



POLICY BOARD MEETING

Meeting Minutes

April 20, 2022 • 12:00 – 2:00 P.M.

FAST Planning Office, 100 Cushman Street, Suite 205, Fairbanks, AK

Web Conference at: <https://fastplanning.us/keepup/zoom/>

Zoom Meeting Telephone Number: 1 (253) 215-8782 Meeting ID: 861-0548-2886

1. Call to Order

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

2. Introduction of Members and Attendees

Attendee	Representative Organization
*Bryce Ward, Chair	Mayor, Fairbanks North Star Borough
*Jim Matherly, Vice Chair	Mayor, City of Fairbanks
*Joe Kemp	Acting Director, DOT&PF Northern Region
*Alice Edwards (absent)	Director, DEC Air Quality
*Aaron Gibson	Fairbanks City Council
*Michael Welch	Mayor, City of North Pole
*Savannah Fletcher	FNSB Assembly
**Jackson Fox	FAST Planning
**Olivia Lunsford (absent)	FAST Planning
**Deborah Todd	FAST Planning
**Randi Bailey	DOT&PF Planning
**Don Galligan	FNSB Community Planning
+Steven Hoke	DEC Air Quality
+Bob Pristash	City of Fairbanks
+Judy Chapman	DOT&PF
+Kevin McKinley	FNSB Planning Commission
Adam Moser	DOT&PF
Kathryn Wenger	FHWA
Michael Lukshin	FHWA
Gary Wilken	Advocates for Safe Alaska Highways
Patrick Filbin	Kinross Gold
Jack Barnwell	Fairbanks Daily News-Miner
Luke Hopkins	Citizen Participant
Mary Farrell	Citizen Participant

**FAST Planning Policy Board Members, ** FAST Planning Staff Members, + FAST Planning Technical Committee Members, • Bicycle/Pedestrian Advisory Committee (BPAC) Members*

3. Approval of the April 20, 2022 Agenda

Motion: To approve the April 20, 2022 Agenda as presented. (Welch/Matherly).

Discussion: No discussion.

Vote on Motion: None opposed. Approved.

4. Approval of the March 16, 2022 Meeting Minutes

Motion: To approve the March 16, 2022 Meeting Minutes as recorded.
(Welch/Fletcher).

Discussion: No discussion.

Vote on Motion: None opposed. Approved.

5. Committee/Working Group Reports (including the Chair's Report)

a. Staff Report and Technical Committee Action Items

- Mr. Fox is actively participating in Steering Committee meetings for the Fairbanks North Borough Road Plan. The Committee is looking for possible road corridor locations throughout the Borough, alternate ways to get in and out of subdivisions, and vacant land that can be subdivided in the future.
- Mr. Fox met with the Borough Transportation Department. This is the Department that runs the MACS Transit System. We are looking at entering into a consolidated planning grant agreement between FAST Planning and the State DOT to provide transit planning services on behalf of MACS Transit to look at their fixed route system, all of their operations, helping them out with fare rate studies, etc. Hope to see a draft of that agreement from the State by the end of the month so we can get it on the May Technical Committee and Policy Board agendas for consideration. Note that the MACS Transit staff seem very supportive of this move to assist them with their transit planning needs and there is funding available through the Federal Transit Administration to do that work.
- Mr. Fox provided a presentation to the Fairbanks North Star Borough Planning Commission on April 12, 2022 to give them a FAST Planning 101. Mr. Fox gave them an overview of the programs and processes, the makeup of all the committees, how all committees work together to perform the transportation planning for our area, and how we identify and prioritize projects that go into our Transportation Improvement Program (TIP).
- The FAST Planning Draft Public Participation Plan (PPP) was out for 45-day public comment that closed April 15, 2022. A small number of comments were received. The comments are being incorporated into the draft PPP. The final PPP will be presented for consideration in May.
- FAST Planning received approval of TIP Amendment #5 from DOT to be incorporated into their State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP). FAST also received a concurrence letter from the FHWA and FTA for TIP Amendment #5. TIP Amendment #5 is now fully approved.
- FAST Planning is developing a new TIP which is the four-year short-range funding plan for projects in our area. As part of that process, the first step is to update the scoring criteria. A work session will be held on April 21, 2022 to bring forward revisions and update the scoring criteria.
- The 4/6/22 Technical Committee action items are pertinent to Item 8.b of the Agenda.

6. Public Comment Period (Non-Action Items)

No public comment.

7. Old Business

a. 2045 Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP) Update

- **Draft Existing Conditions Report available at <https://fastplanning.us/mtpupdate/> Comments due April 22, 2022**

Mr. Fox explained that the Consultant team has completed the Existing Conditions chapter for the 2045 MTP and it is posted on the FAST Planning website for review and comment. The comment deadline is April 22, 2022. This chapter will be included as an appendix to the MTP and is a review of the existing network, roads, paths, sidewalks, etc. Looking towards June for a potential planning charette to identify potential candidate projects to be included in the TIP and eliminate projects that have already been constructed. This plan would serve our area for the next 20 years. This chapter contains the initial base list of projects and project needs for our area, the Road/Rail Crossing Reduction/Realignment Plan, the Non-Motorized Plan, and the responses received at the first virtual open house were also incorporated. The Consultant team still awaiting the most recent crash data for 2017-18.

8. New Business

a. FFY23-27 Transportation Improvement Plan (TIP) Development Plan

Mr. Fox explained the plan development and adoption schedule for the Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP) update and the new TIP that goes from FFY2023-2027. Mr. Fox explained that both documents are required to be updated every four years and the MTP is being updated concurrently with the TIP. Mr. Fox explained that local governments are encouraged to nominate one of their higher priority streets for funding in the TIP. Mr. Fox explained that a Work Session will be held on April 21, 2022 to discuss the scoring criteria with all the local government applicants and other entities. Mr. Fox explained that nominated projects will be put in priority order.

b. Letter Regarding Traffic Study for Manh Choh Ore Transportation Plan (Action Item)

Mr. Fox explained that the meeting packet included a letter containing the scope of work for a proposed traffic study for the portion of the Kinross Trucking Plan in the Fairbanks area. Mr. Fox explained the letter had changed based on discussions with Policy Board members, Kinross staff, and DOT&PF. Mr. Fox explained that the original version brought to the Technical Committee was a letter to Kinross Gold Corporation that turned into a request for a partnership with DOT for a traffic study and the expectations of what we would like to see looked at. That was largely based on public comments received, what we have learned from the community meetings held by Kinross, letters from the public, newspaper articles, etc. Mr. Fox explained that the Technical Committee recommended redirecting the letter to Alaska DOT&PF and their Transportation Advisory Committee for a larger corridor analysis. The Advisory Committee is developing the scope of work for DOT to include our scope of work. Mr. Fox explained that 41 written and verbal comments were received and read into the record at the Technical Committee meeting. Mr. Fox explained that there was support for moving the traffic study. There was preference by the members that provided comments that FAST Planning be involved in the study rather than DOT&PF. Mr. Fox clarified that there was confusion about the scope of work. The scope of work is specific to the urban area communities of Fairbanks and North Pole. Mr. Fox noted that since the Policy Board packet was posted for the

April 20, 2022 meeting, he had received 26 new comments to be read into the record during public comment at this meeting.

