



**TECHNICAL COMMITTEE**

Meeting Minutes – October 7, 2015

City of Fairbanks, Council Chambers, 800 Cushman Street  
Fairbanks, Alaska

**1. Call to Order**

Ms. Gardino called the meeting to order at 12:00 p.m.

**2. Introduction of Members and Attendees**

The following were present:

\* **FMATS Policy Committee members**

\*\* **FMATS Staff members**

\*\*\***FMATS Technical Committee members**

<b>Name</b>	<b>Representing</b>
*** Donna Gardino	FMATS Coordinator
*** Bob Pristash	City of Fairbanks
*** Jackson Fox	City of Fairbanks
*** Bill Butler	City of North Pole
*** Lee Borden (absent)	ADEC, Air Quality Division
*** Mark Peterburs for Brian Lindamood	AK Railroad Corporation
*** Margaret Carpenter for Judy Chapman	DOT&PF Planning Chief
*** Jerry McBeath	FNSB Planning Commission
*** Kellen Spillman for Christine Nelson	FNSB Community Planning Director
*** Glenn Miller	FNSB Transportation
*** Dave Sanches (absent)	Fort Wainwright Planning
*** Melanie Herbert (absent)	Tanana Chiefs Conference
*** Mary Pagel	UAF
*** Alan Hoza	Alaska West Express
** Alicia Giamichael	FMATS Transportation Planner
** Deborah Todd	FMATS Administrative Assistant
** Linda Mahlen	DOT&PF Planning
Guan Griffin	DOT&PF Construction
Pam Golden	DOT&PF Traffic
Tad Tomasic	DOT&PF Construction
Carl Heim	DOT&PF Construction
Russ Johnson	DOT&PF Design

**3. Public Comment Period (3 minute limit)**

No public comment.

**4. Approval of the October 7, 2015 Agenda**

**Motion:** To approve the October 7, 2015 Technical Committee Agenda as amended. (McBeath/Pristash).

**Discussion:** Ms. Carpenter requested that Noble Street project update be added to the agenda under Informational Items. Ms. Gardino stated that it could be put as 11.c. under Informational Items.

**Vote on Motion:** None opposed. Approved.

**5. Approval of the September 2, 2015 Meeting Minutes**

**Motion:** To approve the September 2, 2015 meeting minutes. (Spillman/McBeath).

**Discussion:** No further discussion.

**Vote on Motion:** None opposed. Approved.

**6. Subcommittee Reports**

**7. Old Business**

**a. Coordinator's Office Reorganization Subcommittee**

Ms. Gardino explained that FMATS was looking at different options for the relocation of the Coordinator's Office and she had been getting legal advice.

Ms. Gardino stated that the Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) for the Coordinator's Office spelled out who was going to do what and the services that were to be provided "in kind" by the City of Fairbanks. Ms. Gardino stated that the Coordinator's Agreement would have to be changed in order to make that happen and the Agreement could be terminated with a 30-day written notice. Ms. Gardino stated that the Agreement was all that tied them to the City. Ms. Gardino stated that changing the Agreement was very doable. Ms. Gardino stated that the IBEW did not want to see them leave the Union, however, there was nothing in the Agreement that tied them to being IBEW employees. Ms. Gardino stated that the Chief of Staff for the City of Fairbanks would be meeting with the IBEW on Thursday, October 8, 2015 to discuss the reorganization and the fact that it was probably going to happen whether they wanted it to or not and the IBEW could either work with them or not. Ms. Gardino stated that there were several ways FMATS could restructure: Negotiate a Letter of Agreement with IBEW; restructure the Agreement to purchase payroll benefits from a private provider instead of the City of Fairbanks; incorporate as a non-profit which she saw as the last thing they probably wanted to do, but there were other MPOs that were non-profits; do nothing; or stay where they were at and restructure the Agreement to modify the responsible party for payroll and benefits, i.e., the City of North Pole could potentially provide them with the payroll services and they might be able to purchase benefits from a third party. Ms. Gardino stated that obviously there were a lot of pros and cons to it, but they were going to continue to develop this matrix and see if they could get some revised terms from the IBEW.

Mr. McBeath asked about the amount of in-kind services that were provided by the City of Fairbanks and the dollar amount of those services.

