

FAIRBANKS NORTH STAR BOROUGH PLANNING COMMISSION

MINUTES
May 18, 2010

A regular meeting of the Fairbanks North Star Borough Planning Commission was held in the Assembly Chambers, Borough Administration Center, 809 Pioneer Road, Fairbanks, Alaska. The meeting was called to order at 7:00 p.m. by Tom Marsh, Chairman.

MEMBERS PRESENT: Tom Marsh David Pruhs
 Brian Flemming Ian Michael Hebert
 Nello Cooper Michael Wenstrup
 Pamm Hubbard

MEMBERS ABSENT: Tom Temple Jennifer Peterson
 Joy Huntington

OTHERS PRESENT: Bernardo Hernandez, Director of Community Planning
 Jim Lee, Deputy Director of Community Planning
 Todd Boyce, Senior Planner
 Melissa Kellner, Planner II
 Cynthia Klepaski, Asst. Borough Attorney
 Marnie Long-Boehl, Secretary

A. ROLL CALL

B. MESSAGES

1. Chairperson's Comments:
None
2. Communications to the Planning Commission
 - **Mr. Hernandez** announced to the Planning Commission that the Borough Assembly passed the budget for the next coming year. The Planning Department's budget passed satisfactorily. He thanks the Planning Commissioners that testified in favor of the Planning Department.
3. Citizen's Comments – limited to three (3) minutes
 - a. Agenda items not scheduled for public hearing.
None
 - b. Items other than those appearing on the agenda.
None

C. *MINUTES

D. APPROVAL OF AGENDA AND CONSENT AGENDA

Approval of Consent Agenda passes all routine items indicated by asterisk (*) on agenda. Consent Agenda items are not considered separately unless any Planning Commission member or citizen so requests. In the event of such request, the item is returned to the general agenda.

MOTION: To approve agenda and consent agenda, including minutes of previous meeting by **Mr. Pruhs**, seconded by **Ms. Hubbard**.

Objections

None

MOTION APPROVED

E. CONSENT AGENDA ITEMS

***HP 2010-004** Application by the Alaska Department of Transportation and Public Facilities to rehabilitate portions of the following six roads within the City of North Pole: Cross Way, Snowman Lane, Davis Blvd., NPHS Blvd., H & H Road, and Finnel Drive.

F. PUBLIC HEARING

CU2010-008 A request by Janice Trumbull for conditional use approval of a private school in the Rural Estate-2 (RE-2) zone on Tract A, Mountain View Subdivision, Sixth Addition. **(located west of Skyline Road and north of Farmers Loop Road)**

Melissa Kellner presented the staff report. Based upon staff analysis, the Department of Community Planning recommended approval of the proposed conditional use.

Mr. Marsh asked if there were any questions for Staff.

Mr. Cooper wanted to know how a person would address a water situation – is there a way to measure the water.

Ms. Kellner said that the well has been in place since 1974 and the applicant or land owner would be able to further address this question if they have had any problems in the past.

Mr. Hernandez stated that the ground water is regulated by the Department of Natural Resources (DNR). You have to get permits to get a well and it is on a first come, first served basis.

Mr. Cooper still was not clear on the amount of water in this area – can this be measured?

Mr. Hernandez responded with it is first come first serve with the water system but does not know how the water table would be measured.

Mr. Pruhs asked if there were plans for student showers or just normal lavatory uses.

Ms. Kellner replied just normal lavatory uses but you can clarify this with the applicant.

Mr. Pruhs said that looking at the map – water flow would go down-hill, gravity based system– he does not see where there would be an issue of water.

Ms. Kellner said that Staff thought the water was adequate for the property.

Mr. Marsh asked if there were any other questions for Staff.

