



POLICY COMMITTEE

Council Chambers, City Hall, 800 Cushman Street, Fairbanks, AK

Meeting Minutes – October 21, 2015

1. Call to Order

Mayor Bryce Ward, Chair, called the meeting to order at 12:00 p.m.

2. Introduction of Members and Attendees

Attendee

*Bryce Ward, Chair
 *Luke Hopkins, Vice Chair
 *John Eberhart
 *David Miller
 *Guy Sattley
 *Perry Walley
 *Denise Koch
 **+Alicia Giamichael for Donna Gardino
 **Deborah Todd
 +Mark Peterburs for Brian Lindamood
 +Bob Pristash
 +Lee Borden
 Shelley Potter
 **+Donna Gardino (via telephone)
 Karl Kassel
 Dave Hetman
 Pam Golden
 Shannon Kumpula

Representative Organization

Mayor, City of North Pole
 Mayor, Fairbanks North Star Borough
 Mayor, City of Fairbanks
 Northern Region Director, DOT&PF
 FNSB Assembly Member
 City Council Member, City of Fairbanks
 DEC, Division of Air Quality
 FMATS
 FMATS Administrative Assistant
 Alaska Railroad
 City of Fairbanks
 DEC, Division of Air Quality
 DOT Planning
 FMATS
 Mayor-Elect, Fairbanks North Star Borough
 DOT Design
 DOT Traffic/Safety
 City of Fairbanks

**FMATS Policy Committee Members, **FMATS Staff Members, +FMATS Technical Committee Members*

3. Public Comment Period (3 minute limit)

No public comment.

4. Approval of the October 21, 2015 Agenda

Motion: To approve the October 21, 2015 Agenda. (Hopkins/Sattley).

Discussion: Mayor Ward requested a motion to suspend the rules to add an Item A under Committee Reports in order to take a ten minute break in the meeting for the presentation of an award and cake for Mayor Hopkins. (Walley/Miller).

Vote on Motion: None opposed. Approved.

Approval of the September 16, 2015 Meeting Minutes

Motion: To approve the September 12, 2015 meeting minutes. (Miller/Koch).

Discussion: No further discussion.

Vote on Motion: None opposed. Approved.

5. Committee Reports

a. Presentation of FMATS Certificate and Cake to Mayor Hopkins

Mayor Ward presented an FMATS Certificate of Appreciation to Mayor Hopkins recognizing his ten years of service with FMATS. Mayor Ward thanked Mayor Hopkins for his dedication and service to the community both

on FMATS and as Mayor of the Fairbanks North Star Borough. Mayor Ward stated that he wished Mayor Hopkins the best of luck in all of his future endeavors and that he would definitely be missed.

Mayor Hopkins thanked everyone. Mayor Hopkins commented that FMATS had gone through a lot of changes over the years and some of those changes were brought on by a subcommittee he had chaired. Mayor Hopkins stated that there were other committees taking action as well and it was a public process. Mayor Hopkins stated that he just wished there was more members of the public in attendance, but when there was an issue people showed up when they did not like it, and otherwise everything was smooth and calm. Mayor Hopkins stated that then it was just amongst themselves that they had debates and discussions; but in the end they voted and did business which was what they should do. Mayor Hopkins stated that he was concerned about the MPO funding and MPO process; the fact that there was only one DOT, and how that would go for FMATS. Mayor Hopkins stated that the STIP was not out yet and every year when there was a STIP they grappled with it; but grappling was called for so keep up the good work. Mayor Hopkins stated that he would probably be attending meetings in the future as "Mr." and sitting in the cheap seats.

***Meeting was recessed for ten minutes and recording was stopped.**

***Meeting and recording were resumed.**

Mayor Hopkins stated that the cake was appreciated. Mayor Hopkins stated that he would like to recognize Karl Kassel, the incoming Mayor-elect. Mayor Hopkins stated that he would be attending future FMATS meetings wanted to note for the record that Mr. Kassel was prepared and had been following FMATS for a while as the presiding officer of the Borough Assembly. Mayor Hopkins stated that Mr. Kassel would serve FMATS well.

b. Coordinator's Office Report and Technical Committee Action Items

Ms. Giamichael stated that she was sitting in for Ms. Gardino who was attending an AMPO Conference in Las Vegas. Ms. Giamichael provided information for all meetings, briefings, open houses, project site visits, and presentations FMATS staff had attended or participated in.