Ms. Gardino stated that the dollar amount of in-kind services provided by the City of Fairbanks last year was \$61,000.

Mr. McBeath asked Ms. Gardino if that was cash.

Ms. Gardino stated that that amount was not cash, but in-kind services.

Mr. McBeath asked Ms. Gardino if everyone was in agreement about the dollar value for those in-kind services.

Ms. Gardino stated that risk management, payroll services, and IT support were all types of in-kind services provided by the City of Fairbanks to FMATS and the value of those services was \$61,000 up from \$47,000.

Ms. Carpenter asked Ms. Gardino if there was anything that prohibited the City of Fairbanks from providing those same in-kind services if FMATS worked out an agreement and got out of the IBEW Union.

Ms. Gardino stated that there was nothing that prohibited the City of Fairbanks from providing the in-kind services to FMATS. Ms. Gardino stated that she thought that because the checks came from the City that was where they were having the problem. Ms. Gardino stated that if FMATS was located in the City and their checks came from somewhere other than the City, the IBEW would not have any say. Ms. Gardino stated that because the City wrote their checks, they were considered City employees and that was what caused the problem. Ms. Gardino stated that she did not participate in staff or budget meetings and did not get department head memos and was not notified of City events.

Mr. Miller asked Ms. Gardino if the in-kind services FMATS was receiving were items that the City of Fairbanks was absorbing. Ms. Gardino stated that Mr. Miller was correct. Ms. Gardino explained that the office space, the utilities, and all those items were what the City of Fairbanks provided as their in-kind contribution to FMATS. Ms. Gardino stated that as they had previously discussed, without State funds in the foreseeable future, FMATS was going to run into a problem just paying for the non-federal share of their planning funds. Ms. Gardino stated that they would have to find a funding source and it would have to come from local sources if it was not coming from the State and that was something that was going to have to be looked at when they prepared the next UPWP.

**b. Approval of the Complete Streets Policy (Action Item)**

Ms. Gardino explained that the Complete Streets Policy went out for public comment and no comments were received so the recommendation was a motion to approve the Complete Streets Policy.

**Motion:** To recommend to the Policy Committee to approve the Complete Streets Policy. (McBeath/Fox).

**Discussion:** Mr. McBeath asked Ms. Gardino about the origin of the definition for right-of-way. Mr. McBeath stated that the definition did not sound correct to him in terms of how FMATS used right-of-way.

Ms. Gardino stated that the definition came from **Complete Streets.org** and it was not a definition of right-of-way, but a policy of complete streets to ensure that the right-of-way was planned, designed, funded, and operated with consideration of safe access.

Mr. McBeath stated that the complete streets definition was really talking about a road area and right-of-way was a more complex concept.

Ms. Gardino stated that it was not really a definition.

Mr. Butler stated that it was called a definition in the policy.

Ms. Gardino stated that she did not know and would have to look that up.

Ms. Giamichael stated that it was in the references, but did not know the origin of it.

Mr. McBeath stated that he thought a more complete definition should be provided.

Ms. Gardino stated that they would look into it and could probably use the definition from the DOT Preconstruction Manual.

Mr. McBeath cited a sentence that lacked clarity on the third line of Page 14 Item C as to why it would be more advantageous.

Ms. Gardino asked if Mr. McBeath wanted clarity as to why it would be more advantageous. Ms. Gardino stated that she guessed the intent behind it had been that often times you were not able to do the whole corridor at once because there were right of way issues, for example, so you did the construction in phases to get part of it done one year and continued to work on other issues. Ms. Gardino asked Mr. McBeath if he had a recommendation for how he would like to change it.

Mr. McBeath stated that it just sounded incomplete to him. Mr. McBeath suggested that Ms. Gardino could revise it to say; "It might be met in phased projects." and just stop the sentence there.

Mr. Spillman stated that he would be happy to look up what they had in their department as a definition of right-of-way at the Borough. Mr. Spillman stated that he remembered that the term "owned" was troublesome.

Ms. Gardino stated that they would look at the definition provided in the Preconstruction Manual, but Mr. Spillman's comment was noted.

**Vote on Motion:** None opposed. Approved.

**c. TIP and Conformity Status Update**

Ms. Gardino stated that FMATS had no TIP and they were in a conformity lapse.