Public Comment:

Luke Hopkins read his testimony into the record. I attended the most recent Technical Committee meeting and supported the detailed analysis by FAST Planning that was described very adequately in the original letter that was addressed to Kinross. I am in support of FAST Planning, in collaboration with Alaska DOT, to develop a corridor analysis for the planned Kinross ore haul from Tetlin to Ft. Knox. This would provide the two organizations to use their different focus to look at the following issues. How was the truck route through our urban area was selected and what alternative routes were considered, especially considerations for when road closures occur either due to accidents or weather issues? Increased truck traffic causes congestion and delay on our roadways, how will that be addressed? What are the safety implications of the increased truck traffic? Can our existing infrastructure for roads and bridges handle the extra truck traffic congestion? Will truck traffic significantly contribute to our community's air quality issues with Knox and other air quality components? Where will the trucking depot be located in Fairbanks and how will that truck traffic flow be addressed? The level of detail required to effectively address these local concerns is more complex than DOT is likely to support for both our urban and more rural corridor analysis together. I believe that FAST Planning is better positioned to manage urban analysis and to measure and scope Fairbanks and North Pole community-specific concerns. As a former Mayor and past Chair of a previous FMATS policy organization, I ask the following: That this Policy Committee approve FAST Planning to manage the local analysis and study in collaboration with DOT's larger corridor study that will focus primarily on the rural highway conditions and with FAST Planning developing the urban portion. This has actually been commonplace in our relationship with DOT from FMATS and on to the current FAST Planning organization. For example, the State produced an Alaska Rail Plan, a Statewide Active Transportation Plan, the State Freight Plan in recent years. But in every case, left out any in-depth analysis for Fairbanks and North Pole so our local MPO, now FAST Planning, produced our own detailed, explicit Road/Rail Plan in 2021, the Non-Motorized Plan in 2021, and the Freight Mobility Plan in 2019 for the Fairbanks and North Pole area. Additionally, I request that the Policy Committee request DOT to include representatives on their Advisory Committee that, at a minimum, would include the Director of FAST Planning, a member of the Fairbanks North Star Borough Community Planning, the UAF CSET (Center for Safety Equity in Transportation) Department and, to the extent possible, a member from the City of Fairbanks and the City of North Pole, and transfer and input of relevant information exchange benefits both levels of planning. By parsing out the analysis into a rural and urban component we play to the strength of both FAST Planning and Alaska DOT&PF. Fairbanks and the communities along the corridor will benefit from the combined resources resulting in a more detailed analysis and better outcomes. Additionally, the FAST MTP Air Quality Update, which is solely within the MPO traffic area, should continue to anticipate the proposed trucking plan including an expected trucking depot within our MPO area as proposed by Kinross; limited as those numbers and details have been. As I understood from

the recent information, it is appropriate that FAST Planning would be contracting with firms for much of the effort to understand and address these impact issues. It's been said many times recently that this proposed ore trucking plan, whatever it finally looks like, is utilizing our public highways and our local community roads. And, as such, our citizens should be availed as to the best information, the best analysis, to understand just how safe this ongoing Kinross Alaska expanded mining development be. I thank you for this opportunity to give you comments and I look forward to a wise decision from this Policy Committee on these actions. Thank you very much.

Gary Wilken read his comments into the record. Good afternoon members of FAST Policy Committee. My name is Gary Wilken and I have been asked by the Advocates for Safe Alaska Highways (ASAH) to provide public testimony on Agenda Item 8.b. Our testimony is in three sections:

1. A statement in strong support of FAST being involved to the maximum extent possible in the proposed Ore Haul Corridor Analysis.
2. A request to incorporate April 6, 2022 minutes into the official record of this April 20, 2022 FAST meeting.
3. A request to recognize the developer, Kinross/Contango ORE, has yet to bring forth an ore hauling plan.

ONE: ASAH testifies in strong support of FAST Option 1, preferred. FAST funds and performs its own traffic study separate and apart but running parallel to the DOT Corridor Analysis. However, if needed, ASAH can support the bifurcation of the effort into two independent components: FAST (urban focus) and Alaska DOT (rural focus). ASAH respectfully does not support Alaska DOT managing the Corridor Analysis as a stand-alone one agency effort.

TWO: ASAH would like to ensure that the testimony provided by ASAH, as well as other members of the community on April 6, 2022, is incorporated into today's official record. This may seem to be a benign request; however, this powerful testimony serves as a constant reminder of the support FAST possesses for a robust and objective traffic impact analysis.

THREE: ASAH registers continued concern over the fact that Kinross, in spite of the past 17 months being available to develop and present an ore transport plan, it has been an abject failure to do so. Simply put: how can, in all good faith, the Corridor Analysis team develop a valid review without a plan to review? There are many unanswered questions that have been posed but never answered. Here are but four examples of lingering questions for your consideration. What is the plan to accommodate 188 school bus stops every day along the route? What is the plan to accommodate and negotiate 384 units per day the 8.3 miles up Cleary Summit including Skoogy Curve? Is there a True North bypass? Is there going to be a "break-down yard" or will it be mine to mill doubles the entire route. Remember 120-foot units to the Mitchell is 192 trucks per day then breaking down to 95-foot singles is 384 trucks per day beyond the Mitchell to the mill? How do you accommodate the enormity of those truck counts? When the Shamrock development begins production, 70 miles southeast of Fairbanks near Birch Lake, will those ore haul units just be added to traffic existing at the time, which today is projected to be an ore haul unit encounter every five miles? Does Shamrock double the ore haulers on the road and thereby reduce the encounter distances to "every 2 1/2 miles"?

How can a plan be analyzed without these, and many other vital components, be put in place.