Mayor Hopkins stated that he had been unable to listen to the briefing to the City Council for the Noble Street Upgrade Project and wondered if Ms. Giamichael could provide a brief summary of the meeting and the Council's reaction to it, if any.

Ms. Giamichael stated that she had not attended the meeting and asked if Mayor Eberhart could answer Mayor Hopkins' inquiry.

Mayor Eberhart stated that he attended the meeting and recalled that Ms. Gardino had been surprised that the project was pushed back to 2017. Mayor Eberhart stated that there were various discussions about how to minimize disruption and he heard various proposals about doing half the road; which raised issues about tie-ins and so forth. Mayor Eberhart stated that he did not recall any specific questions from the Council other than making sure there was acquisition of any right-of-way, questions regarding sidewalks alongside the Red Moose Gift Shop; and what could be done in terms of lessons learned from South Cushman, in terms of disruption of businesses

along that route. Mayor Eberhart stated that for whatever reason, there had been a lack of communication, especially with the business owners and Downtown Association; and they were not happy.

Mr. Walley stated that one of the main concerns brought up at the meeting was the timing of the lights which were currently out of whack. Mr. Walley stated that they were told that would be fixed with this project and thought they were surprised that it would happen in the summer of 2017.

Mr. Miller stated that he would like to add a little more background on that. Mr. Miller explained that some of the reasons for the slippage were the right-of-way issues they were having on the project they were not forecasting being able to get the project to construction until July. Mr. Miller stated that with what happened on Cushman Street this year, DOT did not think that it was a viable plan for getting the most coordinated project completed successfully. Mr. Miller stated that they DOT looked at possibly getting the project out in July and having some type of split; possibly from Gaffney to 5th Avenue, which was where the two sewer lines met so it was a logical breakpoint for doing the deep utilities on that end and then having the contractor come in and work on the civil portion of the project the following year. Mr. Miller stated that then they could be working on the deep portion of the other end. Mr. Miller stated that they were still looking at other possibilities, but the soonest they could get a complete project out and have the contractor start work was going to be late July. Mr. Miller stated that it would have been a lot to complete the project in one season.

Mayor Eberhart stated that somewhere along the line he had heard or someone had suggested completing the project in two seasons.

Mayor Eberhart stated that his impression was that the Council really wanted the project to be completed in one season.

Mayor Hopkins asked Ms. Koch about the Idle Reduction Meeting that was conducted by DEC and whether the program was voluntary or part of the SIP.

Ms. Koch stated that she believed that the program was voluntary.

Ms. Koch stated that Ms. Heil had attended the meeting and had met with both private and public fleets, as well as DOT. Ms. Koch stated that Mr. Borden was in the audience and worked for DEC as well. Ms. Koch stated that Mr. Borden had also attended the meeting and could probably provide further clarification.

Mr. Borden stated that he had organized and given the presentation at that meeting. Mr. Borden stated that he was also part of the steering for the program. Mr. Borden stated that he believed the funding for it was mentioned in the STIP, but did not believe it was a mandatory program.

c. Coordinator's Office Reorganization Subcommittee Update

Ms. Giamichael stated that in the Letter of Agreement with the City of Fairbanks and there was an item that stated that FMATS was only required to provide a 30-day written notice for any changes. Ms. Giamichael stated that now that the City was aware of that, they were working with the Union to try to discuss different options and figure out what could be done.

Mayor Hopkins stated that he had not been paying full attention to this aspect but inquired if there had been any further discussions regarding relocation of the FMATS offices to another location in Fairbanks.

Ms. Giamichael stated that they had created a matrix containing pros and cons for all the different possibilities to compare and discuss with the subcommittee.

Mr. Sattley inquired who was on the subcommittee.

Ms. Giamichael stated that they had tried to have representatives from each of the different agencies at the meetings.

Mr. Sattley inquired if anyone from the Policy Committee was on the subcommittee.

Ms. Giamichael stated that Mayor Ward attended the first meeting and assisted them with some of the information but there had been no one from the Policy Committee at the last meeting.

6. Old Business

a. Approval of the Complete Streets Policy (Action Item)

Ms. Giamichael stated that there was no public comment received, but the Technical Committee had suggested two revisions and those revisions had been made since they last saw the document.