Ms. Carpenter stated that they were not in a conformity lapse. Ms. Carpenter stated that they had no TIP, but they were not in a conformity lapse. Ms. Carpenter stated that Ms. Chapman received a response from FHWA that gave them a four year time span from the end of October 2011 when they approved the previous TIP.

Ms. Carpenter stated that they had until the end of October 2015, so they were not in a conformity lapse; but neither the TIP nor the STIP had been approved by FHWA yet. Ms. Carpenter stated that the FHWA accounting system was currently down and they could not process anything and were estimating the end of October.

Ms. Gardino asked if Ms. Carpenter if she was saying that the TIP and STIP were at Federal Highways.

Ms. Carpenter stated that Ms. Gardino was correct.

Ms. Gardino asked Ms. Carpenter when they were delivered.

Ms. Carpenter stated that she thought it was last week and sent Ms. Gardino the letter that said when they were sending it.

Ms. Gardino stated that she did not remember seeing that.

Ms. Carpenter stated that she believed it was the week before.

Ms. Gardino stated that there was no TIP or STIP; so nothing could get programmed. Ms. Gardino stated that they had projects that were waiting, like the Gold Hill Road Project; that could not get their money because they did not have a TIP or STIP. Ms. Gardino stated that they could not start any new projects so they could not start the Cowles Street project.

Ms. Carpenter stated that she believed that was the main issue and they could not start a new phase or start a new project, but thought if it was an increase to a phase, she thought that would be okay.

Ms. Gardino stated that was when you had a TIP, but they did not have an approved TIP.

Mr. McBeath inquired if projects had been stopped due to the lack of a TIP and STIP like the Gold Hill project.

Ms. Gardino stated that DOT needed funding to complete the final design and get the project through Contracts. Ms. Gardino stated that DOT had already received the construction funding, but needed additional funding to get the project through Contracts and out to bid.

Mr. McBeath asked Ms. Gardino if they were just talking about delays and when the issue would be resolved.

Ms. Carpenter stated that FHWA had given DOT an estimated date of the end of the October 2015.

Ms. Gardino stated that they had Steese Front Street and Cowles Street projects that were awaiting funding.

Ms. Carpenter stated that once FHWA got their accounting system up and running, they should be okay.

#### **Seasonal Mobility Task Force Update**

Ms. Gardino explained that they had a Seasonal Mobility Task Force meeting which was when they got together with all the entities responsible for maintenance activities to discuss inefficiencies and how they could improve. Ms. Gardino stated that all those who attended felt that it had been a very productive meeting.

Ms. Gardino stated that there were several topics discussed including the brine mixture that DOT used and the possibility of sharing that brine solution with the University and other entities. Ms. Gardino stated that they received good information from a Borough employee regarding being aware of plowing and creating berms that made accessibility difficult for disabled individuals. Ms. Gardino stated that they discussed projects where there were no maintenance agreements in place yet and how they could coordinate their efforts to maintain those facilities more efficiently. Ms. Gardino stated that DOT would only be plowing major roads during severe snow events and there would be no overtime. Ms. Gardino stated that DOT also explained their new website that people could access to determine the priority level of their particular road for plowing or maintenance.

Mr. McBeath inquired how DOT had done with maintenance efforts during the recent snow events and how Ms. Carpenter thought the new objectives under constrained budget circumstances was working.

Ms. Carpenter stated that she thought the Maintenance Director should come and address that but personally thought that DOT had done as well as could be expected during the time limit that they had to get out there. Ms. Carpenter stated she had heard the other day that even though the budget had been cut and there were certain budget restrictions, if something really bad happened DOT would not sit and do nothing. Ms. Carpenter stated that if somebody was in an emergency

situation, DOT still had to respond. Ms. Carpenter stated that she thought that Mr. McBeath still needed to speak with Mr. Schacher and she could get Mr. Schacher to provide a report at the next meeting. Ms. Carpenter stated that she had not received any complaints coming through her office.

Mr. McBeath stated that he from his perception, it was an announced change and asking whether or not there was a change, but from what Ms. Carpenter was telling him there really was not any change. Mr. McBeath stated that it was certainly important.

