



POLICY COMMITTEE

Main Conference Room

State of Alaska DOT&PF, 2301 Peger Road

Fairbanks, Alaska

Meeting Minutes – August 21, 2013

1. Call to Order

Steve Titus called the meeting to order at 10:00 a.m.

2. Introduction of Members and Attendees

Attendee

*Mayor Jerry Cleworth
 *Mayor Bryce Ward
 *Bernardo Hernandez for Mayor Luke Hopkins
 *Guy Sattley, Vice-Chair
 *Perry Walley
 *Steve Titus, Chair
 *Cindy Heil for Alice Edwards
 †Joan Hardesty
 **†Donna Gardino
 **Aaron Buckley
 **Deborah Todd
 †Michael Schmetzer
 †Bob Pristash
 **Kellen Spillman
 **Margaret Carpenter
 **Linda Mahlen
 Ryan Anderson
 Meadow Bailey
 Rob Campbell
 Kris Riesenber-(via telephone)
 Tami Seekins
 John Jackovich
 Rynniva Moss
 Pete Fellman
 Mike Smith
 Clifton Coghill

Representative Organization

Mayor, City of Fairbanks
 Mayor, City of North Pole
 Mayor, Fairbanks North Star Borough
 FNSB Assembly Member
 City of Fairbanks Council Member
 DOT&PF, Northern Region Director
 DEC Division of Air Quality
 DEC Division of Air Quality
 FMATS, MPO Coordinator
 FMATS Transportation Planner
 FMATS, Administrative Assistant
 City of Fairbanks, Public Works & Engineering
 City of Fairbanks Engineering Department
 FNSB Community Planning
 DOT&PF Planning
 DOT&PF Planning
 DOT&PF Preconstruction
 DOT&PF Information Officer
 DOT&PF – Central Region
 FHWA
 Citizen
 Citizen-Owner of Big I
 Senator Coghill's Office
 Senator Bishop's Office
 Senator Bishop's Office
 Representative Higgins Office

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

3. Public Comment Period (3 minute limit)

Ms. Gardino introduced Aaron Buckley, the new FMATS Transportation Planner to the Policy Committee. Ms. Gardino stated that Mr. Buckley was from Ohio and held a Master's Degree in Planning. Mr. Titus welcomed Mr. Buckley and stated that he thought that Mr. Buckley would find the meeting very interesting. Mr. Titus explained that there were two, three-minute public comment periods and invited anyone wishing to comment to raise their hands. Mr. Jackovich stated that he owned the Big I and was at the meeting regarding the Illinois Street landscaping. Mr. Jackovich stated that he was extremely happy with how the landscaping through the Illinois Street and in front of his business looked. Mr. Jackovich stated that he thought the DOT took the time to do it right and as a business owner he appreciated the money and effort put forth there. Mr. Jackovich stated that he understood the pride that went into it and wanted them to know that he would his best to do what was needed to be done to continue to maintain the area the same way in the future.

Tami Seekins stated that she was here to see what happened with the Chena Small Tracts project. Ms. Seekins stated that she had been involved with the project for a number of years. Ms. Seekins stated that at the last FMATS meeting there had been a recommendation to direct DOT to come up with three design plans and have them ready for presentation with budgets to the Legislature for possible funding. Ms. Seekins stated that she would like to see the project recommended even though there had been some controversy from a small group of people regarding the effect on the gravel pond, but everybody agreed that something needed to be done there. Ms. Seekins stated that this was the safe route to school that her children would be taking to get to school and as a parent she was uncomfortable with the fact that the road had no shoulders, was very dangerous, and people went 40 mph at a minimum. Ms. Seekins stated that her concern was that if they did not go forward with this plan and ask DOT to do these designs, the project would be halted by a couple of homeowners with hypothetical concerns and she did not want to see that happen so if this was the way to move the project forward for the safety of the children and the community, then that was what she was for.

4. Approval of August 21, 2013 Agenda

- **Motion:** To approve the August 21, 2013 Agenda. (Sattley/Heil).
- **Vote on the motion:** None opposed. Approved

5. Approval of July 17, 2013 Minutes

- **Motion:** To approve the July 17, 2013 meeting minutes. (Ward/Hernandez)
- **Vote on the motion:** None opposed. Approved.

6. Committee Reports

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

Ms. Gardino stated that she had Grand Jury duty for the entire month of September and might not be able to get out of it, so she might not be able to attend the Technical or Policy Committee meetings. Ms. Gardino provided an update and highlights from workshops and meetings she had attended and all other FMATS activities that had occurred from the report included in the meeting packet.

