

**Fairbanks Metropolitan Area Transportation System
POLICY COMMITTEE
Main Conference Room
State of Alaska DOT&PF, 2301 Peger Road
Fairbanks, Alaska**

Meeting Minutes – February 20, 2013

1. Call to Order

Chair Steve Titus called the meeting to order at 10:02 am.

2. Introduction of Members and Attendees

Attendee	Representative Organization
*Mayor Jerry Cleworth	Mayor, City of Fairbanks
*Mayor Bryce Ward	Mayor, City of North Pole
*Mayor Luke Hopkins	Mayor, Fairbanks North Star Borough
*Guy Sattley, Vice-Chair	FNSB Assembly Member
*Perry Walley	City of Fairbanks, City Council
*Steve Titus, Chair	DOT&PF, Northern Region Director
*Cindy Heil (for Alice Edwards)	DEC Air Quality
***Donna Gardino	FMATS, MPO Coordinator
**Jessica Smith	FMATS, Transportation Planner/Assistant
**Deborah Todd	FMATS, Administrative Assistant
**Margaret Carpenter	DOT&PF Planning
+Ethan Birkholz	DOT&PF Planning
+Michael Schmetzer	City of Fairbanks, Public Works and Engineering
Linda Mahlen	DOT&PF Planning
Barry Hooper	DOT&&PF Design
+Bernardo Hernandez	FNSB Planning
Kellen Spillman	FNSB Community Planning
Adam Barth	FNSB Transportation
+Joan Hardesty	DEC Division of Air Quality
Julie Jones	Festival Fairbanks
Kris Reisenberg (via telephone)	FHWA

**FMATS Policy Committee Members, **FMATS Staff Members*

+FMATS Technical Committee Members

3. Public Comment Period

Ms. Gardino stated that she had received a couple emails with requests to be read into the public record during the public comment period. The first email Ms. Gardino read was from Candice Crews who stated in her email that she would be unable to attend the meeting, but for the record was in support of continued funding for sidewalks and widened shoulders along Chena Small Tracts. Ms. Crews wrote that she resides in the University Park area and her family uses Chena Small Tracts Road daily in the summer. She and her children ride bikes and take walks there, but are always concerned that there is very little room to move away from traffic. In most areas, if they really had to get out of the way, they would end up in the ditches. As it is a busy road, sidewalks or at least a widened shoulder would tremendously improve their safety during Alaska summers. During the winter she and her family use the road less frequently, but as a PTA member at Woodriver Elementary School,

she knows that many parents have voiced safety concerns for walkers of her neighborhood. She wrote that her school is at the bottom of the list in the district for Safe Routes to School and urged all involved parties to help improve it for their children who have no access to bus routes to get to school. A widened shoulder or a sidewalk along Chena Small Tracts with additional lighting would greatly enhance the safety of all Woodriver students who use the road. She wrote that she walks daily with her own children to school along Palo Verde and she knows how dark it is during the winter. Widened shoulders or sidewalks are needed to avoid traffic and lights to help the drivers see them. She wrote that those simple things simply do not exist in their neighborhood. She wrote that at least along Chena Small Tracts there is the possibility of widening the sides and providing a safe, lighted walkway. Ms. Crews urged them to take advantage of the attention and funding opportunities focused on Chena Small Tracts to make it a safer place for the community's children.

The second email that Ms. Gardino read into the record was from Anna Marie Benson regarding the bicycle path along Chena Small Tracts Road. Ms. Benson wrote that she is a parent of two children who attend Woodriver Elementary School and was writing to urge continued FMATS support of a bike path along Chena Small Tracts Road. Ms. Benson's email further stated that the situation is dangerous along this road, particularly in winter when there is poor visibility and children traveling to and from school. Ms. Benson wrote that children need safe spaces to walk and ride their bicycles and this neighborhood has lots of children and few safe spaces. Ms. Benson thanked Ms. Gardino for all she had done to support the Chena Small Tracts project and urged her encouragement of continued support for the project.

4. Approval of February 20, 2013 Agenda

- **Motion:** To approve the February 20, 2013 Agenda. (Ward/Sattley).
- **Vote on the motion:** None opposed. Approved

5. Approval of January 16, 2013 Minutes

- **Motion:** To approve the January 16, 2013 Minutes. (Ward/Sattley).
- **Vote on the motion:** None opposed. Approved.

6. Committee Reports

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

Ms. Gardino provided an update and highlights of all FMATS activities for the month of February 2013. The FMATS Staff Report and action items were included in the meeting packet.

b. FMATS Art Selection Update

Ms. Gardino stated that the State is continuing work on the contract with the artist and an agreement is being worked out with the contractor to hire the artist as a subcontractor. The Historic Plaque team meeting is scheduled for 2/27/13 to discuss selection of historic plaques for the greenspace.

c. Boundary Subcommittee Recommendation (Action Item)

Recommendation to the Policy Committee from the Technical Committee was to select Option D as the new FMATS MPA Boundary as presented.

Motion: To approve Option D as the new FMATS MPA Boundary, as presented. (Cleworth/Hopkins).