Mayor Hopkins inquired if the blue sidebar lines in the packet such as Items A through G under Principles of Complete Streets were new items that were added.

Ms. Giamichael stated that the items were not new but for some reason those items had printed out in blue on the document.

Mayor Hopkins inquired if the previous context sensitive solutions were part of the current Complete Streets Policy that FMATS had adopted.

Ms. Giamichael stated that this was to adopt it and the previous time had been to approve the document for public comment and these were the changes that had been suggested and made.

Mayor Hopkins stated that, as he recalled, the last time the Complete Streets Policy was discussed, there were comments from the previous DOT Northern Region Director about context sensitive solutions and the process it put in place. Mayor Hopkins stated that he wondered if there had been discussions about that in this round. Mayor Hopkins stated it put a public process in place that called for specific input from various organizations.

Ms. Giamichael stated that it was part of the Policy and Procedures document and she would have to reread the meeting minutes to clarify that.

Mr. Miller inquired about the definition of a “signature street” and wondered if they had a definition for it, but had not gone through the reference section to see if it was defined there. Mr. Miller stated that a “signature street” could mean different things to different people.

Mayor Ward inquired if DOT had a definition for a “signature street”.

Mr. Miller stated that there was nothing that he was aware of.

Ms. Giamichael inquired if Mr. Miller had a recommendation for a better way to word it, or if he thought they should put it in the definition section.

Mr. Miller stated that was what his question was because a signature street could be any street and where did a signature street stop.

Mayor Ward stated that there had been discussion at one of the Technical Committee Meetings he had attended and the intention had been to identify the difference between an urban versus rural street.

Mr. Miller stated that if it read, “a signature urban street” that would be clearer to him and better define what their intention was for future members.

Ms. Gardino joined the meeting via telephone. Ms. Gardino stated that she could provide clarification of what was meant by a “signature street.”

Ms. Gardino stated that the term “signature street” and the way FMATS was using it was used interchangeably with the Complete Streets/Signature Street Ad Hoc Steering Committee of the City of Fairbanks for South Cushman.

Ms. Gardino stated that she would recommend removal of the term if it caused confusion. Ms. Gardino stated that the policy applied to the Metropolitan Planning Area and was intended to be broadly applied but was not a policy that required accommodation of all modes of transportation and depended on the context and was driven by what the DOT Preconstruction Manual dictated.

Mr. Sattley stated that there was too much jargon floating around and maybe he was not a jargon person. Mr. Sattley stated that he did not understand what signature street meant and what context sensitive meant. Mr. Sattley inquired if that meant that things worked together. Mr. Sattley stated that if they got away from the jargon and used urban/rural or inside/outside the FMATS boundary, that would be fine. Mr. Sattley stated that he wondered if they could get away from the jargon and perhaps put it in simpler terms.

Ms. Gardino apologized to Mr. Sattley for the technical jargon, but explained that it was put in the document for clarification between FMATS policy and DOT Design so DOT designers could better understand how it fit with the DOT Preconstruction Manual. Mr. Gardino stated that her suggestion was to remove the term “signature street” because it was nebulous and undefined.

Mayor Ward inquired what Ms. Gardino recommended that they replace it with.

Motion: To approve the Complete Streets Policy (Sattley/Walley)

Amendment to the Motion: To remove “signature” from the introductory sentence that reads “This policy shall be used if a signature street is “incomplete” and does not provide for all users and all modes of transportation.” (Sattley/Walley).

Discussion: Mr. Miller stated that he did not feel that the word “signature” should be removed but, rather clarified, to give a better understanding and provide a qualifier to keep this from appearing on every street or project.

Mayor Hopkins inquired if it was appropriate to remove it and postpone the decision for further clarification of what a signature street was and then make a motion to amend it. Mayor Hopkins stated that he was not sure it required another long public process to insert one little word.

Mayor Ward stated that it was a good thought. Mayor Ward stated that he thought that if it was amended it needed to go out for public comment, even if it was only a one word change.

Ms. Gardino stated that she thought it depended upon the significance of the revision. Ms. Gardino stated that it would be up to the Policy Committee at that time to decide whether they thought it was significant.