Ms. Carpenter stated that she agreed.

Mr. Butler stated that having been in attendance at the meeting, he did not expect to see DOT plowing the secondary roads, but they were out there plowing.

Mr. Hoza stated that the differences were pretty obvious to them and through the weekend the effects were definitely more noticeable as well as outside the urban areas.

Ms. Griffin stated that DOT was going to reduce maintenance personnel at the camps and the remaining personnel would have to cover more area and it would take longer.

## **8. New Business**

### **a. FMATS Improvement Program Phase 4 Increase (Action Item)**

Ms. Gardino stated that a request was received from DOT for \$168,120 to cover changes and there was funding in the current TIP under the FMATS Improvement Program that would be the source of funding to cover it once they received approval. Ms. Gardino explained that Guan Griffin and Tad Tomasiac of DOT&PF were present at the meeting to explain the various change orders that required additional funding. Ms. Gardino stated that it was broken down by changes for the City, Borough Parks and Recreation, Borough Rural Services Areas, and the City of North Pole.

Mr. Tomasiac explained the Change Orders and the reason for each one.

Mr. McBeath asked if the funds came out of FMATS.

Ms. Gardino stated that Mr. McBeath was correct. Ms. Gardino stated that the non-Federal share came out of each of the entities.

Mr. McBeath stated that he could not figure out what, if any, justification there was for the cost overruns and why FMATS should cover them, for example, the ADA ramp issue and why they ever approved during the design phase.

Ms. Gardino explained that an error was made by the designer who inserted the wrong spec sheet into the package and no one caught it until after they were built.

Mr. McBeath asked Ms. Gardino if that was a major error.

Ms. Gardino stated that Mr. McBeath was correct and it was an error.

Mr. McBeath stated that now FMATS was expected to take out of their scarce resources to cover that error which did not seem right to him. Mr. McBeath stated that maybe they should have the design person's head.

Mr. McBeath stated that this was not the first time. Mr. McBeath stated that there was a consistent pattern of cost overruns and nothing in the system that corrected future cost overruns. Mr. McBeath stated that he had seen it repeatedly.

Mr. McBeath stated that he had been on FMATS for a couple years now and it was very frustrating. Mr. McBeath stated that invariably FMATS ended up approving them because there did not seem to be any alternative for projects that were halfway done and needed to be completed. Mr. McBeath stated that he was just expressing his frustration.

Mr. Butler stated that he agreed with Mr. McBeath's frustration. Mr. Butler stated that when they came back and asked for more money due to cost overruns that occurred after project completion and closeout requiring funds from the City of North Pole when they had zero funds for FMATS.

Ms. Gardino stated that Mr. Butler was correct. Ms. Gardino stated that with the Federal increase, there was an increase in the money that FMATS contributed to the project for the non-Federal share; so the City of North Pole had to come up with \$504 dollars and the City of Fairbanks had to come up with \$1,060. Ms. Gardino stated that as Mr. Butler had stated, he did not have \$504 in his budget.

Mr. Butler stated that if those issues had come up during the project, they could have scaled back on something rather than after it was completed. Mr. Butler stated that now the Contractor had to get paid and there were no options.

Mr. Heim stated that the issue was being addressed by the DOT after an audit by Civil Rights. Mr. Heim stated that the DOT would be implementing training to address those deficiencies and develop a checklist to use when reviewing plan sets for ADA compliance on future design projects. Mr. Heim stated that they were working closely with FHWA to resolve those problems in the future.

Ms. Gardino asked Mr. Pristash if he thought that training would be a good idea for the City of Fairbanks as well. Mr. Pristash stated that he thought training would definitely be a good idea to have the latest ADA information and guidelines.

Ms. Gardino stated that given the fact the City of North Pole had zero money in their budget and the fact that FMATS had received \$52,000 back, there was enough money in the FMATS budget to pay both cities' portion of the non-Federal share. Ms. Gardino stated that she shared Mr. McBeath's frustration.

**Motion:** To approve the PH4 increase to the FMATS Improvement Program, FFY14, of \$168,120.35, using FCTP funding identified in the TIP and with FMATS funding the non-federal share above the amounts available from the local entities. (Carpenter/Butler).