Discussion: Ms. Gardino presented the boundary option maps to the Policy Committee and discussed each option and the differences between them. Mayor Hopkins asked for an explanation about the area around Chena Ridge and Chena Pump where there were orange dotted lines labeled UZA on Option D. Mr. Spillman explained that the “UZA” was the Urbanized Area and in 2012 the Census Bureau released the 2010 Urbanized Area and it had to be included in the boundary as required by Federal Regulations. Ms. Gardino stated that the release of the census data precipitated the boundary changes. Mayor Hopkins asked about the increased Gold Hill Road area. Mr. Spillman stated that this was due to a census data boundary increase so the size of the area was increased to accommodate the change in the census blocks.

Vote on Motion: None opposed. Approved.

d. UPWP Subcommittee Recommendation

Recommendation: Recommendation of the Technical Committee was to return the work to the UPWP Subcommittee and review the Memorandum of Understanding against the UPWP to determine priorities and that the subcommittee will be comprised of the Technical Committee as a whole to establish funding to support the priorities.

Ms. Gardino stated that the UPWP Subcommittee met and discussed the MPO priorities defined by the CFR and the United States Code. The UPWP Subcommittee looked at those priorities and determined who the responsible agency was to establish the duties and responsibilities to be performed by each entity. The first priority was the Metropolitan Transportation Plan which is the long range plan that is reviewed by everyone and is the primary responsibility of the MPO, which in this case is the Coordinator’s Office. The UPWP is the primary responsibility of DOT because they are the recipient of the funding and ultimately are responsible for that funding. The UPWP is developed by all the entities that receive funding so at this time the DOT, the MPO, and the Borough all receive funding so they all prepare the UPWP and submit reports to DOT. The TIP preparation is the primary responsibility of the MPO and reviewed by all participants and project nominations come from other agencies and the public. The Boundary Map was the primary responsibility of the DOT with the Borough providing GIS support for map and census data review, and the MPO also provided support. The Public Participation Plan is an MPO priority that was previously produced by a consultant as part of the Long Range Plan but will be developed internally in the future. The Performance Based Planning is a new requirement under 23 USC 134 and as of December 14, 2012 it is required under MAP 21 that the MPO provides Performance Based Planning. The MPO has done Performance Based Planning in the past and it is in the Long Range Plan and will continue to be in the Long Range Plan but will be amended according to targets that are developed by the State which are not anticipated for a couple years. The MPO is required to publish all documents for public review on a website and previously this was a DOT task until a few months ago when the MPO developed a website. Self-Certification is the responsibility of the MPO. The general administration of the MPO is an MPO responsibility with support from the City of Fairbanks and the DOT. The Air Quality Conformity Analysis is considered a responsibility of the MPO, but the Borough provides the planning assumptions for the travel model and the DOT provides the travel model and air quality emissions consultant. The Code required an agreement between the Borough, the State DEC, and the MPO because the non-attainment area is larger than the MPO. Ms. Gardino stated that this should be a DOT responsibility because this issue is bigger than the MPO. Ms. Gardino

stated that currently the MPO manages the interagency consultation, the emissions consultant for the Conformity Analysis in the TIP and Long Range Plan; the DOT manages the Travel Model update and the Borough provides the assumptions for that. Ms. Gardino stated that those are the primary priorities of an MPO as defined in the Code and who is responsible for those tasks. Ms. Gardino stated that there were outcomes and goals an MPO was required to achieve to remain in good standing with the Federal Highway Administration and other activities are necessary to achieve those goals. Ms. Gardino stated that those activities included special studies such as the DOT Household Travel Study lead by DOT. The data will be used by the MPO and will inform the travel model that is used for all kinds of purposes. There are other contracts and agreements that DOT has to produce required by their own internal policies such as maintenance and match agreements. Plat reviews, platting updates, and rezoning are responsibilities of the Fairbanks North Star Borough which includes highway projects and right of way activities. The Borough also produces public involvement communication labels for project level work. There is participation by all the agencies in non-MPO lead committees and commissions such as: the Chena Riverfront Commission, the Borough Transportation Plan, Complete Streets, Wayfinding, Historic Plaques, the State Rail Plan, and the ADA Transition Plan. The Safe Routes to School is another group project that the MPO as well as the Borough is involved in.

Ms. Gardino stated that the next task for the committee was the determination of funding sources and origins of those funds. Ms. Gardino stated that the current funding sources were the PL funds and the provisions of 23 USC 134 was the document that the priority determination was based upon. Ms. Gardino stated that in MAP-21, the Surface Transportation Program (STP) funding is the most flexible of all the highway programs and can be used for highway, bridge, transit, pedestrian and bicycle infrastructure projects. She learned there were several other projects considered eligible for funding such as rehabilitation projects, deicing of bridges and tunnels, development of an asset management plan, carpool projects, recreational trails, electric and natural gas vehicle infrastructure, ferry boats and terminals, ITS, environmental mitigation, border infrastructure, work force development training and education activities, as well as surface transportation planning. There is also a 2% is set aside for state planning and research.

