

MINUTES
INFRASTRUCTURE REVIEW ADVISORY BOARD
OAK VIEW LIBRARY
September 4, 2013 8:30 a.m.

Members and Alternates Present

Mark Cotter, Preston Mettler, Myron Adam, Tim Galbraith, Mark Vellinga, Jeff Schmidt, Phil Gundvaldson, Scott Hofer, Mark Anderson

Members and Alternates Absent

Chad Huwe, Mike Cooper, Steve VanBuskirk, Bill Kemmis,

Others Present

Chad Stensland, Chad Hanisch, Shannon Ausen, Rick Laughlin, Mark Anderson, Brad Ludens, Clayton Jamison, Scott Hofer, Kurt Peppel, Cynthia Monnin, Jon Brown, Heath Hoftiezer, Jeff DesLauriers, Jason Kjenstad, Todd Anawski, Paul Korn, Stacy DuChene, Brooke White, Kim Buel, Mike Kuno, Chuck Point

Approval of Minutes of Last Meeting

A motion was made by Schmitt to approve the August 7 meeting minutes; the motion was seconded by Galbraith. Roll call yeses – Cotter, Mettler, Adam, Galbraith Vellinga, Schmitt, Gundvaldson – 7. Noes, none

Business

a. Proposed Revisions to General Conditions for Public Improvements

Brad Ludens, Principal Engineer with the City of Sioux Falls, distributed a handout, and did not have a presentation. It has been three and half years since the last update to the General Conditions. As with anything we would have liked things worded differently, as well as errors and omissions corrected, so this summer we decided to go through the process and make any necessary updates. Looking through there are three different updates we would like to make, Corrections, Updates and Revisions, and various additions.

Corrections fell under the category of typos, grammar, spelling, and formatting. For the most part it shouldn't be a big deal. Several miscellaneous updates, such as the Department of Revenue has moved, reference to "qualifying utilities" laws have changed, so we need to remove references to those, internet has become more and more a part of our everyday business, so we added website information to certain sections. A couple of sections the instructions to bidders were worded slightly different in sections, and tried to get those matched up a little closer, and update city ordinance references. There were also a lot of state and federal law changes over the last couple of years. One thing we will want to talk to the contractors about before final approval is the Mobilization updates. Some additions we would like to see are language to protect both contractors and the city as we work through some of our projects.

5.1 – We would like to add some appeal language to this section, which outlines the authority of the City Engineer.

8.8A – Extension of time, allowances for delay. Talks about the contractor taking into account various things, specifically normal weather conditions and material lead times so it doesn't become an issue like it has in times in the past.

8.8 E1 – Extension of time for adverse weather days whether that is excusable for a delay in the project. Help to find a normal time of adverse weather time. DOT has a time table that they use for adverse weather and we would like to incorporate some of that language into that section. We would also like to include some language that would include some Contractors, General Contractors not

First step of the process is here today just going over real brief generalities of the proposed changes to IRAB. Next step is small meeting set up with the Sioux Falls Contractors Association. Toby contacted consultants and some contractors to go over in detail each one of the proposed revisions so we can get input. After that we will make any revisions necessary after getting input from the contractors in this group. We will come back to the October 2 IRAB Meeting and ask for approval at that point, if that moves forward we will go to the Land Use Committee of the City Council on October 15, and then the full City Council on November 12. After December 2 everything would be effective. If there is anyone in this room that would like to be a part of the process and has not been contacted in this room, Brad would be happy to sit down and discuss it with you.

Question: In regards to the weather are we doing something different than the DOT?

Response: No, the Adverse Weather table is not in the green book, taken table values from the Sioux Falls area and incorporated them into the General Conditions. For any given month it outlines expected adverse weather for an average grading project which is slightly different than structural or paving project.

Question: I am not aware that there is any language that a subcontractor. Talk about the one that excludes the Contractor's Subcontractor.

