

## ACADIA PARISH PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING

October 29<sup>th</sup>, 2024

The Acadia Parish Planning Commission will hold a public meeting, Tuesday, October 29<sup>th</sup>, 2024, at 4:30 p.m., in the Police Jury Meeting Room, 3<sup>rd</sup> Floor, Courthouse Building, Crowley, Louisiana, to discuss with possible action, the following agenda items:

1. Roll Call
2. Agenda Revisions.
3. Regarding the approval process for **Bexley Rose Subdivision**:

- a. **APPC to consider and approve 3' minimum shoulder widths** - *It should be reminded that MEI observed that little to no shoulders were originally provided even though the approved construction plans indicated there would be 5' wide earthen shoulders on both sides of the road. As a result, the Contractor proceeded to construct shoulders after-the-fact. However, MEI observed that the resulting shoulder widths varied between 3' and 4'.*

*Due to the unknown method of after-the-fact construction of the shoulders, due to the unknown type of soil used, and due to the lack of apparent hydroseeding of the shoulders post-construction, MEI does not represent nor warrant that the constructed shoulders are stable and will remain erosion free. However, it is reasonable to believe that erosion and instabilities, if any, should reveal themselves during the course of the one-year warranty period and, if so, such issues will be the responsibility of the developer to address.*

- b. **APPC to consider and approve max steepness of 2(H):1(V) for ditch foreslopes and ditch backslopes along entire length of roadway** - *During the course of observing the constructed shoulders, MEI also noted that the foreslope and backslope of the ditches appeared to be steeper than what they would recommend. However, while the typical section sheets of the approved construction plans do not show proposed ditch foreslope and backslope values, it appeared from the cross-section sheets that the construction plans (approved by others) show ditch foreslopes as steep as 2:1 in the western portion of the development and 3:1 slopes (or flatter) in the middle to eastern portions of the development. It is MEI's opinion that foreslopes were constructed, generally, steeper than what was approved.*

*MEI does not represent nor warrant that the constructed ditch foreslopes and backslopes will be free from stability and erosion issues. However, it is reasonable to believe that that such issues, if any, would reveal themselves during the course of the one-year warranty period and, if so, it will be the responsibility of the developer to correct.*

- c. Discussion on Known Unresolved / Unaddressed Past Comments:
  - i. MEI still awaits a letter from the developer's engineer regarding their punch list and indicating that all such punch list items have been addressed to their satisfaction.
  - ii. MEI still awaits a letter from Mire-Branch Water indicating that they have accepted the water system within Bexley Rose for ownership and maintenance.

*It should be clarified that a letter has been received from Mire-Branch Water indicating that they “will” accept the water system. However, such letter needs to be revised to indicate that they “have” accepted said system. It is further clarified that it is the developer’s engineer’s responsibility to acquire this letter.*

- iii. MEI still awaits APPJ’s legal counsel to provide APPJ’s standard maintenance agreement.
- iv. MEI still awaits APPJ’s legal counsel’s assistance in resolving the one-year warranty issue. *The APPC should note that the original construction contract that was approved by others did not contain the one-year warranty clause as required by the subdivision regulations. The contractor offered a letter of commitment in this regard, but APPJ’s legal counsel opined that such letter was insufficient. MEI suggested that a construction contract change order be executed between the contractor and the developer (and backdated appropriately) to contractually include the standard one-year warranty clause. MEI awaits APPJ’s legal counsel’s opinion on this proposed solution.*
- v. MEI still awaits APPJ’s legal counsel’s review and comment on the proposed Stormwater Facilities Maintenance Agreement. *Such Agreement is needed because public drainage (roadside ditches) passes to and through private drainage (stormwater detention pond) prior to discharging back into public drainage (highway ditch).*
- vi. At the appropriate time, APPJ’s legal counsel will need to review and approve the surety bond.

d. Reminders:

- i. MEI Limited Involvement - *It is very important for both the Acadia Parish Planning Commission (APPC) and the Acadia Parish Police Jury (APPJ) to understand that MEI was not involved in the pre-application, preliminary plat, construction plan review, and construction phases of this subdivision review process. MEI’s review, therefore, is limited only to the information that was provided to them and is not to be applicable to any reviews and approvals made by others during prior phases of this process. Furthermore, due to significant limitations with their involvement in this project and due to the time constraints within which MEI was asked to provide the service, MEI does not warrant nor guarantee that their review is absolutely free from errors and/or omissions.*
- ii. MEI Does Not Approve Roadway Typical Section - *Based on the geotechnical report for this project, it appears that the recommended asphalt pavement thickness was 3” and the recommended base thickness (soil cement) was 12”. However, the approved construction plans required the use of 2” of asphalt over an 8.5” soil cement base. Furthermore, it appears that 2” of asphalt and 12” of soil cement was constructed. The thickness of the constructed asphalt and base exceeds that shown on the approved construction plans and exceeds the minimum requirements of the Subdivision Regulations (2” asphalt on 8” soil cement) but falls short of what was recommended in the geotechnical engineering report.*

*The APPC and APPJ is advised that any recommendation of acceptance of roadway construction by MEI is only attributed to indicating that the typical section for such roadway meets or exceeds the typical section as required by the Subdivision Regulations. Such recommendation does not extend to the structural integrity and*

*durability of the constructed roadway because it also falls short of the recommendations of the geotechnical engineer.*

- e. As per the recommendation of Mader Engineering, Inc. in a letter to Mr. Bryan Borill, dated October 25<sup>th</sup>, 2024 (attached), consider the acceptance of Bexley Rose Subdivision and the approval of the Final Plat for same **contingent upon approval by APPC of the above and contingent upon approval by Mader Engineering, Inc. that all previously documented comments as found in their August 14<sup>th</sup>, 2024 and September 9<sup>th</sup>, 2024 letters to Mr. Borill, and any and all other comments as provided by Mader Engineering, Inc. in other correspondences, have been addressed to Mader Engineering, Inc.'s satisfaction.**

4. Adjourn.

/s/ JASON GOSSEN

Chairperson

**In accordance with the Americans with Disabilities Act, if you need special assistance, please contact Mr. Bryan Borill at (337) 514-3262 describing the assistance that is necessary.**

October 28, 2024