Mr. Miller stated that he would recommend leaving the word in. Mr. Miller stated that he would rather have the word in as nebulous, than to take it out because he thought it did qualify it as not all streets and that was important. Mr. Miller stated that he would recommend leaving it in and then if they wanted to revisit it later, they could take it out.

Mayor Hopkins inquired if FMATS would be able to assemble something for the next meeting and bring it back to reference what a signature street was.

Ms. Giamichael agreed that FMATS would do that.

Mayor Eberhart stated that he realized that he had used the word “signature streets” when discussing Cushman Street but that he did not have a definition for it but thought it should be left in.

Mr. Sattley stated that he did not have a problem calling Cushman a signature street and would not have a problem calling Gilmore Trail a non signature street, but he did not have a clue about what the dividing line was. Mr. Sattley stated that when they were discussing Noble Street, Airport Road, or Illinois Street were signature streets he wondered what that meant. Mr. Sattley stated that it worked best when there were firm lines like urban or rural; inside or outside the FMATS boundaries; and if no one had an explanation of what the dividing line was for those words, he thought it should be taken out.

Vote on Amendment to the Motion: Three in favor. (Sattley, Hopkins, Walley). Four opposed. (Eberhart, Miller, Koch, Ward). Motion failed.

Discussion: Mr. Sattley asked Ms. Gardino to give him a real world example of the definition for “context sensitive”.

Ms. Gardino stated that it looked at the context of the environment of the road to see what uses the road provided. Ms. Gardino stated that you looked at the land use around that road to see what users needed to be accommodated in that environment.

Mr. Sattley stated that he did not hear anything unexpected in that explanation. Mr. Sattley stated that he guessed it did not do any harm, but did not know why it needed to be in there.

Amendment to the Motion: To change the last sentence of the last bullet under Planning Guidelines to read: “FMATS shall involve DOT and local government in partnering and planning when considering a Complete Streets Network Plan.” (Hopkins/Sattley).

Discussion: Mayor Hopkins explained that the last sentence of last bullet under the planning guidelines read; “*That FMATS shall consider the development of Complete Streets opportunity network plan.*” Mayor Hopkins stated that he read that FMATS shall involve partnering in planning whether that was a written plan but, wanted to ensure that DOT and local governments were involved in the Complete Streets network. Mayor Hopkins

stated that he left out the word “opportunity” as he was not sure what that covered when they were doing plans, but would like that to be clarified to include local governments and DOT since the Complete Streets network plan involved all those entities and he thought that was important.

Mayor Ward stated that he thought he understood Mayor Hopkins’ point, but thought it might be redundant since FMATS was made up of local governments and DOT. Mayor Ward stated that the Technical Committees were made up of employees, participants, and elected officials. Mayor Ward stated that the last sentence was specific and left it open for them to do that in the future if they wanted to, but could not see where it did not include members of any policy committee or any organization who wanted to be included. Mayor Ward stated that he was a little bit curious about the intention Ms. Gardino had from a technical aspect and whether she could clarify that for them.

Ms. Gardino explained that not every street could accommodate all users, but they were going to look at that to determine what was feasible, reasonable, and who the users were. Ms. Gardino stated that, given that, they were going to have situations where not every street was going to accommodate all users. Ms. Gardino stated that, hopefully, in the bigger picture you would have a network where all the users had some sort of connectivity even though it might not be on every single street. Ms. Gardino stated that having that mapped out would help FMATS be more specific in their project development efforts.

Mayor Ward inquired if Ms. Gardino saw that as being a function of the Policy Committee or most likely a Technical Committee aspect.

Ms. Gardino stated that it would most likely be started at the staff level, then the Technical Committee or subcommittee level and brought forward to the Technical and Policy Committee levels for consideration and input.

Mayor Ward inquired where Ms. Gardino thought that sentence should be included and asked Ms. Giamichael to repeat the amendment to the motion.

Ms. Gardino stated that she thought it could be combined with the third bullet, because, as Mayor Hopkins pointed out, to make it less redundant.

