



**Bicycle & Pedestrian Advisory Committee Web Conference  
Meeting Minutes**

June 24, 2021 • 5:00-7:00 p.m.

By computer at [www.fastplanning.us/keepup/zoom](http://www.fastplanning.us/keepup/zoom)

By telephone at: 1 (253) 215-8782 Meeting ID: 815 6864 3575

**1. Call to Order**

Olivia Lunsford, Vice Chair sitting in for Nathan Belz, Chair, called the meeting to order at 5:00 p.m. Ms. Lunsford noted that Donna Gardino had resigned from the BPAC and would be missed. Ms. Lunsford welcomed Mr. Travis Naibert who will fill Ms. Gardino's seat on the BPAC.

**2. Introduction of Members and Attendees**

- \*Nathan Belz, Chair (absent)
- \*Jesse Coleman (absent)
- \*Carl Heim
- \*Travis Naibert
- \*Jim Richardson (absent)
- \*Peter Stern
- \*John Stowman
- \*Larry Zervos
- \*\*Jackson Fox
- \*\*Olivia Lunsford, Vice Chair
- \*\*Deborah Todd
- Susan Bissell
- \*BPAC Representative**
- \*\*FAST Planning Staff**

**3. Approval of the June 24, 2021 Agenda**

**Motion:** To approve the June 24, 2021 Agenda as presented. (Stowman/Heim).

**Discussion:** No discussion.

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

**4. Approval of the May 27, 2021 Meeting Minutes**

**Motion:** To approve the May 27, 2021 Meeting Minutes as presented. (Zervos/Heim).

**Discussion:** No discussion.

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

**5. Staff /Working Group/Chair Reports**

Mr. Fox provided the following updates:

- FAST Planning received all the data sheets for the 2021 Bike and Pedestrian Counts at intersections throughout town. The data was imported into the master

spreadsheet that contained counts for the past ten years and graphs will be created to note the trends in counts over the years beginning in 2010.

- The Non-Motorized Plan was adopted by the Policy Board and the final version of the Plan was posted on the FAST Planning Website.
- Mr. Fox received the PS&E for the Airport Way West Bicycle/Pedestrian Facilities Project path along Wien Road that provided a connection to the Fairbanks International Airport Terminal and will go out to bid this fall and be constructed in 2022 with the larger Airport Way West Improvements project.
- Mr. Fox attended two Railroad Board Meetings in relation to the Chena Riverwalk Project. Mr. Fox explained that progress had been made and it was anticipated that the project would be securing and paying a fee for a 50-year land lease and the Railroad would like to see the City of Fairbanks take full ownership of the pedestrian bridge across the river. Mr. Fox stated that he did yet not know what the cost would be for the 50-year land lease.

## 6. Public Comment Period

No public comment.

## 7. Old Business

### a. Fairbanks Road/Rail Plan – Proposed Pedestrian Crossing Improvements (Action Item)

Mr. Fox explained that the Policy Board released the Fairbanks Road/Rail Plan for a 45-day public comment period ending July 9, 2021, and the link to the Plan document was: <https://fbxings.com/>. Mr. Fox explained that there was a comment box on the website if they wanted to comment there directly or they could make any comments or motions related to the Plan at the meeting.

**Public Comment:** No public comment.

**Motion:** Prior to spending any money on the intersections from College Road to C Street, have the Railroad determine the feasibility for design and funding and potential timeline for the elevated track as a solution as opposed to the separate projects. (Stern/Stowman).

**Discussion:** Mr. Stern explained that he realized that it would be an expensive project to elevate the track and it was something that should probably be long-term in nature as far as design and funding, but he thought it was ultimately a much better solution through that area of town. Mr. Stern stated that he thought that the Railroad was in favor of it because it removed those at-grade crossings so he thought in the long-run it was a much better solution, but the question was could we afford it and was there going to be money for it.

Mr. Zervos asked Mr. Stern how his motion addressed that.

Mr. Stern stated that the question was since that was a desire of the Railroad and it seemed to be somewhat separate from these individual projects, but they were all impacted by it, it was just a question of getting an answer for that one first and finding out if it was going to be feasible. Mr. Stern stated that if it was not then, obviously, we had to fall back to the individual intersections and use those proposed solutions.

Mr. Heim asked Mr. Stern if he were saying one was a better value, like the \$67M dollar one versus doing eight individual projects, or if it was better to chop them up

into individual pieces instead of doing just one big one and that was what he would like them to look at.

Mr. Stern stated that he thought that the issue of the cost of it was significant but if it was a different pot of money to go after that and it eliminated the at-grade crossings which was a goal of the Railroad, then it was probably a better solution for this because it eliminated that whole question of having these at-grade intersection. Mr. Stern stated that fact that it was a lot more expensive than the individual projects, obviously the engineers and designers needed to look at that and see if it was feasible and, if not, then they needed to go back and look at the individual intersections.

Mr. Heim stated that maybe he misunderstood but were these projects individual projects. Mr. Heim asked if the costs of all the individual projects together was more expensive than the one project.

Mr. Fox stated that it was much cheaper than the overpass project.

Mr. Fox stated that he thought the direction of the motion was to have the Plan look deeper into the financial feasibility of the overpass option.

Mr. Heim asked if it needed to be in the Plan.

Mr. Fox stated that it needed to be in the Plan to be considered for funding.