Through this testimony, once again, ASAH, in good faith, asks the developer. Kinross/Contango, be held fully accountable for their ore transport plan. The AKDOT Corridor Analysis team shouldn't have to guess at a plan and configuration. The AKDOT Corridor Analysis team be stood up, staffed, and then put in recess until the developer brings forward their ore transport plan as is it is their sole responsibility to do. We are under no time constraints here. We can wait a year if that what it takes for the developer to complete the work and make it public. After all, we are talking public highways funded y the people of Alaska.

We look forward to furthering the efforts of FAST and we thank you for your leadership in developing, supporting, and executing a fair and object analysis of this arrogant, unprecedented, and unsafe attempt to turn our scenic byways and highways into mining haul roads for decades to come. Thank you for this opportunity to participate.

Written testimony sent to FAST Planning was read into the public record at this point in the meeting and is shown below.

Amy Viltrakis – Dear Mr. Fox, I am writing in support of the proposed study to look at the long-term effects the ore mining trucks will have on the various communities along the highway. Thank you for your help making our communities self. Sincerely, *Amy Viltrakis*

Beth Jones – I am writing to give my support for an independent study concerning Kinross's plan to truck ore through our communities. Safety is my first concern and it can take many forms from the actual roadway and all who use it to the impact on the air around those roadways. Because weather is changing in Alaska, there is a concern with that and will those trucks add to the problems we are experiencing now. What is decided will not only impact the communities on the short term but also the long term. Some impacts can never be repaired or healed. Alaska is special and I hope people see that and protect it so just doesn't become another place that has problems because people were not farsighted enough to realize the negative effect on a place that cannot be altered. Thank you for interest in doing this study. -*Beth Jones, Fairbanks*

Jeff Benowitz – Dear Mr. Fox, As a geologist am very pro-mining, but have many concerns about a >200 mile ore transport plan. Besides the obvious road maintenance, food safety, medical safety, road safety, and moose concerns am a tad surprised more effort has not been put into considering the shaking effect of having a double long ore truck every 7 1/2 minutes pass unstable thawing permafrost lands. Possible of greater concern is every time one of these trucks goes off the road it will require hazardous materials clean up, given the toxic nature of the ore and potential for acid mine drainage. The logical thing is to either build a processing plant on site to either fully process the ore or to create concentrates. And/or extend the Alaska Railroad. Our roads, our freedom, best, *Jeff apple Benowitz.*

Carol Smith – This is in support of the traffic analysis impact on our roads and landscape by the ore transportation requested by Kinross. It's pretty impressive that Kinross isn't willing to help with the costs of this study. If they're so sure there

isn't any negative impact in our communities, they should be willing to help support the study to prove this sentiment.

Kathleen Vander Zwaag – Dear Mr. Fox, I am extremely concerned about the congestion, impact to our road, and dangers of numerous Kinross mining vehicles transporting ore to Fort Knox for processing. As a resident of Delta Junction who drives the same road, I support the traffic study that has been proposed. Thank you for stepping up on this issue. -*Kathleen Vander Zwaag, Delta Junction*

Lee Payne – I am in favor of the DOT traffic study re the Kinross/Manh Choh project. This needs to be done. Thanks. -*Lee Payne*

Jerry Vander Zwaag – Dear Mr. Fox, I am extremely concerned about the congestion, impact to our road, and dangers of numerous Kinross mining vehicles transporting ore to Fort Knox for processing. As a resident of Delta Junction who drives the same road, I support the traffic study that has been proposed. Thank you for stepping up on this issue. -*Jerry Vander Zwaag, Delta Junction*

Karen Post – Dear Mr. Fox, I am concerned about the Kinross plan to truck ore from Tetlin to Ft. Knox. I feel there needs to be more study and information to the public about the effects on communities along this route. From what I know about this trucking portion of the mining plan, I am against the trucking. I am concerned about safety, air quality and quality of life for the communities along this route. Thank you, *Karen Post, Ester, AK*

Jennifer Jolis – Dear Mr. Fox: Thank you for pursuing and advocating for a transportation study re: the proposed Kinross/Manh Choh solution to getting their ore to Fort Knox. On the face of it this is such a potentially dangerous route for the company to be pursuing that a study of its impacts, potential dangers, and alternative routes or other solutions, that such a study is imperative. -*Jennifer Jolis, 3705 Quartz Road, Fairbanks*

Pete Hutton – I fully support the proposed traffic study so that everyone can be fully informed about this harebrained idea to truck ore from Tetlin to Fairbanks please feel free to share these comments. -*Pete Hutton*

Mary & Bob Martin – My husband and I strongly support having a traffic study done about the long-term impacts of the proposed Kinross ore trucking plan. Our roads are not built for that much heavy traffic. The added amount of weight, and the additional numbers of loads constantly travelling along the Alaska and Richardson highway, and through Fairbanks, will not only damage the roads but also will impact the safety on those roads. We live just off of Chena Hot Springs Road and are very concerned about the impact this would have on our newly improved road, as well as our safety. It is not a feasible idea. Please share our comment with the Policy Committee. Sincerely, *Mary and Bob Martin*

Ronald Johnson – Jackson, Thanks for your efforts in supporting a traffic study for the proposed Tetlin - Kinross mining project. This is very much needed. I would love to see part of this deal with the estimated increase in public road maintenance. -*Ron Johnson, Professor Emeritus, Mechanical and Environmental Engineering, University of Alaska Fairbanks, 2113 Jack St, Fairbanks, AK 99709*

Philip Wight – Mr. Fox, I understand the FAST is considering a study to evaluate the impact of Kinross' Tetlin Ore hauling project, as part of their Tetlin Mine proposal. I just wanted to let you know that I am very supportive of such a study which would offer a clear analysis of the long-term impacts to our community.

Thank you for FASTs efforts in evaluating this important project and ensuring safe transportation in our community. Sincerely, *Philip Wight*, 3920 Old Wood Rd, Ester

Jeff Fay – I'm a life-long Alaskan and a 37- year resident of Fox. I strongly support a study of the impacts of Kinross's Man Chou ore trucking plan and its impact on our community. Please include my comment of support of your study in any communications with any bodies that it may affect. Thank you for taking on this important issue. -*Jeff Fay*, Fox, AK

R. Weathers – I support a traffic study for the proposed ore transportation from Tetlin to Ft Knox. We live close to the Richardson and the plan to move ore by tractor trailer is unacceptable at the numbers stated. We run and bike on the shoulder of the Richardson during the summer and x/c ski on the Salcha Ski Trails in the winter. -*R. Weathers*