Mayor Hopkins stated that he appreciated the Coordinator’s input here. Mayor Hopkins stated that for the voting purposes when looking at the first sentence in the last bullet that read, *“Roads with excessive vehicular capacity will be identified for possible reconfiguration to improve access for all users.”* Mayor Hopkins stated that the current language read: *“FMATS shall consider”*. Mayor Hopkins stated that he had particular concern; and that was why he brought the motion forward that sometimes when it said “FMATS” it meant just “FMATS staff” and FMATS staff got to work on it. Mayor Hopkins stated that he had many concerns that the Borough’s Transportation Planner and DOT’s Planning Section were not there; but maybe they were called and asked for some information. Mayor Hopkins stated that was why he was saying that they *“shall”* be involved because he thought it was important when they were talking about a Complete Streets network it was going to go out and involved the City and DOT and complete streets. Mayor Hopkins stated

that he did not think it fit at all in the third bullet because the third bullet was dealing with successful implementation of complete streets required certain things; but here it was talking about if there was excessive vehicular capacity then they would take this action. Mayor Hopkins stated that he would like more direct language because sometimes when they did not have direct language in these policies, instead FMATS staff just went out and did something, then it was done, and then they had it here before Policy Committee. Mayor Hopkins stated that he felt that at a grass roots level it needed to involve DOT and other local governments when considering some complete network planning.

Vote on Amendment to the Motion: Six in favor. One opposed. (Ward).
Approved.

Discussion: Mr. Miller stated that on College Road, DOT got into a situation where the FMATS Committee commissioned a planning document when they were in the final stages of design on College Road which put them back to square one in the whole design process. Mr. Miller stated that he would like to see some guideline that encouraged the planning process, review, and guidance be brought to some kind of completion prior to the final project design. Mr. Miller stated that he realized that was not always totally feasible, but they just did not want to get in the same situation again where they had a separate planning effort going on a project that was actually close to a final design. Mr. Miller stated that the planning effort was pretty in depth and he could see that a lot of public involvement was required but he would like to see something that encouraged the process completion prior to project design kickoff.

Mayor Ward inquired if Mr. Miller was referring specifically to Complete Streets or to all projects.

Mr. Miller stated that he was referring to the Complete Streets policy. Mr. Miller stated that this was a higher level of required planning and process that took place outside of the normal project and asked Ms. Gardino if it was possible to clarify that.

Ms. Gardino stated that she thought it was difficult to do when sometimes a design took 14 years or in the case of Illinois Street, decades. Ms. Gardino stated that on the Illinois project, there are elements that should have been re-designed due to the length of the development process but were not.

Ms. Gardino stated that she did not know if it was better to slow down the design process to find out the results of the studies or better to come back in a few years and have to reconfigure an intersection. Ms. Gardino stated that she did not know the answer but could think of examples that went either way and did not have a definite solution.

Mr. Miller stated that it was complicated and that was why there was not an easy solution. Mr. Miller stated that he could see how this process could significantly change the direction of the project when the project was already well into design, and that was a cost issue. Mr. Miller stated it was a concern but he did not see how to align the two because there was a certain amount of one before the other that had to happen. Mr. Miller stated that they had talked about this internally at DOT. Mr. Miller stated that they saw the issue

but did not see how to solve it. Mr. Miller stated that having talked about this concern, maybe FMATS could keep that in mind when they started to work with complete streets and the process.

Mayor Ward stated that when FMATS first started having discussions about establishing policies for projects he thought the original intent had been to help give direction to DOT. Mayor Ward stated that there had been several projects that when FMATS gave directions it might not be the same terminology used by designers, or the intention of the public in the public participation process was different than what the engineers and designers interpreted. Mayor Ward stated that he could see the concern about moving forward with a project in a timely manner; but thought that in the end this would help give them better projects and make it clearer from the policy perspective when they gave a project to DOT what they were looking for. Mayor Ward stated that his hope was that it would be used as a tool to help make it a better project and a better process; not something that was more complicated.

Mr. Miller stated that clear guidance was always appreciated by DOT, but the issue was clear guidance at the beginning the project when they started the design rather than when they were completing the design when it was difficult to integrate changes and costly in both time and money. Mr. Miller stated that the sooner the guidance came, the better.

Mayor Ward stated that he thought they were well on their way.

Mayor Hopkins stated that on Page 17, there needed to be some discussion about the second and third bullets. Mayor Hopkins stated that there was some public comment on the third bullet that talked about: "Plans and projects should consider future demands from all users in all corridors. These needs might be met in phased projects in the corridor." Mayor Hopkins stated that he could understand the second sentence about phased projects, but was trying to grasp the idea about "These plans should consider future demands of all users across all corridors for complete streets." Mayor Hopkins stated that it was the development of project scope which was a three or four sentence that at some point was included in the TIP. Mayor Hopkins stated that it seemed like a pretty broad sentence to him and wondered if they even had that information when developing a project scope.