The State funds consist of 381 money (state funds) and strongly recommended priorities as hiring an FMATS Coordinator in 2007, CMAQ Program needs in 2008 and projects within the approved FMATS TIP and MPO office. The North Pole contribution was the least restrictive of all the funding. The Committee recognized that there was limited funding and the STP funding has been reduced 29% this fiscal year and that PL funding would be increased but the amount is not known. If funding were lost, what functions or tasks should be removed should be determined. There was discussion and agreement that there were certain areas where funding should be spent outside the MPO such as doing conformity, travel model and planning assumptions. It was decided that after considerable discussion the Technical Committee would return the decision back to the Policy Committee.

Discussion: Mayor Cleworth stated that he appreciated the effort that went into the funds discussion. Mayor Cleworth discussed the history of the problem of funding allocation that he had discussed at the Technical Committee meeting. Mayor Cleworth felt a good faith effort needed to be made to resolve this issue and stated that possibly a mediator needed to be brought in to help decide the distribution of planning funds.

Mr. Cleworth stated that if mediation were the route chosen it would probably not be costly and that something needed to be explored. Mr. Cleworth stated that Ms. Gardino had done more research on the issue than anyone else but something definitely needs to be done.

Mayor Hopkins stated that he was surprised that this issue was being returned to the Policy Committee without a clear recommendation. Mayor Hopkins stated that the discussion about conflicts with the grant and issues with inappropriate expenditures by the Borough was a volatile issue and there was no wrongdoing on the part of the Borough. Mayor Hopkins stated that the GIS efforts being performed by the Borough for the MPO were not fully recognized and many funds are supporting the MPO and many different interpretations of what is considered outside the MPO exist, but he does not feel that mediation is necessary to resolve the issues. Mayor Hopkins is not sure that the system is broken but there is inaccuracy in the statement of duties now performed.

Mr. Titus stated that speaking for the DOT impact on the PL funds is minimal compared to the in-kind services performed by DOT. The City gets no money and the Borough, MPO, and DOT get some PL funds. There is no in-kind dollar amount being contributed to FMATS by the MPO. A small amount of funding is received for the area size that is managed by the MPO. Mr. Titus stated that it may be time to compare the UPWP at inception in 2007 to the current time. The DOT is impacted the most because their in-kind contribution is the largest to the MPO. The Borough did not complete what their version of the allocation would be in the budget comparison prepared for the Technical Committee and UPWP. Differences of opinion exist as to who is doing what and how much they should receive. Mr. Titus does not believe we need to change the status quo but rather look at how things are reported and how MOU and UPWP are written to check for disparity and inaccuracies and we have grown and accomplished many things. We would not be where we are without Ms. Gardino's guidance and help.

Mr. Sattley asked how this funding issue was brought to the table. Mayor Cleworth stated that Mr. Roberts brought it up and thought it was time for the issue of how things were funded to be addressed.

Mayor Ward stated that the two conflicting documents needed to be clarified, the UPWP and MOU.

Mr. Titus stated that clarification has not been obtained from the Technical Committee so we might want to rethink the mechanism we have used to arrive at a conclusion or resolution to this issue.

Mayor Cleworth stated that he agreed with Mr. Titus and thought it would be better to have a mediator with no bias look at the two documents. Ms. Gardino agreed with Mayor Cleworth and Mr. Titus that fresh eyes on this subject would be better to achieve a resolution.

Mr. Titus stated that he did not want to downgrade the work performed by the Technical Committee but no agreement has been reached on this particular subject and should decide on a forum to resolve this issue.

Mr. Sattley stated that Mayor Cleworth's comment that the Borough was already doing some of the tasks being disputed by the MPO is true but that was because they had the

planning authority for the whole Borough and before the MPO the Borough Transportation Planner was funded by DOT and they were doing those things because they had the power.

Mr. Titus stated that we need to be careful because FHWA is an integral part of this discussion and they are aware that this is an issue that needs to be resolved.

Mayor Hopkins asked when the next UPWP approval is scheduled to come before the Policy Committee. Ms. Gardino stated that it is scheduled for next fall. Mr. Titus stated that it can be amended on a yearly basis but is a two year document. Ms. Gardino stated that it can be amended at any time. Mr. Titus stated that it sounds like the Technical Committee has returned the issue to the Policy Committee and they are struggling with it.

Mayor Cleworth stated that he agreed with Mayor Hopkins that the system is not broken and just needs some tweaking. Mayor Cleworth stated that maybe a legal mind should look at the issues and render their opinion and would not mind being bound by that opinion to bring a resolution to this issue perhaps a former DOT official or an attorney.

Mayor Hopkins stated that approval of the funding was the issue that Mr. Roberts had brought up and was it the City or the Coordinator's Office interested in the funding allocation at that time.

Mayor Cleworth stated that the more he looks at the issue, all the PL funding should all be allocated to the MPO. Mayor Cleworth stated that in reading the grant to him it seems like the funding should be going to the Coordinator's Office and stated he was surprised to find that the Borough position was to be absorbed into the MPO and he did not know that.

Mr. Titus stated that he agreed with Mayor Cleworth's statement that this issue needs to be resolved prior to voting on an amendment to the UPWP.