Mr. Naibert asked if there was a plan for the Helmericks Intersection.

Ms. Lunsford stated that there was a plan for Helmericks Intersection and indicated where it was in the meeting packet.

Mr. Naibert stated that it looked like there was no improvements at that intersection at all unless they did the big overpass.

Mr. Fox stated that it looked like the crossing arms crossed both the road and the sidewalk at that location, so he did not think there were any improvements planned for that crossing in the future.

Mr. Heim commented that he thought the \$67 million was possible, but fixing those intersections was a great idea because they were all high traffic intersections and the amount for that did not seem that bad to him. Mr. Heim asked if both the Railroad and FHWA would be participating in that project.

Mr. Fox stated that he thought it met all three requirements for either Federal, State, or Railroad funding and thought that since the Railroad and DOT had interest in the project, they might be able to pool their resources to fund it.

Mr. Fox stated that he agreed with Mr. Heim that this could probably be funded but not by FAST Planning. Mr. Fox asked Mr. Stern if he was asking that the Plan itself provide more detail as to the financial feasibility of the project or was the intent of his motion to ask that this overpass option be preferred over the smaller projects.

Mr. Naibert stated that he agreed with the motion that if they were going to redo the entire track and make it elevated then it did not seem useful to spend money now but if they were not going to do it soon and it was going to take years, then the signals seemed important now.

Mr. Fox stated that the motion highlighted the need to look at the different plans.

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

**Motion:** For the College Road Pedestrian Crossing Improvements, consider a full-length crossing-arm that covers the path and travel lane as opposed to a separate crossing-arm just for the path similar to the existing crossing arms on University Avenue and Helmericks Avenue. (Zervos/Stern).

**Discussion:** Mr. Stern stated that he thought it was a better solution that covered both things, had less mechanical things to go haywire, and was simpler to maintain.

Mr. Heim asked if the projects would be funded by FAST Planning.

Mr. Fox stated that they likely would be.

Mr. Heim stated that he went through there all the time and FAST Planning was light on the money sometimes so \$2.4 million seemed like a lot to him compared to \$67 million for the whole project and the safety of the community. Mr. Heim stated that to drop \$2.5 or \$3 million seemed like a lot when we had other projects around town that would benefit. Mr. Heim stated that in his opinion there was not a problem at those intersections.

Mr. Fox stated that Dr. Belz had stated that same thing at a previous meeting that FAST Planning money was better spent. Mr. Fox stated that if they got it into a planning document as something that we thought was a need as long as it was in the MTP as a project, then anyone could fund it. Mr. Fox stated that the improvements would primarily benefit the Railroad and was a lot of money for a little benefit.

Mr. Heim stated that he felt that what Mr. Stern was saying was that we needed to make sure that it was fiscally responsible.

Mr. Fox stated that they were not making any funding commitments to any of these projects and were just identifying proposed improvements.

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

**b. Mapping of Priority Routes for Non-Motorized Facilities – Status Update**

Mr. Fox explained that a small work group from the BPAC was selected to put together a map showing priority routes for winter maintenance of non-motorized facilities. Mr. Fox explained that they met twice so far and believed that by next month they would have a map with all the different layers and features to show them. Mr. Fox explained that the goal was to have a product similar to the DOT winter priority route scheme for maintenance of roadways. Mr. Fox explained all the different features and layers included on the map. Mr. Fox stated that Ms. Lunsford was digitizing the map and then changes could be made. Mr. Fox stated that the goal was to have the map online for DOT and the Borough to look at as well as having it included in the Seasonal Mobility Recommendations Report Update.

**c. Cycling Education**

Ms. Lunsford explained that this agenda item was tabled at the last BPAC meeting and would be postponed again because the two people presenting this topic were not present at the meeting.

**8. New Business**

**a. FAST Improvement Program FFY22 Priorities (Action Items)**

Mr. Fox explained that there was \$1.1M for next summer for the FAST Planning Improvement Program which was usually limited to mill and pave work. Mr. Fox stated that in FY21 the funding was moved to 2022 so that we could afford the Airport Way West Bike and Pedestrian Facility Project. Mr. Fox stated that a priority list was approved by the Policy Board in 2019 on what we should focus on in FFY2021. Mr. Fox stated that a subcommittee of the Technical Committee met to look at the list and removed and reprioritized projects on that list in the FAST Improvement Program for FFY22 to fit current budget constraints.

**Public Comment:** No public comment.

**Motion:** Combine the Mitchell Expressway and Phillips Field Road Path Projects by prioritizing the sections in worst condition on the two. (Zervos/Naibert).

**Discussion:** No further discussion.

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

**Motion:** To support the 2nd Avenue Dog Park access road and adjacent path resurfacing. (Naibert/Zervos).

**Discussion:** No discussion.

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

**9. Other Issues**

No other issues.

**10. Committee Member Comments**

- Mr. Zervos commented that they had done a great job on the map prioritizing the maintenance for the sidewalks.

**11. Adjournment**

**Motion to adjourn.** (Heim/Zervos). The meeting adjourned at 6:52 p.m. The next BPAC meeting is Thursday, July 29, 2021, 5-7 pm with an in-person option.

Approved:   
Nathan Belz, Chair  
Bicycle & Pedestrian Advisory Committee

Date: 07.30.2021