



TECHNICAL COMMITTEE

Meeting Minutes – November 2, 2022

Key Bank Building, 100 Cushman Street, Suite 205

Zoom Meeting URL: <https://fastplanning.us/keepup/zoom/>

Telephone Number: 1 (253) 215-8782, Meeting ID: 894-3193-5124

1. Call to Order

Jackson Fox, Chair, called the meeting to order at 12:01 p.m.

2. Introduction of Members and Attendee

The following were present:

Name	Representing
*Jackson Fox, Chair	FAST Planning
*Corey DiRutigliano	FAST Planning
*Olivia Lunsford, Vice Chair	FAST Planning
*Deborah Todd	FAST Planning
**Justin Burgess	AES Transportation
**Randi Bailey for Judy Chapman	DOT&PF Planning
**Nick Czarnecki	ADEC Air Quality
**Michelle Denton	FNSB Transportation
**Kate Dueber	Alaska Railroad Corporation
**Kevin McKinley	FNSB Borough Planning Commission
**Tim Zinza for Robert Pristash	City of Fairbanks Engineering
**Bill Rogers	City of Fairbanks Engineering
**Lt. Mike Roberts	Alaska State Troopers
**John Netardus for Sarah Schacher	DOT&PF Preconstruction
**Don Galligan for Kellen Spillman	FNSB Community Planning
**RJ Stumpf (absent)	Fairbanks International Airport
**Jakob Theurich (absent)	University of AK-Fairbanks
**Danny Wallace	City of North Pole
**John Weinberger	Fort Wainwright
Peter Stern	Bike/Ped Advisory Committee
Jack Barnwell	Fairbanks Daily News-Miner
Andrew Ooms	Kittelson & Associates
Michael Lukshin	FHWA
Ivet Hall	DOT&PF
* FAST PLANNING Staff members	
** FAST PLANNING Technical Committee members	

3. Approval of the November 2, 2022 Agenda

Motion: To approve the November 2, 2022 Technical Committee Agenda.
(Rogers/Denton)

Discussion: No discussion.

Vote on Motion: None opposed. Approved.

4. Approval of the October 12, 2022 Meeting Minutes

Motion: To approve the October 12, 2022 Meeting Minutes. (Denton/Rogers).

Discussion: No discussion.

Vote on Motion: None opposed. Approved.

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

Mr. Fox noted the following updates:

- At the October 19, 2022 meeting, the Policy Board:
 - Approved a motion to support the State targets for Travel Time Reliability Performance Measures.
 - Approved a Letter of Support for the Statewide Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) Amendment #5. That letter was submitted to DOT Headquarters.
- At the October 20, 2022 meeting, the Project Enhancement Committee:
 - Offered support for the Airport Way/Peger Road Intersection Study.
 - Passed a motion to support a new public involvement and planning study for the proposed College Road from University Avenue to the Johansen Expressway.

6. Public Comment Period (Non-Action Items)

No public comment.

7. Old Business

a. FFY23-27 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) (Action Item)

• Consideration of Releasing the Draft FFY23-27 TIP, Including Funding Alternatives for 30-Day Public Comment Period

Mr. Fox explained that Page 9 of the meeting packet showed the new project nominations and the updated estimates for the active and illustrative projects in the FFY23-27 TIP. Mr. Fox provided an overview of the funding plan and then explained each individual project included in the FFY23-27 TIP.

Public Comment: No public comment.

Motion: To amend the Draft TIP to move the construction year for the Doughchee Avenue/Beaver Springs Bridge project from 2027 to 2025. (Wallace/Rogers).

Discussion: Mr. Wallace commented that the Doughchee Road/Beaver Springs Bridge project is an erosion control project. Mr. Wallace commented that they see it deteriorate every single year and they have to go back and repair it. Mr. Wallace explained that they would like to see it potentially beginning in 2025, rather than 2027. Mr. Wallace commented that the issue is that he does not know what the effects are on other projects and did not have a project nomination to bump a specific project, but he thinks it needs to be addressed before 2027 if that is feasible. Mr. Wallace stated that he would open it up to discussion but that is the request from the City of North Pole.

Mr. Fox noted that in making this move, he may have to delay projects or project phases from other projects to shuffle the money around. Mr. Fox stated at this time he did not think that he nor Mr. Wallace were necessarily prepared to let them all know which project might slide because this one got accelerated, but just realize that if they do accelerate it, something will likely slide out one year later than what they see in the funding plan. Mr. Fox commented that it is not a large amount of money, so hopefully the impact will not be too much. Mr. Fox stated that he appreciates Mr. Wallace's input so that everybody understands that there is active erosion occurring and this needs to get done sooner rather than later which would cost us a lot more money if the erosion continued.