PUBLIC HEARING OPENED

Janice Trumbull, the applicant, spoke about the water system and if they rented the guest house to a family there would be laundry, dishes, and showers. She does not see where normal lavatory use with 10 students would equal any more use than if rented out to a family. Students bring their own lunches – no hot lunch service provided. There are no buses for the students – the parents would drop off and pick up their children. If there were any type of special events for the parents / students they would do them off premise - maybe at her church. No after school activities will happen after the close of the school day. No plans for extra lighting – they will recess during the lightest part of the day. There are no bells or intercom systems installed at this school.

Mr. Wenstrup asked for clarification if she had more than 10 students interested in her school – would you look for another location.

Ms. Trumbull answered that's correct but that would not happen this school year – they would have to wait to enroll the following year.

Mr. Wenstrup asked if this was just a short term solution for a school – is your goal to get more than ten students.

Ms. Trumbull announced that it could go either way – 10 is a great number.

Mr. Cooper asked if there were any plans to have water delivered.

Ms. Trumbull replied that there are no plans of water delivery.

Mr. Cooper asked if there was a fence on the property for recess and how tall is the fence?

Ms. Trumbull answered yes and the fence is probably 6 foot high.

Mr. Cooper asked if the parking lot will be marked.

Ms. Trumbull replied no because they would only be dropping off or picking up the students. They will not require a permanent parking area.

Mr. Marsh asked if the applicant will be placing a sign out on the road.

Ms. Trumbull replied no.

Ms. Hubbard wanted clarification on the applicant's website – it currently reads that your ambition is to have 30 students. If you receive 30 students – will you relocate?

Ms. Trumbull said that she would relocate if there were more than ten students.

Mr. Cooper addressed the traffic – will there be a possibility that a parent would have to park in a neighbor's driveway and walk over to pick up their child.

Ms. Trumbull said no because you would have to cross Skyline Drive.

Don Ranken, resides at 470 McKinley View Drive, is one of the original homesteaders in this area. His concern is the vehicle traffic problem and how the driveway for the school is angled. It should be at a 90 degree angle instead of a 30 degree angle so you have site distance in both directions. There is a blind spot in the road headed for Farmers Loop. He is not in favor of this conditional use.

Mr. Marsh asked if there were any questions.

Joan Robson, resides at 483 McKinley View Drive, spoke of why they chose this area to live in because of the lack of businesses allowed in this area. As a retired school teacher, she believes this is not a proper environment for a school. She addressed that the Stills use to run a construction site from this same location. She is not in favor of this conditional use.

Mr. Marsh asked if there were any questions.

Mr. Cooper asked if a school bus was in this area.

Ms. Robson replied yes, it goes up Skyline.

Mr. Cooper asked if it was likely that the students that were enrolled in this school could be your neighbors.

Ms. Robson answered that she believes, from the website, that the students come from a far – they are a church oriented group.

Mr. Hebert asked if the Planning Commission were to approve the conditional use, would there be an additional condition that we could address.

Ms. Robson said that it looks as though you covered some limitations – she just does not want to have 30 students in the neighborhood.

Janet Hoople, resides at 1045 Fairweather, thought that Mr. Cooper addressed appropriate questions like how much gallon per minute that the well is receiving – if two houses are sharing the well and what is the quality of the water? She addressed poor quality in her water in the same area and thought that the water would be unsafe for anyone to drink. They haul their drinking water. She is wondering if the water has been tested regularly and also there is a drainage problem. She addressed the time that school began and ended – this would be a heavy traffic time. She is not in favor of this conditional use.

Mr. Wenstrup wanted Ms. Hoople to identify what property was her property on the overhead. He asked Ms. Hoople if her issue was sharing the well or the children's health.

Ms. Hoople explained the health of the children and to be cautious of the quality of the water.

Mr. Wenstrup asked if the water was being tested – would you have a problem with the water.

Ms. Hoople said that they should not drink it. She still is not in favor of a school in the area.

Mr. Wenstrup asked about the traffic problem – do you really think that an additional 10 cars compared to the vehicles already in the area – is it really going to be a problem.

Ms. Hoople said that there is a traffic problem – some people are more careful than others.