7. Old Business

a. Public Participation Plan Comments To Date

Ms. Gardino explained the public participation plan was out for comment until the end of August. Ms. Gardino stated that she had not received any public comment until yesterday when she received comments from the Alaska DOT Civil Rights Office and would incorporate those comments.

b. Local Planning Approval Agreement Comments

Ms. Gardino explained the comments received and transmitted to DOT and the FNSB that were included in the meeting packet.

Discussion: Ms. Gardino explained that the draft agreement was being rewritten and prepared for submission at the next Technical Committee meeting.

Mr. Sattley inquired about the three items in the packet regarding the local planning approval comments. Mr. Sattley stated it was all very interesting but on the third page it shifted to first person language and wanted to know who the individual was from the City of Fairbanks who had written the comments.

Ms. Gardino stated that it was her understanding that several people had reviewed the Local Planning Approval (LPA) Agreement within the City of Fairbanks and the staff had forgotten to change pronouns but was not sure who.

Mr. Titus inquired if Mayor Cleworth wanted to address that. Mayor Cleworth stated that he had not drafted the report, so if Mr. Schmetzer wanted to address that he could. Mr. Schmetzer stated that Jackson Fox, the City Environmental Manager, had drafted up the compiled comments. Mr. Sattley inquired if the paperwork got reviewed by the Technical Committee. Ms. Gardino stated that the Borough and State would review and incorporate the comments, redraft the agreement, and then bring it back to the Technical Committee. Mr. Sattley inquired if it was like a working group presenting it to the Technical Committee.

Ms. Gardino stated that the Borough and the State DOT were working on the agreement and it was her understanding that they would present it to the Technical Committee. Mayor Cleworth stated that the Technical Committee had come up with a list of ideas and comments to be incorporated in the list and he did not see those comments on the list, but he was sure there were some other comments being considered that would be included as well.

8. New Business

a. Chena Small Tracts Project Update and Recommendation (Action Item)

Motion: To recommend to direct DOT&PF to continue the design on the Chena Small Tracts Improvement project, including reconsidering alternatives with widened shoulders, sidewalks, lighting, repaving the roadway, and fencing. (Hernandez/Sattley).

Discussion: Ms. Gardino explained that at the June 2013 Technical Committee meeting, the DOT had presented the current design for the Chena Small Tracts project which was a separated path. Ms. Gardino stated that the

separated path option was in the final design phase right now and needed about \$985,000 to go to construction and the total was a \$1.5 million dollar construction project as shown in the meeting packets. Ms. Gardino stated that at the June meeting, the Technical Committee had asked the DOT to provide them with the alternatives and planning level estimates for those alternatives also included in the meeting packet. Ms. Gardino stated that the construction estimate for repaving the road with six-foot wide shoulders was \$2.7 million and the construction estimate to add an 8-foot sidewalk on the north side, regrade, and repave the road was \$2.6 million. Ms. Gardino stated that the Technical Committee discussed the options and decided to take no action until the August meeting at which time the recommendation on the table today was made. Ms. Gardino stated that the August Technical Committee meeting was held in the City Council Chambers in front of a standing room only crowd. Ms. Gardino stated that there were many people commenting on the project at the meeting. Ms. Gardino stated that she had just received the draft meeting minutes yesterday, but had already posted the recording of the meeting along with the written comments she had received online at the FMATS website. Ms. Gardino stated that she received 18 letters/emails of support and three letters in opposition to the project. Ms. Gardino stated that everyone in the room had commented that something needed to be done and it was not a safe place. Ms. Gardino stated that there was no definite preference, but everyone had agreed that something definitely needed to be done.

Mr. Titus read a summary of the Chena Small Tracts project public comments received by DOT stating that there were 38 comments in support of the project and 7 were opposed. The results received in support of the current design were: 29 in favor of a separated path with 7 against and there were a total of 48 comments received. Mr. Titus stated that it appeared that there was a lot of support for a project and the current project but however, there were some folks who did not like the current project as designed.

Mr. Titus stated that since the motion was directing the DOT he wanted to provide more information regarding the project process. Mr. Titus explained that in 2010 funds were received through the Legislature by DOT, not FMATS, in the amount of \$150,000 in general funds to design a project. Mr. Titus stated that on January 1, 2011, FMATS donated \$350,000 to the project and at that time that was done because the project was not moving forward and the FMATS Committee thought that if they donated the general fund dollars, the project would move forward, and it did. Mr. Titus stated that the project moved forward and later that year another \$100,000 was received from the Legislature.