Response: That is in section 8.8B2 as it reads right now it may allow the General Contractor to use the excuse of the Subcontractor for the work not getting done on time. There haven't been any problems with it so far, but some City staff would like to tighten up the language a little bit. Don't want the General Contractor to just throw up his hands and say my subcontractor wasn't able to get work done, so I need more time. The General Contractor should have control of his Subcontractors and use his leverage to get the job done quicker or use other means to get the work done.

b. Traffic Studies

Shannon Ausen, Civil Engineer, P.E. presented the requirements for a Traffic Impact Study (TIS), as described in Chapter 5 of the Engineering Design Standards. This topic was for informational purposes only and required no action by the Board.

A TIS analyzes traffic of a proposed development for current conditions and for the 20 year planning horizon. The City maintains a traffic model based off of the City's growth identified in the Sioux Falls Comprehensive Plan. When development plans are submitted to the City for review, the majority are accounted for in the model. However, in some circumstances a development may alter what was originally planned. These alterations are addressed in the TIS. Generally, a TIS may be required when:

- a. A proposed non-residential development will exceed 100 vehicles in trip generation in the peak hour or
- b. A proposed multi-family residential development includes 150 or more dwelling units or
- c. Additional access off an arterial street to an existing or new use is being requested or
- d. A future land use amendment is required.

City staff will notify the development during the review process if a TIS is required. If required, the study must be accepted by the City before the preliminary subdivision plan is approved by the Planning Commission. The typical cost of a TIS depends on the complexity of the proposed development and can range anywhere from \$5,000 to \$25,000. After the study is accepted by the City, it is considered a public document for review upon request.

If a preliminary subdivision plan is not required for the development to proceed, the TIS must be approved prior to the issuance of a building permit. If a TIS is more than two years old or land use intensity and planned traffic generation have increased, the TIS must be updated

before the building permit is approved. On average, the City has requested two TIS a year for past five years.

If an area has already been studied and a minor change is being proposed from the original study, the City may request a Traffic Technical Memorandum. The City averages less than one technical memorandum a year. This document is shorter than a TIS, however, still identifies impacts to an arterial street.

There was continued discussion on when a TIS is required. Generally speaking, the majority of our residential subdivision plans do not need a TIS. For example, the TIS recommends improvements needed on opening day of a commercial business and the number of lanes needed to handle the business. TIS also recommends the improvements needed for the 20 year planning horizon as a result of the proposed business. Nationally, TIS help identify impacts on the transportation system of various developments, are a common practice among traffic professionals, and are a sound way to properly plan.

c. Street Right of Way

Shannon Ausen presented on Chapter 8 Engineering Design Standards for collector streets. This topic was for informational purposes only and required no action by the Board. No changes were being requested.

Before 2010, right of way (ROW) for the quarter-mile and three-quarters-mile minor collector streets was required to be 66 feet. Half-mile major collector streets were required to have an 80-foot ROW. Through public feedback and staff discussion it was determined that the major collector ROW width of 80 feet was promoting higher speeds in residential neighborhoods. In 2010, the City changed the Engineering Design Standards to require 66 feet of ROW for all collector streets that mainly serve single family residential developments. However, 80 feet of ROW is required where the collector street intersects an arterial street to accommodate any future traffic signals. For zoning more intensive than single family residential, the ROW is still required to be 80 feet. The street width for the 80 feet of ROW should be 41 feet back to back to allow for added turn lanes and on street parking. If there are special circumstances, a variance request can be sent to the City Engineer requesting to reduce the 80 feet ROW requirement.

Additional Topic

Jeff DesLauriers mentioned that next meeting they will bring to the board for action in addition to Brad's, action on Engineering Design Standards for Sanitary, Water, and Sewer and not sure if there was one for Streets.

Chuck Point would like to know if those changes could be sent out before the meeting and Jeff thought it might be possible.

Adjournment

The next IRAB Meeting is set for October 2, 2013, 8:30 a.m., at the Oak View Library. A motion was made by Jeff Schmitt for adjournment at 9:37 a.m.



Maureen Buller
Secretary



Jeff Schmitt
Chief Planning and Zoning Official