Michelle Gillette – To FAST Planning Policy Committee: I am in support of FAST planning working in addition to the Ak DOT&PF corridor analysis. I think it is important to have a detailed urban focus in addition to the rural component of these studies. One concern I have is that Kinross still says they will only increase traffic 1% in Fairbanks. They picked the point in Fairbanks with the greatest number of vehicles to come up with that number, and they are not even going through that route. It is a total distortion of statistics. They also are not including additional service vehicles resulting from their plan, but only using double trailer numbers. I am also concerned that DOT might limit the traffic safety analysis by saying there are less than one hundred double trailers. Don't forget they might have to break down those doubles, and all the increased fuel and service trucks should be included. Lastly, we need an air quality component as part of this study. Fairbanks and North Pole already don't meet air standards. This transportation plan will make it worse. This is also the worst plan when it comes to releasing greenhouse gases. We should be conserving fuel and limiting emissions, not maximizing them. I urge the policy committee to address and analyze the areas Mr. Fox has brought forth. Sincerely, *Michelle Gillette*, PO Box 368, Ester, AK 99725

Sarah Keller – Dear Mr. Fox, I would like to express my support of a Fairbanks Area Surface Transportation (FAST) study specifically focused on the Fairbanks area with regards to the ambitious ore trucking plan proposed by Kinross. This more focused study in conjunction with the comprehensive, broader-based DOT study will help us in Fairbanks and North Pole and associated communities be aware of the long-term impacts on our area. I think it is important to address the serious local issues like safety, infrastructure impacts and air pollution from frequently running diesel-powered trucks through our urban areas. I think it is important to identify the associated costs and clearly identify who is likely to be paying those costs. Please share my public comment to the Policy Committee at the appropriate time in the meeting. Thank you, *Sarah Keller*, 169 Eagle Ridge Rd, Fairbanks, AK 99712

Darla Theisen – Please consider the rail link as an alternative. The trucking proposal is ludicrous and short term. The time frame proposed is deceiving as it is not for 4-5 yrs. in Manh Choh. It is 25-50 yrs. and a 300+ mile radius around Ft Knox. This is a prime time for all to "get aboard" a train link to the border or at least to Tok/Tetlin. This has been proposed since 1942. What a perfect time with

all the infrastructure funding for Ft. Knox to partner up with the State to do this. Thank you for the study. -*Darla Theisen* (off Amanita)

Tom Duncan – Dear Mr. Fox, thank you for your efforts in pressing for more study of the proposed long-range transport of ore. I support these efforts and look forward to hearing the input from many other agencies and communities as well, for instance all of the communities impacted along the route and also the federal highway administration. Federal monies are spent building our roads. I am curious to hear the input from the FHA about private out of country companies making a profit using infrastructure paid for by US taxpayers. -*Tom Duncan*, Mechanical Engineer, P.E.

Lili Misel – Hello Mr. Fox, I am writing in support of the traffic study for the portion of the ore trucking plan from Kinross Gold through urban areas. I believe it's important to know of the long term impacts the trucking plan will have on the communities along the Richardson, Fairbanks roads and Steese Highway. Thank you for your work on this.

Barbara Schuhmann – Dear Mr. Fox: I support the FAST group doing its own study of the urban impacts of the Kinross ore haul proposal, in cooperation with the DOTPF study of the entire route. In this way, we can put the expertise of both groups to best use. The urban areas have traffic, noise and air quality issues that differ from the less populated parts of the route. There could be routes built for a rail spur or even an industrial road, which by-pass North Pole, Fairbanks and Skoogy Gulch curve. Fort Knox is almost due north of the Chena Lakes project. There are alternatives to bringing that much truck traffic through the middle of North Pole and Fairbanks. But the real problem here is that Kinross refuses to provide any details of its plans. All of us would benefit from knowing the configuration for the trucks, and the transportation plan and safety plan Kinross 's contractor will operate under. I support FAST sending a request to Kinross for this basic information. Without it, we all are left with using a "worst case scenario" for planning purposes. It seems sensible to provide a deadline for this information, depending on how long it takes to conduct an adequate analysis and study. Shouldn't there be some consequence for Kinross's failure to provide this basic information? It should not be allowed to start trucking without first providing basic information needed, with enough lead time, to plan for the impacts it will cause. In addition, Kinross should pay or reimburse both FAST and DOTPF for this kind of analysis and planning. Thank you and the committee for your work. -
Barbara Schuhmann, 520 Marshall Drive, Fairbanks, AK 99712

Dave Waldo – Hello Mr. Fox, I'm in support of FAST Planning collaborating with Alaska DOT&PF on a corridor analysis for the planned Kinross ore haul from Tetlin to Fort Knox. The level of detail required to effectively evaluate safety concerns is more complex than DOT&PF is likely to support for both an urban and rural corridor analysis. I believe FAST planning is better positioned to manage urban analysis and to measure and scope Fairbanks community-specific concerns. By parsing out the analysis into a rural and urban component, we play to the strength of both FAST Planning and Alaska DOT&PF. Fairbanks and the communities along the corridor will benefit from the combined resources, resulting in a more detailed analysis and better outcomes. Thank You. *Dave Waldo*, 1115 W Chena Hills Dr, Fairbanks

Jennifer Campbell – Mr. Fox, I wrote you prior to the Technical Committee meeting regarding your letter to Kinross about their ore haul plan for the Manh Choh mine. Based on that meeting I feel it is important to write again in full support of FAST performing an independent study of the urban impacts of their plan through North Pole, Fairbanks and up to the mine. The DOT corridor study will be beneficial but most likely not detailed enough for the impacts to traffic, air quality and noise in the urban areas. Thank you, *Jennifer Campbell*, 1010 8th Ave, Fairbanks, AK 99701

Scott Bell – I fully support the Corridor Analysis from Tetlin to Fort Knox to ensure the safety and infrastructure wear and tear impacts are fully examined and the costs understood. -*Scott Bell*, PO Box 81795, Fairbanks, AK 99708

Mary Farrell – Dear Mr. Fox: I am in absolute support of the FAST Planning group doing its own, separate study of the urban impacts of the Kinross ore haul proposal. This type of traffic analysis for a newly proposed project that will run through town seems to fall squarely in the purview of FAST. The Fairbanks and North Pole areas have unique air quality and traffic issues that are not shared by the more rural portions of the route. It is unfortunate that Kinross has so far refused to provide details of its transportation plans or help pay for any such analysis. However, this should not stop FAST from moving forward with an analysis that will surely benefit all Fairbanksans and assist with proper planning for this or other similar projects in the future. As it stands, we have no idea what running that many ore transport trucks through town will do to our roads, bridges, air quality and traffic safety. Thank you and the committees for all of your hard work. -*Mary Farrell*, PO Box 83327, Fairbanks, AK 99708