In 2012, Mr. Titus stated that \$298,000 in General Funds was appropriated by the Legislature and so there was \$898,000 available in General Funds for the project. Mr. Titus explained that the DOT was put under pressure in the spring of 2011 to design a project. The project started moving in

February 2011 and the project scope was changed to conform with the capital request that was provided and the original scope request included a road upgrade and bike/pedestrian facility. Mr. Titus stated that there had been discussions about changes in project scope, but the bike path was always within the scope of work being done.

Mr. Titus stated that there were questions whether the project was an FMATS project or not. The Department was given money to design the facility and multiple public hearings were held, one in October 2012 and one in January 2013. Mr. Titus stated that the options from this motion were all proposed and a number of them were rejected. Mr. Titus stated that at the meeting in January 2013 the separated bike path proposal was accepted by the community, so the Department moved ahead and designed that project. Mr. Titus stated that the project was designed and was ready to go to bid.

Mr. Titus stated that DOT reported through the Legislature about it and they could not go to the Federal program to get money since it was all General Fund money and they were led to believe that last year the capital dollars were going to be appropriated, but that did not happen. Mr. Titus stated that a number of Legislators looked at the project and voiced their support. Then, last fiscal year, the Department received Legislative authority to receive and spend the money, but that did not mean they received the money. Mr. Titus stated that had the project received the \$900,000, the project would probably already have been built this spring and been pretty close to being completed now.

Mr. Titus stated that the folks around the lake became concerned about the project because now the project was imminent. Mr. Titus stated that Senator Bishop and Representative Higgins both held town meetings with standing room only about the project and the concerns associated with the project. Mr. Titus stated that the Department thought the project met the needs of the community at one time and now there had been concerns raised through the Technical and Policy Committees and they were directing the Department to change the project. Mr. Titus stated that the Department had followed what the Legislature instructed them to do and had spent General Fund money to do what was directed and now were potentially being directed to do something different including things that were already looked at. Mr. Titus stated that the Department was not real excited about doing all the things the motion stated they needed to do as they had already been done. Mr. Titus further stated that he would suggest that if this were going to be an action by the Policy Committee, the Policy Committee would need to indicate that the Technical Committee needed to resolve through whatever means, what the project was going to be. Mr. Titus stated that Ms. Seekins had stated that she was in favor of the project, but in order to have a project she would support what would make it safer for the children on the road. Mr. Titus stated that he would vote against the motion, as currently crafted, and would encourage

everyone else to do the same keeping in mind that the Phase 4 construction money would have to come through the Legislature. Mr. Titus stated that it would be the individuals, not the Policy Committee, who needed to advocate for that. Mr. Titus stated that he understood that FMATS had general funds to apply towards the project, but which project was also the question. Mr. Titus stated that they as a Department wanted to be participatory and get the work for the infrastructure they had done but did not want to do it over and over again when they thought they had done their process and had a project that was ready to go, that was frugal, met the Legislative intent, at one time met the intent of the community, and was a very safe project.

Mr. Hernandez stated that his understanding was that the project was dead or stopped and was not going any further. Mr. Hernandez stated that since there was a project already approved by the Borough that was ready to go but understood the project was stopped. Mr. Titus stated that the project was ready to go but without any additional construction funding appropriated it would be shelved until the funds were available. Mr. Titus stated that you could say the currently designed project was stopped due to a lack of funding.

Mayor Cleworth stated that he had attended the Technical Committee meeting and heard all the comments and most of the discussions by members of the Technical Committee that followed. Mayor Cleworth stated that he knew that DOT had representation at the Technical Committee meeting and inquired if that meant that the DOT representative had voted in error to bring this motion forward to the Policy Committee since he did not approve of the motion. Mr. Titus stated that he was not sure how the DOT representative had voted. Ms. Gardino stated that the Technical Committee vote had been unanimous. Mr. Titus stated that then it sounded to him like the DOT representative might have voted in error. Mr. Sattley inquired if that meant Mr. Titus was advocating defeat of the amended motion as Mr. Hernandez read it and then recommend a further motion be made by somebody to have it sent back to the Technical Committee.

Mr. Titus stated that if the Policy Committee were going to move forward with that project and think of funding it, then he believed that the Technical Committee needed to work with the community to come up with which project DOT was going to design and there were lots of solutions, and only one design solution. Mr. Sattley inquired if that meant that this motion did not address the second half of that. Mr. Titus stated that Mr. Sattley was correct.