Mayor Hopkins had question about the document since he was seeing it for the first time at this meeting and wanted to know where planning approval authority is listed for the Borough. Mayor Hopkins felt that this was a major function performed by the Borough and DOT brought highway projects to the Borough for approval. Ms. Gardino stated that there was an oversight regarding inclusion of highway project approval by the Borough. Mayor Hopkins was surprised that this duties was listed under "other" in the priorities. Ms. Gardino stated that highway project approval is not listed in the Code but is a critical component and one of the elements affecting the outcome of the goals. Mayor Hopkins stated that he would go back to legal and see where planning fits in. Mayor Hopkins inquired about the Air Quality Conformity and how it fit in with the Draft MOU listed later in the agenda. Ms. Gardino stated that in the Code it did not say that an Operating Agreement had to be developed but did state that an MPO had to be formed. The Code states that an MPO has to be formed when a designation is received. When the MPO was formed and boundaries selected it was not specifically noted that the Operating Agreement must be updated.

Ms. Heil stated that it was easier and more cost effective to combine Air Quality issues with DEC and the Borough within the MPO. The DEC regulations are what manage and regulate the procedures and boundaries and implementation of interagency consultation.

Mr. Titus stated that this issue could be added as Old Business to the agenda for the next Policy Committee meeting.

7. Old Business

a. Illinois Reconstruction Update

Ms. Gardino presented the Illinois Street update stating that DOT held a project status meeting to go over accomplishments from last year and remaining work and bridge work should begin the last week of April or first week of May. There is \$7 million worth of work remaining to complete. All issues from construction last year have been addressed. Mr. Titus stated that the biggest concern for the project last year was traffic control and the contractor had not submitted their traffic control plan this year yet but there will be northbound traffic with intermittent closures when girders are being set during bridge construction. There will be northbound traffic on through from Illinois Street to College Road during bridge construction and no southbound traffic. There will be north and southbound traffic available at the entrance to Golden Valley. Mr. Titus stated that you will be able to travel north to Golden Valley, go into Golden Valley, and go back north or turn south, but there will be no southbound travel to Golden Valley. Mr. Titus explain that Minnie Street will be functioning and the DOT is pleased with how the project has progressed so far. Mr. Sattley asked if they were ahead or right on schedule. Mr. Titus stated that they are right on time. Mayor Hopkins had more questions regarding greenspace areas and stated that he would speak with DOT about that later. Mayor Hopkins stated that it was his understanding that maintenance of the greenspace would be the responsibility of the Borough. Mr. Titus stated that a maintenance agreement had been agreed upon between the City, the DOT and the Borough and everyone was very pleased about that.

8. New Business

a. FMATS Intergovernmental Operating Agreement and Memorandum of Understanding for Transportation and Air Quality Amendment #1 Draft (Action Item)

Recommendation: Technical Committee recommended approval of Operating Agreement and Memorandum of Understanding for Transportation and Air Quality, Amendment #1 Draft, as presented.

Motion: To approve Amendment #1 of the FMATS Inter-Governmental Operating Agreement and Memorandum of Understanding for Transportation and Air Quality, as presented. (Heil/Ward)

Discussion: Ms. Gardino stated that US Code was updated 12/14/12 and code definitions were used wherever possible and some sections were easier to delete and rewrite. The CFR has not been updated to reflect MAP 21. Document went to lawyers for City/Borough to review and minor changes were incorporated in draft with nothing of substance found. New boundary map will be attached to document. Mr. Titus stated that the signatories would be the Mayors and entities involved. Mr. Sattley asked if changes were all those listed in red. Ms. Gardino stated that all changes were bolded and comments in red were made by lawyers. Mr. Sattley asked about the Coordinator vote. Ms. Gardino stated that the motion failed at Technical Committee and the line was not removed. Ms. Gardino stated that she had voted twice in five years and only in the event of a tie.

Ms. Heil asked Mr. Reisenberg about updating an Operating Agreement and the rules for amendments and approval levels stating that you have to be careful when tweaking document so you do not end up having to have the Governor's signature. Ms. Carpenter stated that this only applied to Anchorage. Ms. Gardino stated that this was not considered a re-designation of the MPO. Mr. Reisenberg agreed with Ms. Gardino that this was not a re-designation of the MPO. Ms. Carpenter stated that we did have to have the Governor's signature.

Vote on Motion: None opposed. Approved.

b. Chena River Walk Phase III Phase 2 Funding (Action Item)

Ms. Gardino explained the agenda item was suggested by Mayor Cleworth.

Motion: To initiate the Chena River Walk project using \$400,000 of SB230 funding for preliminary engineering and design. (Cleworth/Walley).

Discussion: Julie Jones of Festival Fairbanks gave a presentation to the Policy Committee of the Chena River Walk project conceptual design. Ms. Jones requested that the design funding be categorized as Illustrative in the TIP with the goal to get going on final design phase work.