Ms. Gardino stated that the bullet spoke to their second goal in the FMATS Metropolitan Transportation Plan which was the goal of building a safe, efficient multi-modal, interconnected transportation network which was what that sentence pointed to.

Mayor Hopkins asked Ms. Gardino about the second goal of the MTP they worked on regarding project scopes where DOT was submitting major projects coming through the community. Mayor Hopkins stated that they did not know enough about it when it was in the MTP. Mayor Hopkins stated that they could only classify them as short term, mid-term, and long term and were not able to modify any of the scope when it was in the MTP and asked Ms. Gardino if she could explain that.

Ms. Gardino stated that the timing of the plans was a consideration and if they did not include placeholders in the MTP for those long range plans, they would not be able to consider those projects later. Ms. Gardino stated that there would be time to consider those projects and the danger of leaving something out was that it was not considered in the conformity of the MTP and if there was something being considered that would affect air quality, they had to be careful to include that in their travel model.

Mayor Hopkins stated that when they say they've addressed all the users for that particular place, the rest of the corridor project almost drives what they will do with the other sections and asked Ms. Gardino to comment on that.

Ms. Gardino stated that the comment about phased projects was driven by planning constraints.

Amended Motion: To approve the Complete Streets Policy and to change the last sentence of the last bullet under Planning Guidelines to read; "FMATS shall involve DOT and local government in partnering and planning when considering a Complete Streets Network Plan".

Vote on Amended Motion: None opposed. Approved.

b. TIP and Conformity Status Update (Action Item)

Ms. Giamichael stated that FMATS still did not have an approved STIP, so they did not have a TIP. Ms. Giamichael stated that after October 31st they would be in a conformity lapse.

Mayor Hopkins asked Mr. Miller if he knew the status of the STIP.

Mr. Miller stated that he would defer to his colleague, Ms. Potter, to answer that question. Ms. Potter stated that the STIP had been at FHWA for at least two weeks now and the Headquarters offices were aware of the importance and their concerns. Ms. Potter stated that she could reach out, as she understood the importance, but they typically expected about a two week turnaround time for their review and would hope that something was pending.

Mayor Hopkins inquired what that meant for them if they were to be out of an approved TIP and conformity and if they had to stop spending money or doing actual work. Ms. Gardino stated that right now they could not program any projects. Ms. Gardino stated that there were new projects that could not be started and funding increase requests on the agenda for approval that could not be programmed due to the lack of a TIP. Ms. Gardino stated that Technical Committee approved additional funding for the FY14 Surface Upgrade Project as well as the Gold Hill project that could not move forward due to the lack of a TIP.

Mayor Hopkins inquired if once the STIP was published was the TIP approved or was there another review or approval process.

Ms. Potter stated that it was her understanding that the TIP itself had been approved by the Headquarters office, but until the STIP was approved and and the TIP needed to be incorporated into the STIP. Ms. Potter stated that

once it was approved by FHWA then everything was accepted and it was a done deal at that point.

Ms. Gardino stated that the TIP may have been approved by the State, but it had not been incorporated into the STIP. Ms. Gardino stated that the action of incorporating it into the STIP did not necessarily occur with approval of the STIP. Ms. Gardino stated that there had been situations in the past where the STIP was approved and the TIP was not incorporated into the STIP.

Ms. Gardino stated that hopefully that would not happen. Ms. Gardino stated that the other thing that they needed from the Federal Highway Administration and Federal Transit Administration was approval of the Conformity and until they received that they could not incorporate it into the STIP. Ms. Gardino stated that they had submitted it on September 17th to the DOT.

Mayor Hopkins asked Ms. Gardino if there had been a past action taken when they were in situations like this before or should they just wait and see what happened instead of writing a letter or sending an email.

Ms. Gardino stated that that there had been instances in the past but this was more than that because they could not provide funding increases to projects. Ms. Gardino stated that the only way they could approve anything was using offset funding.

Mayor Hopkins inquired if FMATS had waited or sent a letter or email in the past and whether that would be appropriate action to take now.