Ms. Heil inquired if the question was whether or not FMATS wanted to take on the funding of the project or not, and if so, then it would have to be redesigned because federal money required the federal design. Ms. Gardino stated that the project was State funded. Ms. Heil asked if the project would stay State funded. Ms. Gardino stated that it would stay State funded. Ms. Heil inquired if that meant that then it was a matter of whether FMATS would expend the General Fund money to redesign or finish the project. Ms. Heil inquired if that meant that was the decision that FMATS was trying to

decide now. Mr. Titus stated that Ms. Heil was correct and there was a completed design ready to go. Ms. Heil inquired if the design were accepted would the project be ready to go. Mr. Titus stated that Ms. Heil was correct and it would. Ms. Heil stated that she felt that it was a policy decision and did not need to go back to the Technical Committee. Ms. Heil stated that the first question was whether FMATS used their own money or not and if they said no, then there was no more discussion. Ms. Heil stated that if they said yes, then there would be a motion. Mr. Titus thanked her for the discussion.

Mayor Ward stated that the question was whether we wanted to redesign the project and he thought the project had gone through all the process and saw no reason based on public involvement to go back and redesign it.

Mayor Ward stated that he thought everyone wanted the project and the question came down to funding. Mayor Ward stated that he saw no reason the project needed to go back to design, we should finish up what we've got, and ask the Legislature to fund that. Mayor Ward stated that he did not think it was necessary to send the project back and he was not in favor of the motion.

Mr. Sattley stated that he disagreed with the DEC representative and the first priority was to figure out which design was wanted. Mr. Sattley stated that having the Technical Committee do that was fine. Mr. Sattley stated that first was the design and secondary was the money not the money first, in his opinion.

Mayor Cleworth stated that in the Safe Routes to School Program there were several projects that were done under that program and asked Ms. Gardino whether this project was part of that program. Ms. Gardino stated that they did a Safe Routes to School Plan and a sidewalk along Chena Small Tracts was a recommendation that came out of that plan, but they had not received any Safe Routes to School Federal funding to implement that portion of the plan. Ms. Gardino stated that the Borough had received funding to build a sidewalk along Palo Verde which was the school associated with Chena Small Tracts. Mayor Cleworth stated that it was his take on the meeting was that people there were trying to come up with a plan that would appease everyone including the lake folks that were upset with it. Ms. Gardino stated that had been her take on the meeting as well.

Mr. Hernandez stated that he agreed with Mayor Ward that we already had a project that was ready to go, not everyone totally agreed with it, but often people did not agree to a project. Mr. Hernandez stated that the project had been approved by the Borough Planning Commission. Mr. Hernandez stated that he did not disagree with Mr. Sattley's suggestion about sending the project back to the Technical Committee either. Mr. Hernandez stated that he felt that this was an important project. Mr. Hernandez stated that this was a route to school, people were driving 40 mph or faster, and there were no places for kids to walk or ride their bicycles. Mr. Hernandez stated that he felt that this was an opportunity to move forward. Mr. Hernandez stated what he

would like to do was see that the project continue to move forward maybe using some portion of FMATS funding. Mr. Hernandez stated that he wanted to hear what people thought about either sending the project back or making a decision to go forward with the project.

Mr. Titus stated that as he understood the motion, a vote for the motion might open up redesign mode of the project and there might be some issues with the Department over that.

Mr. Walley inquired if the project was redesigned and funding were there next year would the redesign jeopardize that funding. Mr. Titus stated that it was a possibility and would depend on what design were chosen and if right-of-way or additional clearing were involved that would impact the construction season next year and depending on which way others decided to go, it might not happen. Mr. Titus stated that if the current design were tightened up and the Policy Committee decided to use General Fund money to fund the project, the project could start next spring as designed.

Amendment to the Motion: To delete “to direct”; delete “to continue” and replace it with “finish”; delete everything after “Improvement project” and add “have the FMATS Policy Committee solicit legislative monies to move to construction.” (Ward/Sattley)

Discussion: Mr. Sattley stated that this would accomplish what we were thinking of doing in two motions which was to defeat the original motion, and then have another motion to send it back to the Technical Committee. Mr. Titus clarified the motion to Mr. Sattley and stated that the motion would be to finish up the current design. Mr. Sattley stated that Mr. Titus was right and it would not go back to the Technical Committee and would solve the whole thing. Mr. Titus stated that the way he understood it, the intent of Mayor Ward’s motion was to finish up the current design and then solicit funding from the Legislature for the project. Mayor Ward stated that Mr. Titus was correct and that was the intention behind his motion and later on FMATS could always come back through and fund the project if the Legislature did not feel inclined to fund the project in the spring.