Mr. Wenstrup noted that she had a large piece of property and asked if she had plans of subdividing.

Ms. Hoople replied no.

Mr. Wenstrup asked if she planned on building in that area.

Ms. Hoople explained that they had a house on their property to the north.

Mr. Hebert asked where she accessed her house.

Ms. Hoople said that she was on Fairweather.

Mr. Hebert asked if the property of the guest house had bad drainage.

Ms. Hoople said yes but would need to ask Mr. Still.

Mr. Marsh said that we can address that question with Mr. Still.

Art Robson, resides at 483 McKinley View Dr., is not in favor of this conditional use.

Arvil Still, resides at 841 Skyline Drive, is the property owner where the school is proposed to reside. He stated that the well is 165 feet, the static water level is at 60 feet, and when the well was drilled, it was pumped at over 50 gallons a minute. The pump is rated at 10 –12 gallons a minute. In thirty years they have never had a water problem. They have a softener on the water. It has been tested – no arsenic but some iron in the water. The driveway has a slight angle but he can see all the way to the corner. He sees no concern about a blind spot. He does not believe that a school will create that much traffic in the area. They have had renters in the past. His grand daughter attends this school and it is a safe environment for students. This is not meant to be a large public school.

Mr. Wenstrup asked how many people have been in the guest house in the past.

Mr. Still said four – a couple and two children.

Mr. Wenstrup asked when the last time it was rented.

Mr. Still said a year or year and a half ago.

Mr. Pruhs stated that this looks like that it's not meant to be an economic value but a place for your grand daughter to attend. You don't mind having ten students on your property.

Mr. Still said that it does not bother him – there is a fence around the guest house.

Mr. Marsh wanted Staff to show the driveway of the property on the overhead.

Mr. Marsh asked if there were any other questions.

PUBLIC HEARING CLOSED

MOTION Move to approve **CU2010-008** with four (4) Recommendations and four (4) Findings of Fact by **Mr. Hebert**, seconded by **Mr. Wenstrup**.

Discussion

Mr. Hebert addressed that some people want their neighborhood to stay like it is but he does not see a traffic problem or a problem with the water. He is in favor of this conditional use.

Mr. Wenstrup asked Staff if they knew if a speed limit sign would be installed for slowing down traffic because of a school in the neighborhood.

Mr. Hernandez replied that he did not know of any signs.

Mr. Boyce said that he was not aware of any signs to lower the speed limit. It would be unlikely for a school this size.

Mr. Wenstrup asked if they were to grant this conditional use and the school would move – does this conditional use end or stay with the property or will this become a recommendation.

Mr. Hernandez said that you would have to add a condition.

Motion: **Amend** the Recommendations as follows by **Mr. Wenstrup**, seconded by **Mr. Hebert**:

5. If the property is not used as a school house for two years, this conditional use approval will become null and void.

Mr. Pruhs asked if this conditional use is for Ms. Trumbull only – will this conditional use become void if she vacates the property.

Mr. Hernandez said that it would stay with the property.

Mr. Pruhs asked legal if he could make an amendment so it would not stay with the property.

Ms. Klepaski stated that conditions usually run with the property and not with the person.

Mr. Hernandez stated that you need to look at this as a use for the property. You have to make a determination if this location is satisfactory for a school of ten children.

Mr. Marsh asked if there were any more discussions on the amendment.

ROLL CALL

Seven (7) in Favor: **Mr. Cooper, Mr. Hebert, Mr. Pruhs, Ms. Hubbard, Mr. Flemming, Mr. Wenstrup, Mr. Marsh.**

Zero (0) Opposed:

MOTION TO AMEND, PASSED.

Mr. Cooper is in support of the conditional use.

Mr. Pruhs is in support of the conditional use. He likes the idea that the landlord is on site if any problems arise.

Mr. Marsh is in support of the conditional use. He believes that there will be minimal impact on the neighborhood.