Susan Wilken – Dear Mr. Fox, I am writing in support of FAST sending the proposed letter to Kinross for answers to the questions, rather than combining it with the DOTPF study of the whole route through the Richardson Corridor. FAST doing a study concentrating on the urban boundaries will only enhance the complete study. I feel that rolling these questions into a DOTPF study will only dilute the impact. I would also ask that Kinross be responsible for paying or reimbursing FAST for this analysis. It does not go unnoticed that both Kinross and our borough representatives have allowed any deadline for an Ore Hauling Plan to be set, thus creating a situation of unaccountability for Kinross. Thank you for asking the critical questions. Please send the letter to Kinross. -*Sue Wilken*, 2829 Chief William Drive #6, Fairbanks, AK 99709

Steve Hovenden – Good morning, Mr. Fox: Allow me to add my name to those who wisely support the FAST independent study of the Kinross ore haul proposal. It is duly noted that Kinross has not actually submitted one, but when they do, again, FAST will be well served by their own study. In conjunction with the DOTPF study, everyone will enjoy the talents and skill of both. It is unfortunate that Kinross so far refuses to provide any detail and facts, or to participate in cost sharing of the study. This, in concert with Kinross's public statement that the state of Alaska should "Double the fuel tax" to help mitigate costs for the severe road damage that will occur, serves as an example of an old saying, "Handful of gimme, and a mouthful of much obliged." I encourage you and the committee to continue and I thank you for your work. -*Steve Hovenden*, 360 Terrace Drive, Fairbanks, Ak. 99712

Motion: To approve the letter [regarding traffic study for Manh Choh Ore Transportation Plan]. (Matherly/Fletcher).

Discussion on Original Motion:

Mayor Matherly: I have been really digging into this overall plan recently and the amount of traffic, the amount of detail, just blows me away when you read the studies. All of those letters had some excellent points all the way from bus stops to an engineer who believes in mining and supports mining but has a real concern. One of the first things I thought about when I looked into this was why don't they just build a mill right there? It would save. I have to believe that building the mill, I do not know the whole financial breakdown mind you, but all the money and all the trucks, and all the hauling and all the road damage that would occur. The insurance, the gas, everything had to pale in comparison to just building a mill there. Those were some of my initial thoughts and I heard that shared in one of the letters. This absolutely worries me to no end. It is not just the trucks. I also read a report where a piece of ore fell out of one of the trucks in some other state or city somewhere and went right through a window. I think people might try to pass these vehicles and not realize how long they are. I mean we are talking not a very wide road to be honest with you. Motorhomes alone, sometimes are too wide to get around. But I like seeing tourists, that is not my point. This needs so much additional study and so much additional scrutiny, that it would be a crime for us at FAST because we have an excellent team of people that could look into this. To me it would be a crime to not do this. I wholeheartedly believe in partnering to do this, the bifurcating word. FAST Planning needs to be part of this. This is part of what FAST Planning, I believe, should do, not just to seek money for projects. It is an incredible resource for that, and we all know that, but to also study this kind of thing. I just could not agree more with the sentiment of every single letter that was read into the record and the public testimony from Mayor Hopkins of course, and Senator Wilken and others that spoke on those letters. So, anyway, I made the motion, I believe in this whole-heartedly, and I hope the Board agrees with me. That's all my comments for now. Thank you, Mayor Ward.

Mayor Welch: I will say this to the Board, I even have experience with this. In the Summer of 2001, I was in Northway. Every fortnight I was down there back and forth from Fairbanks International Airport to Northway going right through Tetlin, Tok, all of that, up and down that road. So, from 30 April of 2001 to 1 October of 2001 we were taking all the fuel pods out at the Northway Airport, and they trucked it in these big side dumpers all the way up to Moose Creek for it to be burned. So, what I experienced coming up the road, and remember there is always construction on the road too, is that the people that would get impatient because they were backed up by the trucks especially if there were pilot cars and things and it takes those trucks time to get back up to speed. And I can tell you that two times, I had to pull my Sat phone out and call in a report of people flying up behind me in a government car and almost slammed into the rear of me. So, sometimes it is not necessarily the truck, it is the people getting impatient around the trucks too, that are going to cause accidents. So, if I had not witnessed that. So, I am in full support of FAST Planning being involved, especially when it comes into our urban areas. But I have driven it both in the rural and in the urban areas. So, I think that I have gone through these reports, and I have listened. These letters that came in today are very compelling that people have legitimate concerns. I do not think it is just the people in the urban areas, it is the rural areas as well. And as some of you

know, we have seen fatalities down here on the Richardson Highway in North Pole and as a Mayor that disturbs me that we would not have some sort of check on this. The bifurcation idea may very well be okay, but I do think it is going to take a lot of tender loving care on the part of our Policy Board here to take a very good look at this and get a better way to do this. Thank you, Mr. Mayor. Thank you to the Board.

Savannah Fletcher: Thank you Mayor Ward. I agree with the statements made by my fellow Policy Board members. I really appreciate all the public comment. I think it is clear that we need this analysis. I am just curious and perhaps, Mr. Fox, you could answer this. At this time, it does not strike me as totally clear in our letter that we would wish to bifurcate responsibilities and have FAST Planning take over the urban corridor responsibility. I think we could just change some sentences at the end to make that clearer. Because at this point, there is not a mention of that in the letter, correct?

Mr. Fox stated that Ms. Fletcher was correct. Mr. Fox stated that the version in the meeting packet on Pages 68 and 69 was written basically as a request to DOT to include the scope of work as outlined in their larger corridor analysis. Mr. Fox explained that it does not ask that the efforts be bifurcated between urban and rural, and that FAST Planning would manage the urban portion of that study, nor any request for or any details as to if it were bifurcated whether FAST Planning would fund that, or if we are requesting DOT to provide some funding for us to complete that study. The letter would have to be amended if that was the intent of the motion. Currently the letter is just asking DOT to include this scope of work in their larger corridor analysis.

Amendment to the Motion: To amend the letter to add two sentences to the second-to-last paragraph as follows, "At that time, we would like to contribute our conversation and collaboration with your Committee and Kinross and Alaska DOT&PF on partnering with FAST Planning to accomplish the objectives outlined in this letter. At this time, we would anticipate bifurcating responsibilities and having FAST Planning take the lead on the urban traffic impact analysis, with Alaska DOT&PF focusing on the rural traffic impact analysis. We await more details from Alaska DOT&PF before we begin to plan our funding and how we will accomplish the urban impact analysis." (Fletcher/Matherly).