Mr. Sattley inquired if Mr. Titus was comfortable with his Department being asked via the motion to solicit funding and if that was wording Mr. Titus was comfortable with. Mr. Titus stated that the Policy Committee would solicit the funding. Ms. Gardino reread the motion to clarify the wording to everyone. Mr. Sattley inquired if that wording was bearable to Mr. Titus. Mr. Titus stated that it was not acceptable once he totally understood the motion. Mr. Sattley stated that was why he had asked. Mr. Titus stated that the Department soliciting money was a dicey deal. Mr. Titus stated that if the motion were to say: “and the Policy Committee would solicit”, that would be better because the Policy Committee would be asking for the money from the Legislature. Mr. Titus explained that if it did not happen in the spring, the Policy Committee would still have the opportunity in May to fund the project and still get it completed next summer. Ms. Heil suggested that instead of the motion

directing the DOT it could be reworded to say: “The Policy Committee supports or encourages the DOT to continue rather than directed them to finish the design.....”.

Vote on Amendment: Six in favor. One opposed. (Cleworth). Approved.

Amended Motion: To recommend DOT&PF finish the design on the Chena Small Tracts Improvement project and have the FMATS Policy Committee solicit legislative monies to move to construction.

Vote on Motion: Six in favor. One opposed. (Cleworth). Approved.

b. Foundation and Installation Funding (Action Item)

Motion: To use \$142,000 of SB230 funding for the foundation and art installation. (Heil/Hernandez).

Discussion: Ms. Gardino explained the cost breakdown for installation of the artwork foundation. Ms. Gardino explained that this had been a Federally funded project and now it was a State funded project. Ms. Gardino explained that previously the ICAP funds had come out of the Illinois Street project, but since it was no longer part of that project, now the funding was coming out of the project ICAP. Ms. Gardino explained that she had been assured by Mr. Titus’ Construction staff that this was a good estimate for the foundation work. Mr. Titus commented that the money was needed to cover some unforeseen sight conditions encountered by the contractor which raised the cost to \$142,000 to keep the project moving forward. Mr. Titus explained that the DOT was hoping the price would come in less, but it should not come in any higher than that amount. Mr. Titus stated that he had Construction personnel look at the construction costs to ensure that they were reasonable and had been assured that they were.

Vote on Motion: None opposed. Approved.

c. FFY14 FMATS Coordinator’s Office Budget (Action Item)

Motion: To approve the FMATS Coordinator’s Office Budget for Fiscal Year 14, as presented. (Hernandez/Heil).

Discussion: Ms. Gardino stated that every August she came to the Policy Committee with the budget breakdown included in the meeting packets. Ms. Gardino stated that the Coordinator’s Office had come in under budget due to personnel shortages this fiscal year. Mayor Cleworth stated that the City was not a big fan of how the PL funds were used and had a problem with the PL funding source. Mayor Cleworth explained that he would vote against the budget because of the funding source. Mr. Titus commented that Ms. Gardino did a very good job of coming in under budget and he appreciated that fact.

Vote on Motion: Four in favor. Three opposed. (Cleworth/Walley/Ward). Approved.

d. Illinois Street Landscaping (Action Item)

Discussion: Ms. Gardino explained the photo and typical section of the landscaping included in the packets and that this item was put on the agenda by Mayor Cleworth.

Mayor Cleworth stated once a month the mayors got together and discussed different subjects and the Illinois Street improvements were discussed in front of the Big I and the maintenance there. Mayor Cleworth stated that they had discussed what was happening north of that area for landscaping and Mayor Hopkins wanted to get further clarification on exactly what would be happening in that area.

Mayor Cleworth stated that he would like information or a report from DOT as to what was envisioned in the area that was now gravel and continuing north in that corridor. Mr. Titus introduced Mr. Anderson to respond to Mayor Cleworth's inquiry. Mr. Anderson stated that on the Illinois Street project he had gone out and spoken with construction staff and looked at all the different areas discussed in the last few weeks. Mr. Anderson stated that he was informed that original plans accommodated drainage through a combination of paving, topsoil, and seeding, but further down Charles Street towards College Road there would be a combination of topsoil and seeding and there were also areas back towards downtown that would be paved along the corridor. Mr. Anderson stated that in his opinion construction staff had a handle on the issues and it would consist primarily of pavement, topsoil, and seeding for grass.

Mr. Sattley asked Mr. Anderson how wide a swath was being discussed from the edge of the sidewalk to the edge of the right-of-way. Mr. Anderson stated that it varied depending on right of way widths, profile of the road, and the surrounding topography. Mr. Sattley inquired whether that meant 6 ft., 10 ft., or 2 ft. Mr. Anderson stated that in some places it went as wide as 10-15 ft. and in some places it might be 3 ft., but they would have to lay out the plans for more specifics along the project corridor. Mr. Sattley inquired if that Mr. Anderson was talking about both sides of the road. Mr. Anderson stated that it was on both sides of the road. Mr. Sattley inquired if that meant that on the west side you had the railway with a big chunk and Golden Valley, and that was it. Mr. Anderson stated that Mr. Sattley was correct and that a lot of that area along the railway was paved, behind the sidewalk that was in the proposed plans, and past Charles Street it would all be seeded with topsoil and grass seed and that included the area in front of Golden Valley. Mr. Sattley inquired if that also included seeding along the fence in front of Golden Valley. Mr. Anderson stated that the fence was being taken down in that location. Mr. Sattley inquired if they were talking about grass up to the location where the fence had been in front of Golden Valley. Mr. Anderson stated that Mr. Sattley was correct.