Mr. Wenstrup thinks that the school is a great idea. He understands how the neighbors feel that are opposing the school but with a condition of up to ten students, he thinks there should not be a big concern. He is in favor of this conditional use.

ROLL CALL

Seven (7) in Favor: **Mr. Cooper, Mr. Hebert, Mr. Pruhs, Ms. Hubbard, Mr. Flemming, Mr. Wenstrup, Mr. Marsh.**

Zero (0) Opposed:

MOTION TO APPROVE, PASSED.

PUBLIC HEARING

CU2010-009 A request by the David H. Ainley Revocable Trust for conditional use approval of a public utility/service use for wells and a pump house on a portion of Tax Lot 1515 in Section 15, Township 2 South, Range 2 East. **(located east of the Old Richardson Highway and west of Lake Drive)**

Jim Lee presented the staff report. Based upon staff analysis, the Department of Community Planning recommended approval of the proposed conditional use.

Mr. Wenstrup wanted to see a map on the overhead.

Mr. Lee pointed out the property on the overhead.

Mr. Wenstrup asked if the need for this well is in response to the water situation that Flint Hills had.

Mr. Lee responded yes.

Mr. Hebert asked if Flint Hills is the applicant and Owner of the well and they will be supplying the City of North Pole with water.

Mr. Lee said that the Owner will remain Flint Hills but they will supply the City of North Pole with water.

Mr. Hebert asked if Staff knew what kind of extraction they are going to pull from the well.

Mr. Lee responded no.

Mr. Hebert wanted clarification on Condition #1 – what does any material changes mean.

Mr. Lee said that there were some discussions with consultants and Staff.

Mr. Hernandez stated that if they are going to put new lot lines in and make lots smaller – those are material changes. They would have to come back for another conditional use for new lot lines.

Mr. Hebert asked if they were 100 feet difference from where they put their well....

Mr. Hernandez said that they would give them some latitude from where they are going to put the well to get water.

Mr. Lee said that was consistent with the discussions he had with Flint Hills.

Mr. Hernandez wants to make sure the landscaping is done because this will become a residential area.

Mr. Pruhs wanted to know if Ann Farris with ADEC, the person that is handling the spill, had reviewed any aspect of this conditional use.

Mr. Lee said no.

Mr. Pruhs said that we are looking at within 100 yards of the contamination site – we are looking at two wells with known contamination and ADEC has not had any review of this well site.

Mr. Lee said that this is a land use permit to allow the applicant to have this use to build a well and pump house because it is in a zoning district. It is a different issue about quality of water. It is his understanding that Flint Hills is acquiring all the right permits and the appropriate analysis of the water.

Mr. Hernandez stated that you can be sure that DEC is going to be evaluating this well because it will be providing public water.

Ms. Klepaski advised that nothing that the Planning Commission votes on tonight guarantees anything other than they have this conditional use.

Ms. Hubbard asked if the lots around the property have structures on them.

Mr. Lee responded that in the 139 acre parcel – there are no lots legally created. They have preliminary plat approval and are making a number of modifications. The first phase of the subdivision is to create Tract A and access to the tract.

Ms. Hubbard asked if the wells and pump house will be built before the lots are created and sold.

Mr. Lee responded yes.

Mr. Flemming asked what route the water is going to be pumped from the pump house.

Mr. Lee replied that it will be pumped out to the Old Richardson and then on to the City of North Pole's water plant.

Mr. Flemming asked if there was going to be noise from the pump house.

Mr. Lee replied that the noise is equivalent to one vehicle.

Mr. Flemming asked about access to and from the pump house.

Mr. Lee said the access would be Cheechako Way and connecting to Blanket Boulevard.

Mr. Flemming wanted clarification if Flint Hills disclosed how far the contamination had moved from the source.

Mr. Marsh stated that this is for land use only – DEC would be involved with the contamination problems.

Mr. Marsh asked if there were further questions for Staff.