**Discussion:** No further discussion.

**Vote on Motion:** None opposed. Approved.

**b. UPWP Funding Distribution and Allocation (Action Item)**

Ms. Gardino stated that according to the Memorandum of Agreement, FMATS was supposed to be notified on July 1st of their planning funds for the next year but at least they received a letter so that was good. Ms. Gardino stated that the FMATS planning distribution this year was \$366,185 dollars. Ms. Gardino stated that the letter also discussed the Discretionary Urban Planning Program (DUPP) which they

anticipated resuming work on and making funds available for planning projects in smaller urban communities as well as the two MPOs and would consult with FMATS, regional planners, and representatives of the smaller urban communities in the development of that program.

**Motion:** To recommend to the Policy Committee to approve the FFY16 PL Funding Distribution Allocation. (Carpenter/McBeath).

**Discussion:** Mr. Spillman asked for clarification from Ms. Gardino about whether the Technical Committee was approving or just recommending that the Policy Committee approve it. Ms. Gardino stated that the Technical Committee made recommendations to the Policy Committee.

Ms. Gardino stated that FMATS could use money from the DUPP Program. Ms. Gardino stated that they issued their Freight Mobility Plan, received responses, and were negotiating with the most qualified applicant who was almost \$100,000 higher than the amount FMATS had budgeted for that plan. Ms. Gardino stated that she was supposed to meet with them, but had not heard from them yet. Ms. Gardino stated that she had told them that FMATS did not have any more money so they were going to have to come down significantly or there was no point in wasting anyone's time.

Ms. Gardino stated that for the Bike and Ped Count Methodology outlined on Page 25; they had about \$21,900 budgeted. Ms. Gardino stated that they had received those bids back and the lowest price was \$38,000; so they were short there too. Ms. Gardino stated that if FMATS could apply for the DUPP Program that would be great, but they could not because there was no program.

**Vote on Motion:** None opposed. Approved.

**c. Yankovich-Miller Hill Bicycle and Pedestrian Multi-Use Path PH4 Increase Stage I and Stage II Update**

Ms. Gardino explained that Mr. Heim of DOT was the designer for this project and was in a bind because the project had been broken into two stages due to right-of-way and funding issues. Ms. Gardino stated that now the funding was uncertain and had become a serious issue since all the State funds were spent on the Cushman and South Cushman Street projects. Ms. Gardino stated that Mr. Heim was present to explain where the design was for the two stages of the project and the right-of-way situations on the project.

Mr. Heim explained that the Borough Assembly passed a Resolution that asked DOT to go back to the 26 affected property owners on the Yankovich-Miller Hill Stage II project and he had been ready to send out the mailers and have a meeting in the middle of October. Mr. Heim stated that he had called Ms. Gardino and been informed that there was no money in Stage II. Mr. Heim stated that what he had hoped to do was spend some of the money left over in the right-of-way phase for property acquisition after the public meeting. Mr. Heim stated that he thought that maybe those funds were better used somewhere else. Mr. Heim stated that DOT was able to minimize some of the future right of way impacts to the existing property owners. Mr. Heim stated that he had been directed not to hold that public meeting and to start a new project that would rebuild Miller Hill and Yankovich and bring them up to current design standards.



Ms. Gardino explained that there had been a project in the previous TIP to actually address the roadway but that project was not in the current TIP but was in the Long Range Plan and could be moved up in priority if necessary, but DOT would have to let them know. Ms. Gardino stated that the issue was that Stage I of Yankovich was being built with State funds and they did not have enough State funds to go to construction on Stage II. Ms. Gardino stated that DOT could not obtain right of way or condemn property when they did not have an official project and now there was no available funding for a project.

Mr. McBeath explained that it was a dangerous road situation that was in the plans for reconstruction a couple years down the road and now there was a delay due to lack of funding due to right-of-way issues. Mr. McBeath stated that there were really two issues here: The fundamental need to reconstruct Yankovich that really needs State as well as Federal support; and the property owners did not want to see value and trees on that land lost. Mr. McBeath stated that the Borough Assembly had heard from a lot of people that had a lot of grievances and his recommendation was to sit on the project for a while and give the property owners time to come to terms with their concerns.