Mr. Hernandez inquired why it was better to pave in some cases and seed in others. Mr. Anderson stated that in the railroad area, for example, it was preferred to be paved and it was his understanding the City was involved in the decision of where paving and seeding would occur elsewhere in that area. Mr. Hernandez inquired if Mayor Cleworth had a design or preference what parcels should be paved or seeded and planted with some type of landscaping. Mayor Cleworth stated that before he answered, he needed to ask Mr. Anderson a question of what the plan was for the specific area in question. Mayor Cleworth stated that grass tended to require more maintenance and his idea was to put in vegetation that required low or no maintenance to make the corridor more aesthetically pleasing. Mayor Cleworth stated that looking at simply brush and trees to line Cushman Street and just north of that if there could be a continuation of trees that could be put up that would be low or no maintenance costs similar to the Design Alaska proposal.

Mr. Hernandez inquired if there had been discussions with the property owners in that area about landscaping and maintaining it. Mayor Cleworth stated there had been discussions about that but he would defer the question to Mr. Pristash and Mr. Schmetzer. Mr. Titus stated that this was beyond what was in the contract already. Mr. Pristash stated that last summer they saw that the road profile was high but nothing could be done at that point so they proceeded with the regular design. Mr. Pristash stated that it was decided the best thing to do was to reduce the amount of impervious surface and get the most pervious surface to provide the least amount of runoff. Mr. Pristash stated that the road was high north of Slater Street and the area of the old FE Buildings and GVEA was lower and to fix all that it was decided to put catch basins and grass but the question was who would maintain the grass. Mr. Pristash stated that then mulch had come up and the fact that it was easier to maintain than grass. Mr. Pristash stated that it had progressed from there and they came up with durable plants that had been used before and asked the contractor for a price.

Mr. Titus stated that it was his understanding from the engineer's estimate that this would cost an additional \$200,000+ to the contract over what was originally designed. Mr. Titus stated that the City and DOT had a maintenance agreement where the City was responsible for the road maintenance but not the landscaping maintenance. Mr. Titus stated that if it was determined that topsoil and seed were landscaping, the City would not be responsible for that, so who would be responsible for the landscaping maintenance. Mr. Titus stated that in regards to the maintenance, he thought that Mayor Cleworth was clear about the fact that there was no landscaping maintenance included in the agreement with DOT. Mayor Cleworth stated that he thought that the landscaping and maintenance were supposed to be conducted by DOT. Mr. Titus stated that it was determined by DOT project

staff that there was no landscaping on the project; so who would take care of the grass and seed. Mr. Titus stated that it would obviously fall to the DOT and they were prepared to do that maintenance for the topsoil and seed. Mr. Titus explained that it was his understanding that the maintenance of the area adjacent to Mr. Jackovich's place would be covered by the Borough.

Mr. Hernandez stated that it was also his understanding that the Borough would take care of that. Mr. Titus stated that if the DOT took care of the topsoil and seed on the corridor, Terminal Street stuff and the landscaping put in under the contract would all be taken care of. Mr. Titus stated that in addressing the Mayor's Complete Streets concept, if topsoil and seed were put in there might be an opportunity in the future to make that all match up. Mr. Titus further stated that this project was supposed to be over the first of October so he was not sure if they would be able to get through with the landscaping and how it was funded might cause an issue. Mr. Titus stated that if it solved the problem of a maintenance issue, DOT would take care of the maintenance of the topsoil and seed. Mr. Titus stated that with Terminal Street taken care of and if the City took care of plowing snow and bridge maintenance, then project maintenance was covered.