Mayor Hopkins stated that there was a unanimous vote to get this project into the TIP and then the Railroad proposed a river walk that would be along Chena Landing Loop and asked what had happened since then regarding the Borough desired permit area. Ms. Jones stated that a permit application was requested for the project from the Railroad in 2011 but because an existing right-of-way showing a bike path, the railroad put the bike path all the way down Phillips Field Road on Lots 4 and 5. The Railroad expressed concern about getting tenants on Lots 4 and 5. Ms. Jones stated that Lots 4 and 5 were not included in the current permitting process and address Lots 4 and 5 at a later date. Mr. Sattley inquired where the trailhead would be. Ms. Jones explained that the trailhead was to be on Peger Road but DOT informed them a driveway would not be allowed. Ms. Jones stated that the site study from 2006 will need to be updated but was hoping the project would get moved up into TIP. Mr. Titus asked about what would be accomplished with the FMATS funding of \$400,000. Ms. Jones stated that they would be looking all over the place for additional funding but would like to be considered in the budget for future funding. Mr. Titus asked if the \$400,000 was in addition to the \$3.8 million listed. Ms. Jones stated that there are grants pending and she has money for riparian zones and also wanted to point out that these bridges would be less costly than the William Wood Centennial Bridge. Mayor Hopkins asked if a railroad permit had been issued. Ms. Jones stated that they were awaiting the Railroad response to their permit submission. Mr. Hopkins stated that he had problem with the trailhead locations and who was approving the acceptance of the conditions of the railroad permit and felt that the Railroad was not being fair in their permitting process. Mr. Schmetzer explained that City staff helped with the design of the project. Once the design is accepted it may be DOT or some other entity performing the work and the issues would be worked out with the Railroad. Mr. Sattley asked how much space is available for the trailhead between Phillips Field Road and the river. Ms. Jones stated that they had not run the numbers and they might be able to put a kiosk there and have a bridge from near there that would cross over. Mr. Sattley stated that it looked really cramped in there. Mr. Hopkins asked if Festival Fairbanks had looked at the possibility of using the south side of the river.

Vote on Motion: None opposed. Approved

Amendment to the Motion: Any final railroad permit must come before the FMATS Policy Committee prior to execution. (Hopkins/Sattley).

Discussion: Mayor Ward inquired about the maintenance agreement for the project. Mayor Cleworth stated that he did not know who would maintain that project. Mayor Ward asked if the City of Fairbanks would be responsible for the Maintenance Agreement or if Festival Fairbanks would maintain the parking lot. Mayor Ward inquired if there would have to be an operating agreement in place before we funded the project. Mr. Titus stated that there will have to be a maintenance agreement in place but not sure who would be doing that right now. Mayor Ward stated that it should go through the nomination process but he would like to clarify the maintenance before the Policy Committee funds the project. Ms. Jones stated that the Railroad will be coming before the Policy Committee prior to final permit issuance and maintenance will have to be decided before that. Mr. Titus asked who was nominated to perform maintenance for that project. Ms. Gardino stated that she did not have that information available. Mayor Hopkins stated that there was a discussion regarding maintenance but no action item recommended when this was brought before the Policy Committee stating that City of Fairbanks had stated that they would assume maintenance but the discussion was open ended. Mayor Ward thought it sounded like a good project but should have a maintenance agreement in place prior to a vote on the project and that the process needs to be followed and maintenance agreement in place before the project is approved in the future.

Vote on Amendment to Motion: None Opposed. Approved.

c. Amendment to the 2012-2015 TIP Amendment #4

Ms. Gardino stated that there was no recommendation from the Technical Committee because the public comment period had not closed when the Technical Committee met, so she went over the changes to the TIP. Ms. Gardino stated that only comments received on the TIP were from the State. Ms. Gardino stated that right after the last Policy Committee meeting notice was received from the State that the funding allocation would actually be \$659,500 less to keep in line with the Anchorage funding percentage and therefore she had to amend the TIP to reduce the total for each fiscal year by \$659,500. Ms. Gardino stated that DOT had also commented that there was some general fund money available and she had taken out some GO Bond fund money and added in the general fund money to the TIP, but subsequently found out there was no general fund money available, so she removed the general fund money from the TIP again during the comment period. To accommodate those changes, Ms. Gardino stated that she took \$659,500 out of the Preventative Maintenance project in Fiscal Year 13, in Fiscal Year 14 she took \$659,500 out of the Cowles Street project, and in Fiscal Year 15 she took the \$659,500 from the Gold Hill project and made that portion of the construction illustrative to keep it fiscally constrained. Ms. Gardino stated that in Fiscal Year 13 she was still planning on funding Cowles Street as there was still some unallocated funds that were reduced but still available for use. Ms. Gardino stated that at that time there had been discussion about whether to fund a Preventative Maintenance Project for the South Cushman or Gillam projects and which project was selected would be the determining factor for how much money would be allocated to the Preventative Maintenance program. There was a total of \$1 million dollars in funding

which was more than enough for the preventative maintenance on the Gillam project but not enough for the South Cushman project. Ms. Gardino noted that the City and State met to discuss the constructability of both projects and she had not received the results of that meeting, but that they were leaning towards performing preventative maintenance on South Cushman. Ms. Gardino stated that she had received a planning level estimate from the DOT of \$2 million dollars for preventative maintenance on South Cushman but the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) had advised that curb corners of a road would have to be addressed when performing any preventative maintenance projects. So the DOT estimate of \$2 million dollars did not take curb corner compliance into consideration and the new estimate would probably be closer to \$3 million as a conservative estimate for preventative maintenance on South Cushman.