Mr. Spillman explained that the concern the Borough had was about the future development of new properties that would cost more to acquire right-of-way from after they were developed.

Mr. Hoza inquired if there was any way that Planning could utilize future projects that were in process to determine the development of properties in an area.

Mr. Spillman stated that the Borough has provisions in the subdivision code that future improvements have to be shown in the plating process. Right-of-way needed for future projects will be shown in the plat so that future property owners were aware that a project was coming. He explained his concern for projects that are so far down the line, that there would be nothing to show landowners in the plat.

Gardino stated that because State funding was so uncertain right now, the only way that they could see the project moving forward was if the project were moved up in the time frame. Ms. Gardino stated that the nomination would need to be reviewed and scored again in order to move it up in priority.

Mr. McBeath thought it would be a good idea to revisit the scoring on Yankovich.

Ms. Gardino asked Mr. Heim when DOT would have a new estimate for the project.

Mr. Heim stated that it would probably take approximately a month to complete an estimate.

Ms. Gardino stated that if they could put in a request to make the project Federal, so they could get the project built.

Mr. Pristash inquired if there was only \$700,000 left and that was left to acquire right of way and if there would be additional costs associated with the Federal money.

Ms. Gardino stated that Mr. Pristash was correct and there would be costs associated with the Federal money.

Mr. Spillman stated that a possible solution would be sending out mailers to the undeveloped lots containing contact information regarding proposed right of way takes in the area.

**d. UPWP Amendment (Action Item)**

Ms. Gardino explained that an amendment had to be prepared, as explained in the meeting packet. Ms. Gardino stated that as of September 14, 2015, FMATS still had \$62,915 that had not been programmed but in July 2015, the Policy Committee approved \$57,200 of that amount. Ms. Gardino stated that there was actually \$5,715.70 remaining to be programmed. Ms. Gardino stated that FMATS had never done a UPWP amendment before so this was new territory for them. Ms. Gardino stated that she was trying to capture all the changes they had in this one amendment.

**Motion:** To recommend to the Policy Committee to approve Amendment #1 of the UPWP, as presented. (Carpenter/Fox).

**Discussion:** No further discussion.

**Vote on Motion: None opposed. Approved.**

**e. Steese Expressway/Front Street Facility PH3 Increase (Action Item)**

Ms. Gardino explained that due to the reconfiguration of the design, DOT was looking for \$30,000 in additional funding for the project right of way easements. Ms. Gardino stated that there was currently \$20,000 in the TIP so they only needed \$10,000 in additional funding.

**Motion:** To recommend to the Policy Committee to approve an additional \$10,000 for the right-of-way on the Steese/Front Street Facility project using offset funding. (Carpenter/McBeath).

**Discussion:** Mr. McBeath stated that the memo from Ms. Schacher did not explain clearly what the additional money was for.

Ms. Gardino stated that she did not know how many easements were needed but she had put \$20,000 in there as a place holder and now Ms. Schacher had gotten a firmer look at it. Ms. Gardino stated that she did not have a firmer number on the number of easements.

**Vote on Motion:** Nine in favor, none opposed. One abstention (McBeath).  
Approved.

**f. FMATS Improvement Program Projects-Amended (Action Item)**

Ms. Gardino explained that the amendment was for removal of storm drain and culvert installation from the North Pole FMATS Improvement Program Project and replacing it with crack seal projects for the City of North Pole.

**Motion:** To recommend to the Policy Committee to amend the FFY16 FMATS Improvements Program to delete the culverts and storm drains and to add in the crack sealing project in North Pole. (Butler/Pristash).

**Discussion:**

Mr. McBeath asked for an explanation of the project.

Mr. Butler explained that a field site visit was made to see if putting in storm drains would work on North Pole High School Boulevard where they have an area where water collected, but it was determined that it could not be done at a reasonable cost.

Mr. Butler stated that the money was already allocated so they thought that crack sealing was a good alternative since they always had pavement that needed it.

Mr. McBeath inquired what the cost would have been for installation of the storm drains.

Mr. Butler stated that there was only \$8,000 in the project and that was not enough for the installation.

Mr. McBeath inquired if it would accomplish delay of further erosion and infiltration of water.

Mr. Butler stated that it would delay further erosion and provide a seal on the road to prevent further degradation of the road.