Mr. Hernandez inquired if anyone had talked to residents along the corridor and inquired if they were willing to maintain the landscaping if it were put in that area. Mayor Cleworth stated that he thought that they had spoken with the residents in that area. Mr. Schmetzer stated that when the project was designed by DOT and City Engineers there was a fast push to get it out and not much thought had been given to pedestrian facilities on Illinois Street. Mr. Schmetzer stated that now there are pedestrian facilities down the entire alignment where before there was a gravel shoulder. Mr. Schmetzer stated that he did not recall the City ever commenting on back of sidewalk and to the right-of-way. Mr. Schmetzer stated that they meshed a plan set together, and put it out to bid. Mr. Schmetzer stated that they realized this spring that there were some areas along the back of sidewalk that they clearly did not think through. Mr. Schmetzer stated that he had spoken with all the adjacent private property and business owners in that area and they all wanted landscaping and had agreed to maintain it. Mr. Schmetzer stated that in a couple places there was a City ordinance that required landscaping to separate a parking area from a public right-of-way. Mr. Schmetzer stated that Denali State Bank was considering expansion of their parking area and if they did that, that landscaping would satisfy the City ordinance and no additional landscaping would be required as it would meet the City ordinance.

Mr. Sattley inquired which landscaping Mr. Schmetzer was talking about. Mr. Schmetzer clarified that it was the vegetative strip of trees and shrubs that met the City ordinance. Mr. Schmetzer stated that it was the same case with the Fairbanks Daily News-Miner. Mr. Titus inquired if the topsoil and seed on the contract met the City landscaping ordinances. Mr. Schmetzer stated that

it did not, but giving them additional property and having them do the maintenance, would meet the intent of the City ordinance.

Mr. Hernandez inquired if the property owners had agreed to maintain the landscaping in that area if it was provided. Mr. Schmetzer stated that was correct. Mr. Titus stated that the Department had the responsibility for maintenance since it was FHWA funded. Mr. Titus stated that it was probably not a good idea to have private individuals agreeing to do maintenance. Mr. Titus explained that there was a lady on Van Horn Road who mowed the right of way all the time. Mr. Sattley stated that was fine until the property was sold to somebody who did not own a lawnmower. Mr. Titus stated that the fact that those people were willing to do maintenance was a wonderful thing, but DOT would still be the lead in making sure that the maintenance was done. Mr. Sattley inquired if Mr. Schmetzer was including the railway in the happy people that would be doing the maintenance. Mr. Schmetzer stated that it would be the Daily News-Miner who leased from the Railroad doing the maintenance. Mr. Sattley asked Mr. Schmetzer about the big railroad parking lot in that area. Mr. Schmetzer stated that it would not be included as the Railroad had no capability of maintaining landscaping. Mr. Sattley stated that the Railroad Real Estate Division in Anchorage probably did not want to come to Fairbanks to maintain it. Mr. Schmetzer stated that he had no idea that the City had no maintenance authority in that area and had been ready to draft a maintenance contract in that area until the Mayor informed him of that fact.

Mr. Titus stated they had a contract with contract requirements and appreciated the fact that the Mayor would like to mesh that with the Complete Streets project, but under the contract there would not be a drainage issue. Mr. Titus stated that the Department would go forward and take care of the topsoil and seed that was not the responsibility of the City. Mr. Titus stated that he suggested finishing the contract and then if something more exotic was going to be done it could be looked at then. Mr. Hernandez stated that four or five years ago a Borough telephone survey had found that the citizens wanted more economic development and more beautification in the city. Mr. Hernandez stated that he thought what had been done along that area had made the community more attractive and economically viable. Mr. Hernandez stated that he would go ahead and offer a motion to put in the landscaping in where people were willing to maintain it and since it would require minimal maintenance he would go ahead and propose it. Mayor Cleworth seconded that.

Motion: To have the landscaping be put in along this area where people are willing to maintain it (along the Illinois Street Reconstruction project). (Hernandez/Cleworth).

Mr. Sattley inquired if there was any possibility that property owners could pay to put in trees or landscaping where the grass was in the right-of-way later. Mr. Titus stated that they would have to get a right-of-way beautification permit from DOT and those were typically approved by DOT and FHWA encouraged. Mr. Sattley asked if that meant that if one of the property owners wanted to do landscaping at their own expense in the right-of-way, they could put in trees and whatever was required by the landscaping ordinance in the right-of-way and scoot their parking over a little bit. Mr. Titus stated that they could not park in the right-of-way, but they could get a landscaping permit beyond what was already being done under the contract.

Mayor Cleworth stated that he spoke in favor of the motion because grass required maintenance and he knew that DOT did not like to mow grass and if there was something that could be done to mitigate that, it would make it a lot more attractive than it is. Mr. Sattley inquired where the money would come from. Mr. Titus stated that he was not sure where the funding would come from. Ms. Gardino stated that the project would not be requesting additional funding. Mr. Titus stated that speaking for the DOT they got enough unfunded mandates and did not get a lot of additional funding to their maintenance budget and it was nice when you did not have to do the maintenance and assign others to do it and it was difficult to take on all this stuff. Mr. Titus stated that while he liked the look of landscaping there needed to be an organized effort and they needed to get something that would mesh with the Complete Streets project. Mr. Titus stated that there might be money available in the project but to put in landscaping and pay for it and say that DOT would have to maintain it was not favorable to him.