PUBLIC HEARING OPENED

John Poirrier, resides at 1001 Black Bear, is speaking as a property owner. He became aware of this conditional use when surveyors from PDC asked permission to enter his backyard to survey the access route of the right-of-way to make the connection through the property line and through the Grange property. The trend of the ground water is from the Refinery to the north along the Tanana River. The areas to the east are outside of the contaminated plume. He is in favor of this conditional use and expressed that Flint Hills is doing the Community of North Pole a favor by building these wells and pump house to solve any water contamination issues. Flint Hills is being proactive – they are motivated to do the right thing for the Community.

Mr. Pruhs asked as a residential land owner – are you in favor of this.

Mr. Poirrier said yes.

Mr. Cooper asked what favor Flint Hills is doing for the Community.

Mr. Poirrier said that Flint Hills is taking the lead and being proactive to solve water issues in the Community. They have been taking responsibility and have been doing water testing since this happened to North Pole. They have accepted responsibility.

Mr. Wenstrup asked if a fence should be installed around the pump house.

Mr. Poirrier responded that at this time the area is undeveloped. They may need a fence in the future.

Mr. Wenstrup said he was looking at the plans and how the lots would be subdivided.

Mr. Poirrier said that he had not seen any plans.

Mr. Wenstrup asked **Mr. Poirrier** if he would want a fence built.

Mr. Poirrier responded that he lives far enough away that his opinion did not matter. This would be a decision of the property owners that live in that area.

Mr. Pruhs asked if Mr. Poirrier had seen any schematics of the well production and if this is a large enough well system for this area

Mr. Poirrier had not seen any plans.

Mr. Marsh asked about his concerns as a member of the Grange.

Mr. Poirrier replied it is the same concern.

Mr. Marsh asked if there were any other questions.

Steve Lowry, resides at 326 Driveway Street, is employed by RCH Surveys. They are involved to get the application started for the conditional use.

Mr. Pruhs asked if he knew the schematics of the well flow usage.

Mr. Lowry said that according to the engineers, they have a 1200 gallon per minute well.

Mr. Pruhs communicated that you're not looking for coming back with a different site.

Mr. Lowry said that he did not think so – he is a PLS and not a PE but he thinks this will work for quite awhile.

Mr. Hebert stated that the Planning Commission is being asked to look at this as a conditional use for the land. He is surprised that there is no information on the hydrology. Opening up a well like this, does change the dynamics of the hydrology in the area.

Mr. Lowry is a PLS and is not qualified to answer this question.

Mr. Pruhs is surprised that there is not a City of North Pole engineer attending this meeting.

Mr. Lowry said that he does not think that there is an engineer from the City of North Pole present at this meeting. We do have an engineer from PDC present.

Mr. Cooper wanted clarification on what favors that Flint Hills is doing for the City of North Pole.

Mr. Lowry stated that there was a previous owner of Flint Hills that started this contamination of the water but the current owners are the ones that are taking the initiative to solve the problems of contamination.

Keith Hanneman is PDC's engineer working with Flint Hills on the project. The favor that Flint Hills is doing is providing the wells and well house. They have coordinated the well location with DEC and are doing modeling of the ground water.

Mr. Hernandez asked if he was an engineer.

Mr. Hanneman stated that he is a Civil Engineer.

Mr. Hernandez asked what the direction of the water flow in the area is.

Mr. Hanneman replied to the northwest.

Mr. Hernandez asked if below ground, there is a lot of water.

Mr. Hanneman said yes and they are looking at putting a several hundred foot well in to minimize the draw & effects on the water table.

Mr. Cooper asked if Flint Hills is installing the wells as a Community action or their responsibility as mitigation.

Mr. Hanneman said that they are doing this because the existing wells are right on the fringe of contamination with very low wells. There is no regulatory reason for Flint Hills to install these wells at this time.

Mr. Wenstrup asked about his experience on the City of North Pole's water system. Do you think this is a good location for the pump house?