Ms. Gardino stated that if they could get the DOT to do the work under their Preventative Maintenance Program that it would be more cost beneficial than hiring a separate contractor to do the work.

**Vote on Motion:** None opposed. Approved.

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

**Motion:** To recommend to the Policy Committee to approve the FFY16 Policy and Technical Committee Meeting dates. (Carpenter/Butler).

**Discussion:** No further discussion.

**Vote on Motion:** None opposed. Approved.

**h. Cowles Street Reconstruction Scoping**

Ms. Gardino explained that Cowles Street was one of the projects in the TIP that FMATS wanted to start as soon as possible. Ms. Gardino stated that in line with the Complete Streets Policy, they had heard from the DOT that they wanted FMATS to be more involved in the planning process and give them more direction.

Ms. Gardino stated that this project would be a City of Fairbanks project and the City would send a memo to DOT requesting that they be the ones to design the project, do the survey, and provide the environmental. Ms. Gardino stated that they wanted to be more involved in looking at the road and assisting DOT with ideas for what they wanted the road to look like.

Mr. Pristash stated that the first thing was to decide what they wanted the typical section to look like and whether they wanted to provide four-foot shoulders for bicycles with a six-foot sidewalk, or an eight foot sidewalk with no shoulders for bicycles. Mr. Pristash stated that he knew what they were supposed to do and what was safer for bicycles, but it was a unique street and there were aerial facilities and discontinuous sidewalks along the entire project. Mr. Pristash stated that they wanted to have a meeting or scoping session to see what they had now and what they wanted to do for a typical section because that defined the right-of-way, utilities, and other things.

Mr. McBeath inquired if there had ever been a scoping session open to the people living along Cowles. Mr. Pristash stated that he did not know. Mr. Pristash stated that there could have been public meetings about it.

Ms. Gardino stated that there had been no public meetings that she knew of but, there would be public meetings during the NEPA process.

Mr. Pristash stated that they would want an idea of what kind of typical they could do just to give people an idea and give them something to look at.

Ms. Gardino stated that they were not going to decide anything. Ms. Gardino stated that they just wanted to get their feedback. Ms. Gardino stated that it had to go through the NEPA process, they would have to have alternatives, and she assumed they would have a public meeting. Ms. Gardino stated that opportunity would be there. Ms. Gardino stated that this was just the initial scoping meeting to go out and look at the project and see what ideas they had for the road. Ms. Gardino stated that this was a new procedure that they were trying to follow.

Mr. McBeath stated that they usually needed something out there so that people could form their ideas around it or reaction to it. Mr. McBeath stated that there could be a couple of possibilities that met engineering standards such as a four-foot wide and then a separated bike path.

Mr. Pristash agreed and stated that was what he was saying the “typical section” was.

Ms. Gardino stated that they could make the sidewalks eight-feet with no shoulders, or do the four-foot shoulders and then five-foot sidewalks.

Mr. McBeath stated that those properties were pretty close to the road, so there would be a right-of-way take and that would be expensive. Ms. Gardino stated that there was 45-feet of right-of-way.

Mr. Pristash stated that they did have the right-of-way there. Mr. Pristash stated that within the existing right-of-way, they could do the typical that he was talking about. Mr. Pristash stated that they would need to have temporary right-of-way to build sidewalks to the right-of-way line.

Ms. Gardino stated that their goal was to look at every project to accommodate all users if possible and what it was they needed to have on Cowles Street.

Ms. Gardino asked Mr. Pristash if there was parking along Cowles Street.

Mr. Pristash stated that there was no parking along Cowles Street.

Ms. Gardino asked who would be interested in participating in a field trip.

Ms. Gardino wrote down: Alan Hoza, Jerry McBeath, Mary Pagel, Margaret Carpenter, Judy Chapman, Jackson Fox, Bob Pristash, and Kellen Spillman who thought he or Christine Nelson would probably go from the Borough.

Ms. Gardino stated that she would write Mr. Spillman down and he could facilitate that with Ms. Nelson.

Mr. Spillman commented that the Borough had gotten in trouble in Platting before because it had to be a noticed meeting.