Discussion of Amendment to the Motion:

Mayor Matherly: I think what Ms. Fletcher did was great because I was curious about that too. I know when this letter was written, or this amended version, I think it was brought to Mr. Fox's attention that bifurcating might have to occur because of the limits and boundaries of FAST Planning. So what this represents to me is that they take care of their lane and then DOT looks at it. But having more than one group look at it, I think is the main focus, so I wholeheartedly support Ms. Fletcher's amendment to that and see if any other members want it tweaked or they like the wording too.

Mr. Kemp: I think, and maybe Mr. Fox can back me up here, I think the intent was that the Technical Committee went through this thing and they looked at it. This letter is being sent to the Department to consider the bullet points that you guys have laid out here. We have since set up a corridor study which will bring a consultant on, and they will do the study. The Department is not going to do the study. Then there is an Advisory Committee that will go through that study and

make sure that the communities along the route including Fairbanks area, that the concerns are being met and addressed in that study. I think the Technical Committee wanted to go through there and make sure that the Department was taking care of all the issues on this letter and if something fell off, say for whatever reason, one of the bullets, the Committee and the consultant doing the analysis decided we are not going to do that, for whatever reason, then FAST Planning would go ahead and procure a consultant to go ahead and do that. Maybe it was something with the PM2.5 that the overall committee just did not care about or something like that, and then FAST Planning decided "Hey we want further analysis on this, and we are going to do that." So, I think trying to split this thing up into two different corridor studies essentially, with FAST Planning doing one and the Department doing the other one, is a really bad idea. You can have different consultants. They better coordinate really well together so they are looking at the same things on the entire route. I know that urban and rural are going to look different, but you are going to want to have the same analysis done everywhere up and down the line and splitting this thing apart? I think that was the whole reason the Technical Committee put us in this position where; "Hey address all of our needs please" and that is what this letter is coming to the Department for. I think the last two sentences getting put in there to say that we are going to split this apart is exactly what the Technical Committee did not want us to do.

Ms. Fletcher: To respond to Mr. Kemp's comments. I am really trying to frame this, and I can cut and paste the language into the chat box so everyone can see it. I appreciate that we hear from you those updates from DOT. But until we actually see that plan and that group brought together, in writing, we do not know with certainty what that will include. I think we have heard loud and clear from the public that this is the type of analysis they at least want within this FAST region. I want to leave this door open saying; "We await to hear your plans DOT." There is a chance that once we see those in a month or two, that we all vote here; "Yeah, we will just work with them." But, at this point I want to have the letter signal to folks that we do see FAST as having the urban expertise, we are ready to proceed with the detailed analysis for this area if it is necessitated. That is really all this is trying to do. I do not think it locks us into anything. It just signals that and allows us to have that freedom moving forward.

Mayor Matherly: Maybe the same consultant can be used for both FAST and DOT. Maybe that is an option. I understand people's concerns here. But to me the concern of the overall plan far exceeds the worry about the studies maybe intersecting. I hope I said that clear for you. I think it needs to be done. Maybe the same consultant, like I said, can be used for both. But to me, the worries about the overall plan, the trucking plan, to me outweighs the worry about this, what I consider to be a pretty minor issue when it comes to the two studies. I mean let's get the studies going and see how they might intersect. But I think FAST clearly needs to play a role here, so I still stand by my support of Ms. Fletcher here.

Mr. Kemp: I just wanted to add one more thing here. FAST Planning will be on the Committee going forth with analyzing the study. They will have a seat at the table as will the Borough and both cities.

Mayor Welch: On that amendment too and echoing what Mayor Matherly said, I believe in many ways we will do better having the two studies because there could be shown where there could be complementary things where they actually come to the same conclusion. But you could also find some problems that are uncovered

by FAST that will not be uncovered by DOT, or vice versa. I am not overly worried about having two studies, obviously. So, I am for the amendment. Thank you.

Mayor Ward: This might be a little bit snarky, but I think it is probably warranted with the discussion on the amendment. I think it is pretty clear that we are not talking about our own money on this one because the purpose behind a corridor study is to not take a segmented approach to a corridor. It is to look at the entire corridor. As I appreciate the intent, I think, Ms. Fletcher that you have with the amendment is to ensure that there is a focus provided on the urbanized area, particularly in the MPO boundary, as that is the area of authority that we have. I think that can be incorporated into a single plan. And so, I do not think there is a need and I think we would do ourselves a disservice and the folks that pay for this organization a disservice by doing two separate plans and having two administrative burdens. But we can focus our energies, as I think the letter clearly states, to look at the impact to the MPO as kind of our main focus. And we are going to be laser beam focused on that. But in the context of an entire corridor study that goes from the very beginning of the project to the end. So, I do not necessarily know if the language, as it is worded, for it to be bifurcated is necessary. I think that they need to be very integrated. I do agree with the sentiment that there needs to be more focus on that urbanized area. 1) Because it is where most people are interacting with the traffic; but then 2) because that is our area of influence. I think that the letter as it is originally drafted is clear enough in that in my communications with Mr. Fox and with the State on it. I actually got a letter, as the Policy Board Chair and as the Mayor, to be involved in the committee for this. I believe that they are going to have that strong focus on this urbanized area. If we want to add something else to make sure that is very, very clear in the letter, I would be support of that. But I think the amendment, as it is drafted, I am not in support of two separate plans. I think it needs to be one corridor study with an emphasis on the MPO.

Mayor Matherly: Just a question for you Mayor Ward. I do not think you and I have talked too much about Manh Choh. I have heard from Mayor Welch and his concerns and Mr. Wilken. How do you feel about it? Are you concerned as we are and concerned as some of the letters that have read about the traffic? You are in the Borough, and a lot of this is going to go through the Borough. It is a real concern for me. Can you share your thoughts if you would not mind, please?

Mayor Ward: Yes. I would be happy to share my thoughts when we get back to the main motion. I do want to make sure we are staying focused on the amendment which is to separate and have two essentially separate plans with the MPO managing one of them. But I would be happy to do that under the main motion.

Vote on Amendment to the Motion: Three in favor. Three opposed. (Ward, Gibson, Kemp). Amendment to the Motion failed.

Discussion on original Motion:

Mr. Gibson: I really like this letter and I appreciate all the public testimony. That is the way it should be done. I appreciate the idea of doing this study. I do have some concerns in making sure that we are not overextending our organization into doing additional things when our focus should be on road projects and making sure that we are accomplishing our main mission to begin with. But, as far as working with the DOT, I think that would be a very good idea.