Mr. Hernandez stated that he understood Mr. Titus' concerns and that they already had a large area to maintain, but this took the onus off DOT. Mr. Hernandez stated that if folks were willing to maintain it, this would be a valuable resource for them and we should let them go forward with it. Mr. Titus stated that DOT had the responsibility, could not depend on the benevolence of the public, and since there was not a broad agreement in place that they would take care of it, he could not assume that would be the case. Mayor Ward inquired if maintenance was also required where landscaping was installed or a beautification permit were obtained for the property by the property owner prior to installation would that be a possibility.

Ms. Heil stated that just a contract change order and who would track that contract would be a task in itself. Mr. Titus stated that it was in the realm of possibility. Mr. Sattley asked Ms. Gardino if there was an actual representation of what could be in that strip and if there was an actual estimate for the landscaping there. Ms. Gardino stated that an estimate received from HC Contractors on August 10, 2013 listed an exact amount to provide landscaping for the areas alluded to. Mayor Cleworth stated that if

this were done it would be as maintenance- free an item as they could come up with and thought it was a win-win for everyone.

Vote on Motion: Four in favor. Three opposed. (Titus/Heil/Ward), Approved

9. Public Comment Period (3 minute limit)

Mr. Jackovich stated that one of the things he recognized being close to the street and during snow removal was when the snow was moved to the sidewalks and then taken to the grass area, it left little rocks in the grass that killed the grass. Mr. Jackovich stated that he would was excited to maintain his area because he wanted to make his business look good inside and out for as long as he could. Mr. Jackovich stated that you had to be there to do the maintenance or have someone else do it. Mr. Jackovich stated that when snow was plowed it needed to be moved to the sidewalk and then taken away so it did not leave little rocks behind that would kill the lawn. Mr. Jackovich stated that he thought that the maintenance part could be performed by all the owners.

10. Other Issues

None.

11. Informational Items

a. College Road Corridor Study Open House-September 3

Ms. Gardino stated that the second open house was September 3rd from 5-7 p.m. at the Bentley Mall and would look at the three segments and alternatives that had been derived.

b. Illinois Street Reconstruction Update

Ms. Gardino stated that the list of change order included in the meeting packet. Ms. Gardino explained that the contractor was working near the bridge and on the College Road intersection.

c. Historical Plaque and Artwork Update

Ms. Gardino explained the project updates included in the meeting packet. Ms. Gardino explained that Mr. Buckley was working on the plaques and the foundation was being worked on as well, and the artist was on board and excited to begin work.

d. State Fund Summary

Ms. Gardino explained the State Fund Summary included in the meeting packet.

e. Banking Request Response

Ms. Gardino explained the banking request response received from DOT Headquarters was approved as presented.

f. Obligations/Offset List

g. Performance Based Planning Requirement

Ms. Gardino explained the Performance Based Planning requirement by FHWA presented in the handout included in the meeting packet.

12. Policy Committee Comments

- Ms. Heil stated that the Federal Register notice came out last week for the Fairbanks Carbon Monoxide Limited Maintenance Plan and if there were no adverse comments, it would be a direct final and was good on October 8th. Ms. Heil explained that this was the second year plan and in ten years after that, Fairbanks would be redesignated to a "Total Attainment Area" with no more maintenance requirements, so Fairbanks was on the downhill slide for Carbon Monoxide.
- Mr. Titus stated that the Commissioner had sent him an email and wanted to know why headbolt heater outlets were being installed in high school parking lots but once he explained that it was being done under CMAQ the Commissioner thought that it a very good idea.
- Mayor Cleworth asked Ms. Heil if there was contemplation of changing PM_{2.5} requirements. Ms. Heil stated that new standards were coming out for PM_{2.5} and it was looked at every five years. Ms. Gardino inquired if they were contemplating Fairbanks might become a non-attainment area for the annual standard. Ms. Heil stated that DEC was looking at that right now. Ms. Gardino asked if that meant that Fairbanks would be a non-attainment area for two different PM_{2.5} standards. Ms. Heil stated that hopefully that would not be the case.

13. Adjourn

Motion to Adjourn: (Hernandez/Heil)

The meeting was adjourned at **11:46 a.m.**

The next Policy Committee Meeting is scheduled for **10 a.m. on Wednesday, September 18, 2013** at the DOT&PF Main Conference Room on Peger Road.

Approved: _____


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

Date: _____