Mr. Titus asked whether a motion needed to be made since there was no recommendation from the Technical Committee to accept this amendment to the TIP.

Ms. Gardino stated that changes would need to be made prior to a motion if the South Cushman Preventative Maintenance Project were selected because currently there was only \$1 million in Preventative Maintenance so other funds would have to be put toward that and those funds were available.

Motion: To approve TIP Amendment #4, as presented. (Heil/Cleworth).

Discussion: Mayor Cleworth stated that at the last meeting the discussion was whether to allocate PM money to the South Cushman or Gillam. At that time it did not make sense to put the money on South Cushman so it was decided to put the money towards the Gillam project. Since then, the City met with DOT and tried to look for a solution since South Cushman was determined to be the number one concern of the community. It was decided that the money would be used to do the preventative maintenance, paving, sidewalks, and addressing drainage problems on South Cushman.

Amendment to the Motion: To move \$3,000,000 to PH4 of the Preventative Maintenance Program for South Cushman, including work on curb corners. Mayor Cleworth stated that the funding would come from the following sources:

- \$1 million already shown in the TIP
- \$146,100 not programmed in the current TIP Draft on Page 16
- \$700,000 from Cowles Street Reconstruction Phase 2
- \$1,153,900 from Offset Funding

The City would design the project and DOT would administer the construction with complete sidewalk work, duct tanks, and drainage would be addressed under a separate project using the designated State funds that have been obtained. (Cleworth/Heil)

Discussion: Mayor Hopkins inquired about the scope of work and completion schedule for the first part of work performed on the South Cushman project not counting funds that would be available later.

Mayor Cleworth stated that the hope was to obligate the PM monies by the end of the year and have a design for the project with completion slated for 2014. Mayor Hopkins stated that he was not at the meetings and had overhead discussions of just using the PM money for repaving using the grinding and cut down work method that was used on the University Avenue project and what that part of this or was that idea thrown out and more money now going to be spent on South Cushman. Mayor Cleworth stated that this was part of this project.

Mr. Schmetzer stated that PM funds were limited and there was not enough for drainage improvement and pavement replacement. Mr. Schmetzer stated all of South Cushman has been surveyed and that after looking at the project, he and Mr. Pristash were proposing using City funds for the design of the drainage upgrades on South Cushman with construction this summer. Mr. Schmetzer stated that there are a lot of places where the curb, sidewalk, and gutter pan have settled and there are places on South Cushman where the pavement is probably two feet thick due to pothole patching. With their survey data, the City could replace any bad gutter pan and sidewalk this summer, with Legislative funding provided directly to the City, and obligate the PM project by August 1st. All the drainage work could be done prior to the PM project so funding would cover the pavement replacement and ADA curb corner upgrades on South Cushman next year.

Mayor Hopkins asked whether all the money could be obligated this summer so we would not lose it. Mr. Schmetzer stated that we would not lose the PM money. Mayor Hopkins asked if that meant that we could have the PM money to spend next summer without having to go back to the bank for additional funding. Mr. Schmetzer explained that with the survey data the City currently has for the entire South Cushman corridor, every problem on the street could be taken care of before the PM funds were even touched. Mr. Schmetzer stated that he has an idea where those problems are and the exact locations would be determined by looking at the survey data. Mr. Sattley asked Mr. Schmetzer about construction this summer to replace the curb and gutter stating that this would cause a lot of pavement to be torn up and wondered what people would be driving on for a year until the pavement project was started next year. Mr. Schmetzer stated that some type of temporary pavement surface would be placed. Mr. Sattley asked if that would be a gravel surface. Mr. Schmetzer stated that it would not be gravel as that had been tried once on Wendell Street and he would not do that again. Mr. Sattley added that it made sense to do underground work first, temporarily pave the road, and then tear it up and repave it next year, but asked how much extra it would cost to do it that way. Mr. Schmetzer stated that they would not be disturbing much pavement except in locations where storm drain laterals and catch basins were installed. Mr. Sattley stated he understood then that it was just going to be torn up in spots.

Mr. Titus stated that the PM project would then go over the top of that next summer. Mayor Ward asked if this new base surface from the PM project on South Cushman would be the long term plan for South Cushman or if the pavement would be torn up again at a later date.

Mayor Cleworth stated that the long range plan would probably be to go back in but that funding coming out of Juneau for these type of projects would become scarcer and scarcer, so he expected this to last for a long time. Mayor Cleworth stated that

his hope was to go back in and address underground utilities but with future funding uncertainties, he expected that this would probably have to last quite a while.

Mr. Titus questioned Mayor Cleworth about his motion stating that the City would be performing the design work rather than the DOT with respect to obligation of Federal funds. Mr. Titus stated that his understanding from the meeting was that the DOT would be doing the design work and was concerned about obligation of Federal funds stating that in order to get Federal funding, the DOT needed to do the design work. He stated that he was not at the meeting but that representatives from DOT and the City were at that meeting. Mr. Schmetzer stated that since the meeting, the City realized that they should not proceed with a PM project without first upgrading the drainage if they had the money available at the City to do those upgrades. Mr. Schmetzer further stated that he did not have approval from his boss to spend the City money at that meeting.