Mr. Hanneman replied yes.

Mr. Hebert asked if the existing well will be abandoned once the new wells are in place.

Mr. Hanneman said yes.

PUBLIC HEARING CLOSED

MOTION Move to approve **CU2010-009** with five (5) Recommendations and four (4) Findings of Fact by **Mr. Hebert**, seconded by **Mr. Pruhs**.

Discussion

Mr. Hebert would have liked to see more data but is in favor of this conditional use.

Mr. Pruhs would have liked to see some representation from the City of North Pole. He is in favor of this condition use.

Mr. Wenstrup asked Staff if the regular advertising and Dear Property Owner letters were sent.

Mr. Lee said all requirements were met.

Mr. Hernandez said that if there was a problem with notification – we would not be having this meeting.

Mr. Wenstrup is in favor of this conditional use.

Mr. Marsh believes this is in the best interest of the Community. He is in favor of this conditional use.

ROLL CALL

Seven (7) in Favor: **Mr. Cooper, Mr. Hebert, Mr. Pruhs, Ms. Hubbard, Mr. Flemming, Mr. Wenstrup, Mr. Marsh.**

Zero (0) Opposed:

MOTION TO APPROVE, PASSED.

PUBLIC HEARING

RZ2010-007 A request by the College Estates Homeowners Association to rezone Lots 1-9, Block 1 and Lots 1-12, Block 2, College Estates subdivision from General Commercial to Single Family-5 or other appropriate zone. **(located on either side of RJ Loop and north of College Road)**

Ms. Klepaski received one of the Dear Property Owner letters and she does own property in the area and will recuse her from this part of the meeting.

Mellissa Kellner presented the staff report. Based upon staff analysis, the Department of Community Planning recommended approval of the proposed ordinance.

Mr. Wenstrup asked Staff if they considered any other zones i.e. Multiple-Family or other appropriate zone.

Ms. Kellner explained that she spoke with the applicants about Two-Family or Multiple-Family and they were not interested in those zones.

Mr. Wenstrup wanted to see the zoning of the neighborhood on the overhead.

Mr. Pruhs asked **Mr. Hernandez** how the original General Commercial zoning came about.

Mr. Hernandez said that someone wanted to put a viewing farm of animals in the area and parcels were subdivided and someone built residential and it was permitted by the zoning code.

Mr. Pruhs indicated that the streets were 40 foot wide and unpaved.

Mr. Cooper remembers a bison farm.

Mr. Hebert understands why Lot 12, Block 2 was a zoning permit denial and will still not be conforming but needs clarification on Lot 1, Block 2 – it was denied under General Commercial for a zoning permit – they built anyway – they are 2.8 feet from the side lot line. In the staff report it said that there was no side yard requirement in General Commercial so this would be grandfathered but if it was in General Commercial it wouldn't be considered a side yard.

Mr. Hernandez said that's correct but once it goes to Single Family-5 there will be a 5 foot setback requirement but then this property becomes grandfathered.

Mr. Hebert commented that the zoning permit was denied once.

Ms. Kellner explained that a zoning permit was denied based on the site plan submitted with the zoning permit but they did not build in the way it was described in the site plan.

Mr. Hernandez said it was a front yard violation not the side yard.

Mr. Marsh wanted clarification on the grandfather process – some of the properties would not conform – they could apply for grandfather rights.

Mr. Hernandez said as soon as the rezone passes they can.

Ms. Kellner announced that they have already submitted those requests.

Mr. Wenstrup asked about the three (3) properties that did not respond – they don't need grandfather rights.

Ms. Kellner replied that two of the lots are undeveloped – the one that is developed, Lot 7, Block 1, is unclear – no survey or zoning permit on file.

Mr. Wenstrup said that those people that have not responded - they might not know that they have to apply for grandfather rights.

Ms. Kellner said that's correct.