Ms. Gardino stated that she did not think a letter would hurt and it might be helpful since she did not think they were aware of the implications.

Motion: To approve the Policy Committee Chair and the MPO Coordinator to call the DOT Commissioner to discuss the effects of an unapproved TIP and the DOT Planning Reorganization on the MPO. (Eberhart/Hopkins).

Discussion: Mayor Eberhart stated that the FMATS reorganization issue and other relevant issues might be useful discussions to have when they contacted the Commissioner.

Mr. Sattley stated that he was fine with it up until the part about talking to the Commissioner regarding the reorganization of FMATS and did not see what business it was of theirs how they reorganized.

Mayor Eberhart stated that he misspoke.

Mayor Ward stated that he thought a call to the Commissioner would be very appropriate to make sure that the Commissioner was aware of their status of not being able to move monies around to pay contractors.

Ms. Potter stated that it was very important to note that there were other issues and even if the STIP were approved, due to the implementation of the new FHWA accounting system they could not send anything to FHWA for processing until the accounting system was up and moving. Ms. Potter stated that even if funding increases were approved, it was her understanding they would not be able to pay them anyway, so it was unfortunate.

Mr. Miller stated that the Commissioner was aware of the issue, but it was hard to push with a rope when it was at FHWA.

Vote on Motion: Six in favor. None opposed. One abstention (Miller).
Approved.

8. New Business

a. UPWP Funding Distribution and Allocation (Action Item)

Ms. Giamichael stated that it had been recommended by the Technical Committee to approve the letter and to approve the amendment to the UPWP in the next action item.

Motion: To approve the FFY16 PL Funding Distribution Allocation. (Hopkins/Sattley).

Discussion: Mr. Miller inquired what FMATS was approving with the letter.

Ms. Giamichael stated that it was her understanding that FMATS was approving the letter from DOT.

Vote on Motion: None opposed. Approved.

b. UPWP Amendment (Action Item)

Motion: To approve \$5,715.70 of PL Funds to be used for Bike and Ped Count Methodology. (Walley/Koch).

Discussion: Mayor Hopkins inquired about the amount being put towards the project and where the match funding came from for the Bike/Ped Count Methodology.

Vote on Motion: None opposed. Approved.

c. Steese Expressway/Front Street Facility Phase 3 Increase (Action Item)

Ms. Giamichael stated that an email was received from Sarah Schacher of DOT requesting an increase of \$10,000 from offset funding be added as a placeholder for the project.

Mayor Hopkins inquired where the placeholder funds were coming from.

Ms. Giamichael stated that it was just a placeholder since they did not have any offsets right now.

Mayor Hopkins stated that the money had to be coming from somewhere and wondered where that might be.

Ms. Potter stated that the offset depended upon the type of project that was closed out and it was too early in the year to determine where the money would be coming from so that was why it was just a placeholder.

Motion: To approve an additional \$10,000 for the right-of-way on the Steese/Front Street Facility project, using offset funding. (Walley/Hopkins).

Discussion: Mayor Hopkins inquired why this could not wait until November 18th meeting.

Ms. Giamichael stated that the issue was that they wanted to put it in now as a placeholder to prevent an administrative modification in the future.

Vote on Motion: None opposed. Approved.

d. FMATS Improvement Projects – Amended (Action Item)

Ms. Giamichael stated that they would like to replace storm drains and culverts with the crack sealing program in North Pole. Mayor Ward stated that the project would be done as a preventative maintenance project by DOT to avoid the additional cost of hiring a separate contractor.

Motion: To amend the FFY16 FMATS Improvement Program to delete the culverts and storm drains and to add in the crack sealing project in North Pole. (Hopkins/Sattley).

Discussion: No further discussion.

Vote on Motion: None opposed. Approved.

e. FFY16 Policy and Technical Committee Meeting Dates (Action Item)

Motion: To approve the FFY2016 Policy and Technical Committee Meeting dates. (Hopkins/Sattley).

Discussion: Discussion followed about whether the motion should include both the November 2015 and November 2016 meeting dates to accommodate the Alaska Municipal League meetings.

Amendment to the Motion: To amend the FFY15 November Policy Committee Meeting date to November 12, 2015 and to change the FFY16 meeting date to November 9, 2016. (Eberhart/Hopkins).