Ms. Gardino stated that she had spoken with the lawyer and he said that it was not a meeting and they did not need to have it noticed. Ms. Gardino stated that she could only go on the advice that she received from the lawyer. Ms. Gardino stated that she specifically asked the question because there was really not a meeting location and they were going to be walking up and down the street.

Mr. Spillman stated that they had to notice site visits before per the Open Meetings Act, but they could talk about it after. Ms. Gardino stated that she had tried to cover that base and was told that they did not need to advertise it. Mr. Miller stated that he agreed with Ms. Gardino. Ms. Gardino stated that it depended on what lawyer you asked. Mr. Miller agreed and stated that he appreciated Ms. Gardino checking and she could only go with the advice she got because if you asked three attorneys you were going to get three different answers.

Ms. Carpenter stated that they should do something about their public involvement policy. Ms. Carpenter stated that they should look at that and see how it was addressed, because it kept coming up about meeting notices.

Ms. Gardino stated that she was not sure what Ms. Carpenter meant and asked her when it had come up. Ms. Carpenter stated that it had come up several times.

Ms. Gardino stated that this was the first time she had been unsure.

Ms. Giamichael stated that it came up when they scheduled the subcommittee meeting and then had to cancel and reschedule it because it was not advertised.

Ms. Gardino stated that was a mistake and not a question.

Ms. Carpenter stated that it should be addressed somewhere so they knew.

Ms. Gardino stated that it was addressed in the Open Meetings Act but she had checked with a lawyer and he said it was not needed. Ms. Gardino stated that they would do a Doodle Poll and include a couple different dates but she did not want to wait too long because there would be snow on the ground.

## **9. Public Comment Period**

No public comment.

## **10. Other Issues**

No other issues.

## **11. Informational Items**

### **a. Road Safety Audit – Badger Road**

Ms. Gardino introduced Pam Golden from DOT to provide an update of the results DOT obtained from the Badger Road Safety Audit and the status of the Highway Safety Improvement Program and the projects they were planning.

### **b. HSIP Program Update**

Ms. Golden explained the HSIP Program. Ms. Golden stated that the HSIP Program was one line item in the STIP and was an umbrella for a huge pot of money.

### **c. Noble Street Update**

Ms. Gardino introduced Russ Johnson from DOT to provide an update on the status of the project. Mr. Johnson stated that they had consulted out the right-of-way acquisition and could have possible condemnations so there was the likelihood of the date slipping. Mr. Johnson stated that the sewer line was another issue that needed to be addressed and was in bad shape. Mr. Johnson stated that the storm

drains also needed replacement. Mr. Johnson stated that those were all betterments. Final PS&E could possibly be done by May 2016 but there was a concern that the utility would drag their feet and they could lose time there. Mr. Johnson stated that they were at the point where the utility company would either have to get on board with them or they were going to just move ahead without the betterments to the project.

**d. Federal Highway Reauthorization Status (Funding Bill through 12.11.15)**

Ms. Gardino stated that the House was trying to come up with a Bill and there was no government shut down and managed to fund the government through 12/11/15.

**e. 09.16.15 Policy Committee Action Items**

Ms. Gardino explained the Policy Committee Action Items that were included in the meeting packet.

**f. Obligations and Offsets**

Ms. Gardino explained that there were no obligations and offsets since they did not have a TIP.

**12. Technical Committee Comments**

Mr. Pristash commented that Cushman Street was paved and there was one, six-inch lift and the side streets were being paved. Mr. Pristash stated that all the curb and gutter was in and sidewalks were being poured. Mr. Pristash stated that they had density and it was the strongest pavement he had ever seen. Mr. Pristash stated that the lighting packages were in and the signal poles. Mr. Pristash stated that he wanted to open the project in about ten days because he wanted to give the sidewalk contractor as much time as possible to pour the sidewalk, weather permitting.

**13. Adjourn**

**Motion to Adjourn:** (Butler). The meeting adjourned at 2:05 p.m.

The next Technical Committee meeting is Wednesday, November 4, 2015, at noon in the City Hall Council Chambers, 2<sup>nd</sup> Floor, 800 Cushman Street, Fairbanks, AK.

Approved: \_\_\_\_\_

  
Donna Gardino, Chair

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

10.7.15

FMATS Technical Committee