Mr. Hernandez clarified that if we have a site plan done by a surveyor – it shows if they are consistent with the zoning. Then we have zoning permits where people tell us where they are going to build but that's not accurate until we have a site plan.

Mr. Hebert asked why Staff is approving the lots without signature.

Ms. Kellner said that if they get 51% signatures on a petition, they can include the entire subdivision in the rezone request. Excluding these lots would create spot zones.

Mr. Hernandez added that if you own 25% of the land in the rezone, you have to have the signature but if you own less than 25% your signature is not necessary.

Mr. Hebert asked if that is in Title 18.

Mr. Hernandez said yes.

PUBLIC HEARING OPENED

Robin Dodson, resides at 1965 RJ Loop, is the President of College Estates Homeowners Association. After attending the Planning Commission meeting regarding Great Northwest, we found out that we were zoned General Commercial. Planning Commissioners and Staff let us know the procedure to change our zoning to Single Family-5. We have complied with the procedures for rezoning and urge your adoption.

Mr. Pruhs addressed how impressive it is for the time frame of getting this rezone together.

Sharon Boko, resides at 1860 RJ Loop, thanked the Planning Commission and Staff for the help in processing this rezone.

Mr. Marsh asked if there were any questions.

PUBLIC HEARING CLOSED

MOTION Move to approve **RZ 2010-007** with four (4) Findings of Fact by **Mr. Hebert**, seconded by **Mr. Cooper**.

Discussion

Mr. Hebert is in favor of this rezone.

Mr. Pruhs concurs with Mr. Hebert.

Mr. Wenstrup is in favor of this rezone since it includes the entire neighborhood.

Ms. Hubbard congratulated the applicant for helping out the neighbors and she is in favor of this rezone.

Mr. Marsh concurs with this rezone.

ROLL CALL

Seven (7) in Favor: **Mr. Cooper, Mr. Hebert, Mr. Pruhs, Ms. Hubbard, Mr. Flemming, Mr. Wenstrup, Mr. Marsh.**

Zero (0) Opposed:

MOTION TO APPROVE, PASSED.

G. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

H. NEW BUSINESS

I. COMMISSIONER'S COMMENTS

1. FMATS

- **Mr. Wenstrup** announced that there was extra grant money and if it was not used by July 1st it will go back to the Federal Government. He spoke of the Cushman / Barnett traffic use with the new bridge – at this time it was decided to go one-way but the policy committee meets tomorrow and it will be further discussed.
- **Mr. Cooper** gave his ideas on traffic flow.
- **Mr. Hebert** said it was a concern to him to have the roads two-way because of left hand turns - it could create a lot of congestion.
- **Mr. Marsh** advised that one-way traffic is great for getting traffic though but it's not great for keeping traffic slower.
- **Ms. Hubbard** is unclear why the discussion did not happen earlier when the bridge was being planned.
- **Mr. Wenstrup** said the plan was to have two-ways – both bridges – that was the goal. They were going to build a round-a-bout. The City decides the roads and they wanted two-way because of Vision Fairbanks. The Policy Committee decided that the bridges should be one-way. There is a possibility that the bridges still could go two-way – it is not out of the question as of yet.
- **Mr. Hernandez** said the bridge construction project had been on the board for 30 years. It was going to be one-way traffic south on Barnette and one-way traffic north on Cushman and having the bridges going one-way. Vision Fairbanks Plan wanted the roads to work with the land use, so they wanted two-way traffic.

2. Title 17 Rewrite Project

- **Mr. Hernandez** stated that Title 17 should be introduced at the Borough Assembly in August and referred to the Platting Board and Planning Commission at that time for their review.

3. Comprehensive Plan Advisory Board (CPAB)

- **Mr. Hernandez** stated that CPAB have not had a meeting – the Land Use Suitability Maps are still being reviewed.

4. Other Commission Comments

- **Mr. Hernandez** announced that there will be no meeting on June 1st. Our next meeting date is June 15th.

I. ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business the meeting was adjourned at 9:30 p.m.