Vote on Amendment to the Motion: None opposed. Approved.

Vote on Motion: None opposed. Approved.

Amended Motion: To approve the FFY2016 FMATS Policy and Technical Committee Meeting dates and to change the Policy Committee November meeting date to November 9, 2016 and to amend the FFY15 November meeting date to November 12, 2015.

9. Public Comment Period (3 minute limit)

No public comment.

10. Other Issues

No other issues.

11. Informational Items

a. Yankovich/Miller Hill Multi-Use Path Stage I and Stage II Update

Ms. Giamichael stated that they ran out of State money for Stage II so DOT would not be able to acquire right-of-way and move to construction. Ms. Giamichael stated that they were looking at different options such as doing the road at the same time as the path. Ms. Giamichael stated that once they decided on an option and received estimates, they would have to re-score the project(s).

Mr. Miller stated that they had enough money to purchase the right-of-way but not to proceed with construction and felt it better to wait until they had a full plan.

b. Cowles Street Reconstruction Scoping

Ms. Giamichael stated that FMATS would be meeting on Wednesday, October 28th from 1-3 pm to discuss the scope and different options for the Cowles Street project.

c. FMATS Improvement Program Phase 4 Increase

Ms. Giamichael stated that the increase was approved by the Technical Committee. Ms. Giamichael stated that an increase of \$168,000 was approved with the TIP as the funding source to cover those charges.

d. Road Safety Audit – Badger Road

Ms. Giamichael introduced Pam Golden of DOT to provide them with a brief presentation regarding the Badger Road Safety Audit.

e. HSIP Program Update

Ms. Golden also presented the approved HSIP project nominations and explained where and what those projects were.

f. Federal Highway Reauthorization Status

Ms. Giamichael stated that the House released their own bill called the Surface Transportation Reauthorization and Reform Act which competed with the DRIVE Act.

g. Obligations and Offsets

Ms. Giamichael stated that there were no obligations or offsets due to lack of an approved TIP or STIP.

12. Policy Committee Comments

- Mayor Hopkins thanked everyone and stated that he might come in and sit in the cheap seats.
- Mayor Eberhart thanked Mayor Hopkins for all his input. Mayor Eberhart stated that he appreciated his knowledge and all his hard work and thought they worked well together when coordinating all these projects.
- Mr. Walley commented that Councilmen Cleworth stated that he had been on the Policy Committee for over a decade and still did not understand all of it. Mr. Walley commended Mayor Hopkins for all his hard work and service to the community. Mr. Walley stated that he appreciated all his input on the committee for the past ten years. Mr. Walley stated that he had been taking notes and would be using them in the future.
- Mr. Miller stated that this was the second retirement or change in job he had been at for Mayor Hopkins, the first being with the University of Alaska and thanked him for his service.
- Ms. Koch stated that she wanted to mention that DEC issued some air quality regulations that were out for public notice until December 3rd. Ms. Koch stated that in January 2013, EPA updated their annual standard for PM_{2.5} and that standard had been in effect since then. Ms. Koch stated that when EPA updated any standards they, gave the state three years to update the State regulations to point to the correct updated standards. Ms. Koch stated that was one of the things that they had done and she did have one specifically PM_{2.5}-related item that she wanted to bring to everyone's attention and the one item was the voluntary dry wood seller program changes that were made. Ms. Koch stated that she wanted to make sure that everyone was aware that

they were out for public notice and on the DEC website, so if they had any questions, they could give her a call.

- Mayor Ward stated that he wanted to add that he really appreciated Mayor Hopkins' participation and leadership with FMATS. Mayor Ward stated that he thought this was a shining example of how a community could come together and work through some difficult issues and provide a high level of service to our community and thanked him for his participation. Mayor Ward stated that he also wanted to thank Mayor Hopkins' family as well because he appreciated the sacrifices they made so he could serve the community.

13. Adjourn

Motion to adjourn. (Hopkins/Miller). The meeting adjourned at 2:25 p.m. The next Policy Committee Meeting is scheduled **Thursday, November 12, 2015** at 12 p.m. in the City Hall Council Chambers, 800 Cushman Street, Fairbanks, Alaska.

Approved: 

Mayor Bryce Ward, Chair
FMATS Policy Committee

Date: 11-12-15