Mayor Ward: I definitely understand and have heard the concerns from the community on the safety aspects of the plan. There are a few things I think I would like to go over on the letter. 1) I am supportive of doing a traffic impact study and looking at the safety concerns that have been identified from the public in regard to the transportation plan or the moving of ore such a long distance from the Manh Choh project to Ft. Knox. I think it is important though to take that into consideration with our role as the MPO as a transit planning organization. We do transit planning, so we prepare for development. If we understand a project is coming online, our goal as an organization is to look at how we can put together plans/projects that can be implemented to minimize the impact to the system. To improve the safety of the system. I think we tread a little bit on interesting territory when we look at this from a traffic impact study, which is; How would a particular project impact our community? I think if we go into it with the predetermined or predisposed idea of denial, as I have heard with some of the comments, I think we are going to be doing a disservice. 1) To the organization that is proposing this project, but then 2) to our community because that is not our role. Our role is to look at the impact of this particular project on the infrastructure, on the transportation system, and then make recommendations that can be done to mitigate that whether it be through operational decisions or whether it be through capital projects. So, I just want to make it clear that I am going to support this letter, but it is not with the predetermined idea that this is going to result in denial of the project, but that I hope it really does identify areas that we can focus either with the contractor, with Kinross, on how they can improve their plan to minimize the impact to the community, or what we can do as the planning agency to improve our system for this type of traffic. I would like to also add that there is nothing in the regulatory package that requires a company with doing a project, as we understand it today, to go through any kind of regulatory review. That can be both good and bad. As we have heard from testimony today and other interactions not just with FAST Planning, folks are concerned about the safety impact of this project on folks that are traversing through the area. I think those are very warranted. Those are things that definitely need to be taken into consideration. But, again, looking at it from the view of, what do we do to mitigate those impacts not to kill a project? So, again, I will support the letter as it is presented here. I think there are good questions. I think the State has a plan on how we can address these to look at things like the bus stop issues, to look at the hours in travel of these particular projects. But I want to be really clear on why I am supporting this moving forward and that it is not to ultimately result in not doing a project but finding out how we can talk about operational changes or capital infrastructure changes that can support these types of projects. I guess just to further that a little bit more, we need to be careful about what we ask for. So, if we are asking for anyone that has this amount of truck traffic on the road to go through this type of review, then we need to certainly be thinking about other freight impacts to this community such as the companies that bring freight up and down the Parks every day, or transport goods and services up to the North Slope, or transport other goods and services up and down the Richardson. There are certainly areas that we need to take into consideration here on what our role as a community really is in regulating this type of activity and does it meet that threshold. We have certain thresholds in place already through our planning actions of when traffic impact studies are generated and when that is required, and this does not do that. So, I think with the concern

from the community, I am glad that we have a plan or way to move forward with this. I just want us to be careful about what we are asking for here.

Mayor Matherly: First of all, it is disappointing that the amendment was defeated. I will say that first off. I would rather put it in and take it out later. Sometimes that is easier than trying to put it in later. I think the stronger we start stepping with this, the better. I think the more we start on this solid foot, the better. With all due respect to your comments Mayor Ward, I do not really put this in the same category along with the other trucking companies that bring stuff up. This is the biggest thing I have heard of. I have been reading a lot on this and talking to the players. I think this is kind of an unprecedented amount of continuous, round-the-clock, all year long. Part of my worries are, underestimating, you know, if the mine is as big as they say. And keep in mind, I never even said or even tried to hint around that I would like to kill the deal either. I am very pro-development and I think that was the message of a lot of folks that wrote in. I think the Manh Choh Mine could be a huge blessing to this State but just put a mill there. Now I know we cannot say that to Kinross and to Manh Choh. That is up to them. I just think there are other alternatives they could look at. I do not put this on the same level as just Span Alaska or others just trucking stuff up. I think this is much, much larger than that. And if they do underestimate the amount of trucking, then you cannot put that toothpaste back in the tube. I think the strongest message we can send up front, the better. My opinion. Question to Mr. Fox. What I am confused about now is since Ms. Fletcher did want to put in some language, and sometimes we win and sometimes we lose a vote. I get that. It is not a problem. But now does this letter, Mr. Fox, put us squarely in the research? In other words, does this letter without those amendments still say to the group, FAST Planning wants to be involved? Because, to what Mr. Gibson said, Yes. I know what FAST Planning was designed to do, but I think sometimes important things call for important involvement. Even above and beyond what the group does normally. That is just my opinion. We all have a stake in this ore transportation, and we all have a stake in the problems that could arise from it. In my opinion. Mr. Fox, does this give you the teeth you need? Because I think you support this. Does it give you the teeth you need, without that amendment or that word bifurcate which stresses everyone out for some reason. Does this give you the teeth you need to get in there and ensure that FAST Planning is going to be involved as much as we possibly can? Could you answer that please?

Mr. Fox: I think it does. Again, in my opinion, this letter is a statement of expectations for what we would like to see analyzed in the urban area. And it is a request for collaboration and partnership with DOT that these expectations be met within their larger corridor study.

Mayor Matherly: Okay.

Mr. Fox: I will circle back to Mr. Kemp's comments though. As that corridor study unfolds and that scope of work is developed and they hire a consultant, we will, being at the table, we will readily see whether or not our expectations are being met or not. And at that time, this issue can come back to the Board for consideration of filling in the gaps or doing a more detailed analysis. You know, if we can clearly see that the larger corridor study is not going to meet our needs. I am okay with this moving forward as it is and it will be just kind of a "wait and see." And I will give this body updates as I see them.

Mayor Matherly: Just to close out. That did not excite me at all. Jackson's comments did not excite me one bit. "It's okay." "I guess I'm okay with it." "I could circle back." That does not give me a warm fuzzy. I am just going to be honest with the group here. Not one bit. Why can't we see the importance of this and put in that language? We are not slapping anybody in the face. We are all wanting to do what is best for the state, but this is a huge deal. And of course, I know outside of these meetings, Ms. Fletcher, Mayor Welch, we could all call players and we could still talk and be involved. I get that. But a collective voice like FAST is really important. I mean, it is important. To me it is not just, 'Hey pave my road.' I mean, which is great. I love that. But I think we can use our voice in other ways on this one. So, just the fact that Mr. Fox said "Oh, it's okay." I mean it does not excite me. I am just sharing that with the group. I am pretty disappointed. I will vote for the letter of course. It is better than no letter at all. But let's don't toss it all out now. I mean, we do not want to insult the players that are trying to build it. I get that and I respect Mayor Ward's comments. But let's don't slap ourselves as FAST and not give us the strength we need to really talk on this. I really would like to hear other Board comments if I could. If I am being way too passionate, fine, okay, I get it. But I think Ms. Fletcher was right on the money with her amendment. I cannot believe that did not go through. Thank you.

