murph O'Brian were suggested as potential board members to fill the vacant board seat.

VII. Calendar of 2020 Meetings
February 24th Special Meeting
April 24th, 2020
August 28th, 2020
October 30th, 2020

VIII. ADJOURNMENT @ 12pm



Joshua Cross, Chair

02/24/20

Date

ATTEST:



Kim Sollien, Planning Services Manager

02/24/2020

Date