Mr. Titus stated that was a different project than the PM project. Mr. Schmetzer stated that you could not separate the projects because you are changing grade points, repairing gutter pans, and repairing everything. Mr. Titus inquired what kind of money would be used for that. Mr. Schmetzer stated that it was state money. Mr. Titus stated that if it was state GF money and they were talking about a PM project which was Federal money and could be two separate projects. Ms. Gardino stated that they were two separate projects. Mr. Titus stated that his concern was about tying up Federal money when GF funding was available so that PM money did not have to be banked. Mr. Schmetzer stated that when Mr. Pristash started designing the storm drainage for the entire project corridor, the PM process would be minimal and could be completed in a very short time period. Mr. Titus stated that we needed to be sure that we could meet that deadline for the design phase and asked Mr. Hooper if he could comment on that since he had attended that meeting. Mr. Hooper stated at that meeting it was discussed that DOT would do the PM design and what the DOT strategy would be make the PM project work with the City changes to match the curb work with the PM work. Mr. Hooper stated that he shared Mr. Titus' concern about meeting Federal requirements for funding obligations. Mr. Titus stated that he was not sure the City could meet the Federal requirements for obligating the money. Mayor Hopkins inquired if this action could be postponed for a month. Ms. Gardino stated that this action could not be postponed. Mayor Cleworth stated that the action should not be postponed but instead modified by elimination of the sentence. Mr. Titus stated that he would prefer to take the sentence out and work on it because if we vote on the motion then we are locked in to a process and he is not in the habit of making amendments.

Amendment to the Above Motion: Mayor Cleworth stated that with the concurrence of the second he would like to amend his prior motion to eliminate the sentence: "The City would design the project and DOT would administer the construction with complete sidewalk work, duct tanks, and drainage would be addressed under a separate project using the designated State funds that have been obtained. (Cleworth/Heil)

Vote on Amendment to the Above Motion: None Opposed. Approved.

Discussion: Mr. Titus stated that he assumed all Mayor Cleworth's numbers were correct and had been coordinated with Ms. Gardino. Ms. Gardino stated that she forgot to mention that she had added University Avenue back into the TIP even

though it was going to be in the STIP because it did not make it in the last Amendment so she reinserted it until it officially gets back in the STIP. Mr. Birkholz commented that inherent in that motion was the assumption that Gillam would not be funded. Ms. Gardino stated that there was no money in the PM program for Gillam. Mr. Birkholz stated that it should be clarified. Ms. Gardino stated that Mr. Birkholz had a good point. Mayor Hopkins inquired about the Cowles project start date. Ms. Gardino stated that the Cowles project was not funded because it was to be funded in FY14 but we lost \$659,000 and we had extra this year, but it will not be started this year, so the project has moved out of the TIP. Mayor Hopkins asked if that meant that what we were voting on was to move the project start date up a year with \$700,000. Ms. Gardino explained that Mayor Cleworth's motion amended that and Mayor Cleworth took the \$700,000 to make South Cushman Street project whole. Mayor Hopkins stated that since he did not have that information in front of him he did not know what was done. Ms. Gardino stated that Mayor Hopkins was correct that Cowles Street Reconstruction project start is no longer in FY13 or 14, but we might still get more offset funding and could get the Cowles Street project started and an updated SSE is being worked on. Mayor Hopkins asked for clarification of the funding sources for South Cushman. Mr. Titus asked Mayor Cleworth if he had checked those numbers with the Coordinator's office. Mayor Cleworth stated that he had and did not make the numbers up. Mr. Titus asked Mayor Cleworth to repeat the funding source information. Mr. Sattley asked if Mayor Cleworth could repeat the list again. Mayor Cleworth repeated the funding list of: \$1 million already shown in TIP, \$146,100 not programmed in the current TIP draft on Page 16, \$700,000 from Cowles Street Reconstruction Phase 2, and \$1,153,900 from Offset Funding. Ms. Gardino stated that the Offset Funding List in the meeting packet noted that right now there was \$1,258,000 in offset funding but there was also \$440,000 pending offsets leaving a total of \$1,700,000 in offset funding and this would take all but \$600,000 and the TIP also included \$350,000 leaving \$350,000 offset funding available. Ms. Gardino further explained that \$500,000 had already been accounted for change orders on Illinois Street but this would still leave funding available. Mayor Hopkins asked if that meant that the four lines for preventative maintenance funding in the TIP Amendment Summary would now be going to fund South Cushman. Ms. Gardino clarified that the results of the previous actions made the balance in preventative maintenance \$1 million dollars and the \$700,000 taken from the Cowles Street project put back into Preventative Maintenance and that was where the money . Mayor Hopkins requested a copy of the new summary to the TIP.