Mayor Welch: I would not make the assumption that the people on this Board were sitting here trying to stop development. I think what we are trying to do is encourage that this is done properly and safely. There is a lot of unintended consequences. I would never go to the point to say that because there is no regulatory requirement, that is why the State is finding itself in trouble. I can look at environmental concerns and say if the State DEC had been better prepared to know what sulfolane and [inaudible], I would not have all the contamination I have in my city today. So, maybe that is why this needs to come to our attention to do something about it. I have enough evidence with just trying to remove snow from what is happening with these big side dumps in my city. Having fire hydrants knocked over, peoples' cars smashed, utility poles just about pulled out of the ground. So, I could just imagine what it is like screaming down the road at 65 miles per hour too. I am not trying to squash development. We have a possibility here to take a good look and say let us now find the proper way and make that part of regulations for any future development as well. And I would rest on that. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Ms. Fletcher: Yes. Three points. I agree with folks who have already spoken. This is not a study with predetermined outcomes. I think that is precisely why we are asking for a study. Because folks are assuming whether or not this would be safe, and we are trying to get to the bottom of that. So, at least I do not get the impression from anyone on this Board that they are supporting this or not assuming there would be a predetermined outcome. Second, I am frustrated. I hear everyone being appreciative of the public input that has been provided in this process. But it seems as though, and I think I am on the same page as Mayor Matherly, we as a Board are only listening to that public input to the degree that we are comfortable with it. I am hearing a strong statement from folks that they do want FAST to be in the leader seat on this analysis. And this letter, as we just heard Mr. Fox confirm, kind of takes us out of that seat. Having one FAST rep on this committee with DOT is not the equivalent to having the entire Board kind of leading this, getting up to date things, and getting to debate amongst ourselves

how we proceed. So, I do not think we are fully listening to the public's request here. And thirdly, even if regulations do not require a safety impact analysis here, are we going to leave ourselves to a tort system that then places the burden on individuals who might be harmed from accidents that could occur to then bring lawsuits and try to seek remedies after damages occur? I do not think we want to support that kind of expensive process on private individuals. This is an appropriate discretionary choice of FAST to review safety concerns in advance and try to mitigate any harms before they occur. So, I do think this falls well within the purview of what FAST is supposed to do and I am really proud that we are stepping up to do it. So, that being said, I do support this letter. I am just a little frustrated that we are missing some of the nuance I think is important. Thanks.

Mr. Kemp: Ms. Fletcher are you saying that you think that there is going to be lawsuits involved from accidents from the truckers being on the road? Is that what you are saying? To the State?

Ms. Fletcher: Do you want me to respond or wait my turn?

Mr. Kemp: Yes. I am just trying to understand what you are asking.

Ms. Fletcher: No. I am not asking for anything. I am just kind of responding to Mayor Ward's comments that under regulations there is not a requirement for a safety analysis here. And my point is, simply because regulations may not require it, I think FAST has discretion to choose how we are going to promote safety in our community and effective traffic flows in planning. And I see this as something we should do even if regulations say, in this instance, this project does not necessitate it. Because I think in those situations when regulations do not require it, it is because we are depending on a private market to then hold companies accountable after-the-fact, after something goes wrong, and that is when our tort system comes into play. So, I am not saying that the State will suffer lawsuits. I am just saying that the remedy for citizens in our community if we do not try to do an analysis now and mitigate harms in advance, would be things like bringing expensive lawsuits after they have suffered harms. And I do not think that is a good system. That is all.

Mr. Kemp: It is not just the FAST Planning that has a seat at the table. The Borough has a seat at the table. I mean Mayor Ward got two letters, one for FAST and one for the Borough. Both cities are getting an invitation. So, there are four Policy Board members here that got letters that are on this FAST Planning Committee that will, whether it is themselves or someone in their administration that will have a seat at the table. So, there is going to be three or four people on this FAST Planning Committee that will be on the Transportation Committee for that study as well. So, they should be pretty well represented here is how I see it.

Mayor Ward: I just wanted to provide some clarification to my comments earlier. I am supportive of the letter, and I am supportive of the State doing this review. My comments in regard to the requirement, that this is not required, I think is to some of the comments that we received from the public that made it seem like there was no interest for folks to do this from a regulatory perspective. So, I think that obviously as DOT has set up the Committee and then FAST Planning through the letter that we have before us today, is engaged in this process and will be engaging to have those discussions on safety and impact to the community. I was just trying to make that clarification. My other comment on the predisposition of the plan for denial was, again, a reference to some of the comments that we received

that seemed very much against the project. Now with that being said, I think there are concerns that we can draw from those comments on how we address them. But I just wanted to make sure I was clear on that one. I do not believe that the Policy Board is coming to this with a preconceived notion of denial, but we certainly received comments to that tune here at the Policy Board and at the Technical Committee. So again, I am supportive of the letter as it is written, and I am supportive of being part of that process to identify these issues moving forward and what we can do to rectify them.

Vote on Original Motion: None opposed. Approved.

9. Other Issues

No other issues.

10. Informational Items

a. Infrastructure Investment & Jobs Act (IIJA) Update

Mr. Fox provided the monthly update of the various funding opportunities available to Alaska in the IIJA Bill.

b. Obligations and Offsets

Mr. Fox explained the obligations and offsets included in the meeting packet.

11. Policy Board Member Comments

- Ms. Fletcher commented that she wanted to briefly thank folks and stated that it was nice to have a robust and engaged dialogue even if they were not all on the same page.
- Mayor Ward thanked Ms. Fletcher and stated that he echoed those comments.
- Mayor Matherly seconded what Ms. Fletcher said and commented that he enjoyed a robust discussion. Mayor Matherly stated that at the City Council level they did not always see eye to eye, but they all had the same passion for our state and our community. Mayor Matherly stated that he respected everyone on this Board, and they all worked very hard on these projects. Mayor Matherly commented that he had to give a tip of the hat to the State DOT and to the Public Works Department because this was an unprecedented winter. Mayor Matherly wanted everyone to know that the City was working very hard to tackle the leftover winter that they had. Mayor Matherly thanked everyone for serving on this Board and stated that it was a pleasure to work with all of them.

12. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 1:53 p.m. The next Policy Board Meeting is scheduled for Wednesday, May 18, 2022.

Approved: 

Mayor Bryce Ward, Chair
FAST Planning Policy Board

Date: 5-19-22