- d. Chena Small Tracts Bike and Pedestrian Facility Project Update and Funding**
Presentation by Barry Hooper of DOT is included in the meeting packet.
- e. Yankovich - Miller Hill Bike and Pedestrian Facility Construction Funding**
- **Motion:** To add \$500,000 of state funds to Phase 4 of the Yankovich-Miller Hill Bicycle and Pedestrian Facility project. (Heil/Sattley).
 - **Discussion:** Mayor Hopkins asked about the issues along the farm road, particularly what the scope of the project was for this area. Mr. Hooper and Mr. Titus said they did not know at this time, but could find out. Mr. Birkholz said he understood the scope to include a separated path just north of Dalton Trail, crossing over to University land, but was not clear on the scope toward Sheep Creek Road. Mayor Hopkins mentioned the university's study as presented by Mr. Scott Bell in a previous meeting, and felt there was a lot of angst about the approach to the roundabout. Mayor Hopkins said he would like to hear details

again before the project design was ready for construction in February 2014. Mayor Hopkins asked if a delay of this action item prevent DOT in continuing design work? Mr. Titus and Ms. Gardino confirmed that it would not delay design. Mr. Titus asked Mr. Hooper if the Policy Committee could be briefed at a later time on this project; Mayor Hopkins said he would like to hear an update before making a decision. Ms. Gardino confirmed that the decision could be delayed until more information is presented.

- **The motion was withdrawn (Heil/Sattley).**

9. Public Comment Period

None.

10. Other Issues

None.

11. Informational Items.

a. Update on the Design of the FNSB Bus Shelters

Adam Barth gave update to the PC on the FNSB Bus Shelters. Mr. Sattley asked about the heat in the shelters and if it had been discussed stating that electrifying the shelters increases the cost of the shelters. Mr. Barth stated that there is about \$1.7 million in the current budget. About \$25,000 per shelter with no electric and double that for electric. Mr. Sattley thinks that heating the shelter is insane. Mr. Titus agreed. Mr. Sattley stated that if the cost is twice as much to electrify and heat, they could build twice as many non-heated and electrified shelters. Mayor Ward stated that the designs for the heated shelters that he saw were open and it was ridiculous to heat an open shelter. He believed that heating the building if it was open wasn't cost effective. Adam Barth stated that the idea for the heat in an open shelter would be to provide a timed heat. Mayor Cleworth stated that the Marriott Hotel has a problem with homeless people near the heat exchange vent and believed that an open heated bus shelter would have the same problem.

b. University Avenue NHS Designation Approval

FHWA confirmed that University Ave. is now a part of the NHS and will be removed from TIP as soon as it gets in the STIP. Mr. Sattley asked about grandfathered money that was available for University Avenue. Ms. Gardino stated that all the money was used for Illinois Street change orders and that wiped out the University Avenue grandfathered funds and the project will now be DOT funded.

Mayor Hopkins asked about University Ave comments and if they made any change to the TIP or STIP. Ms. Gardino stated that all the comments were listed on the STIP page but not sure if Mayor Hopkins' comments were specifically addressed.

c. Obligations/Offset List

Ms. Gardino presented information regarding obligations and offsets.

d. State of Alaska ADA Transition Plan and State Rail Plan

Ms. Gardino stated that the State is getting together an ADA Transition Plan but has not received any further communication on that, and also a State Rail Plan. Mayor Hopkins inquired when the request was sent out. Ms. Gardino stated that on 1/24/13

she received an invitation to participate in the State Rail Plan update. She received a letter that the first meeting would be 2/26/13 from 1-4:30 in Anchorage. She could attend telephonically but would prefer to attend in person. Mr. Titus stated that Sara Mason would be attending from DOT. Mayor Ward stated that he would like to attend the meeting either telephonically or in Anchorage. Mayor Hopkins stated that a motion should be made that meetings should be held along the railbelt. Mayor Ward stated that he had spoken about participation and this committee is for statewide railbelt plan not just the interior. Mr. Titus stated that he would research this and find out what the particulars are.

e. Correspondence from Representative Kawasaki

Ms. Gardino talked about correspondence from Representative Kawasaki regarding the Interior Delegation briefing held in December thanking FMATS for their presentation. Mr. Birkholz tendered his resignation from the Technical Committee in preparation for his May 1, 2013 retirement and assigned Margaret Carpenter to assume his position.

12. Policy Committee Comments

Mayor Cleworth asked about a Technical Committee Meeting wherein sixteen items were noted as needing resolution in the local planning approval agreements. Ms. Gardino stated that her recollection was that the Borough and DOT would be looking at that to resolve. Mayor Cleworth added today was a good discussion.

Ms. Heil stated that the comment period on the LMP ended last Friday.

Mr. Titus thanked everyone for the good discussion of UPWP and asked them to think about earlier options discussed.

Mayor Hopkins stated that he was disappointed in the vote at the last Policy Committee meeting on the South Lathrop Railroad Crossing and knows there are issues with maintenance but it serves businesses in this community and hopes this topic can be brought up again in the future.

13. Adjourn

- **Motion to adjourn.** (Sattley/Ward).
- **Vote on the motion.** None opposed. Approved.

Meeting adjourned at 12:53 p.m. The next Policy Committee Meeting is scheduled for 10:00 a.m., Wednesday, March 20, 2013 at DOT&PF Main Conference Room on Peger Road.

Approved: Steve Titus
Steve Titus, P.E., Chair
FMATS Policy Committee

Date: 2/20/13