Mr. Galligan asked Mr. Fox how confident we were in the cost estimate. Mr. Galligan commented that if they moved the project up to 2025 that could have significant impact if that cost estimate is 50 percent of what the actual cost would be.

Mr. Fox explained that the cost estimate provided by the City of North Pole was about \$430K and he bumped it up to \$600K. Mr. Fox commented that Mr. Netardus was working on it and asked if he had any idea what the cost would be.

Mr. Netardus explained that he did not have a cost estimate at this time, but they were currently working on that estimate.

Mr. Fox explained that this number was in flux and a smaller number had been provided with it, but it might be combined into the FAST Improvement Program so they might get a better bid out of it in 2025.

Mr. Wallace explained that they had a local engineering firm do an estimate for this and that did not mean that it would align with what DOT comes up with, but they are fairly confident that the initial \$430,000, if they started today, was pretty accurate.

Mr. Netardus asked Mr. Wallace to meet with him about it in the next few days.

Vote on Motion: None opposed. Approved.

Motion: To amend the Draft TIP to provide \$200,000 for the Right-of-Way Phase for the Woll Road Resurfacing and Widening Project in 2023. (Netardus/Galligan).

Discussion Mr. Netardus commented that achieving 2024 construction is a risk at this point, if right-of-way is delayed, and asked Mr. Fox if the project would fit in 2025 if the Advance Construct was reduced in 2024.

Ivet Hall of DOT commented that she was the Project Manager, and they cannot widen the roadway without getting extra right-of-way so if they can, she would encourage them to try to keep the construction in 2024.

Mr. Fox explained that right now they had funding in 2024 for construction.

Vote on Motion: None opposed. Approved.

Motion: To recommend to the Policy Board to release of the Draft FFY23-27 TIP for a 30-day public comment period. (Rogers/Bailey).

Discussion: No discussion.

Vote on Motion: None opposed. Approved.

Motion: To fund the Geist/Chena Pump Road Corridor Study in the Draft TIP. (Weinberger/Zinza).

Discussion: No discussion.

Vote on Motion: None opposed. Approved.

b. 2045 Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP) Update (Action Item)
• Consideration of Releasing the Draft MTP Update and Air Quality Conformity Analysis for 30-Day Public Comment Period

Mr. Fox explained that Page 20 of the Meeting Packet contained the Executive Summary for the 2045 MTP. Mr. Fox requested that the Technical Committee review the MTP project list and policy assessment carefully and provide their comments by December 2, 2022. Mr. Fox introduced Andrew Ooms of Kittelson

& Associates to provide an overview of the 2045 MTP Update. Mr. Ooms reiterated that comments were due on the MTP project list and policy assessment by December 2, 2022.

Public Comment: No public comment.

Motion: To recommend to the Policy Board to release of the Draft 2025 MTP Update for a 30-day public comment period. (Netardus/Denton).

Discussion: Mr. Netardus asked Mr. Fox if there would be any reason not to move this ahead since people had not had time to read it fully yet.

Mr. Fox explained that they were required to update these documents every four years and the deadline to complete this document was January 31, 2023.

Mr. Fox explained that from this date forward, if this was released for public comment, all Technical Committee members have about 45 days to do a thorough review and provide comments. Mr. Fox explained that we were hoping to have this document completed and adopted so that we did not get into a lapse going past the end of January 2023.

Mr. Czarnecki asked Mr. Fox if he could explain what implications the timeline might have for a potential conformity freeze if this MTP did not get approved on that timeline.

Mr. Fox explained that if they did not meet the end of January 2023 for our timeline, it would be considered a lapse, so our TIP document would basically be frozen so the funding plan would be frozen as well and we would not be able to make any amendments or modifications to it. Mr. Fox added that we are trying to avoid a lapse and thought we could meet that schedule to have the document adopted and the Air Quality Conformity Analysis approved by the Federal Highway Administration and Federal Transit Administration.

Mr. Czarnecki asked Mr. Fox how long it typically took to get the Air Quality Conformity Analysis completed and through the Federal Highway Administration.

Mr. Fox explained that once this project list is firmed up, updates are made to the Travel Demand Model, and provided to our Consultant, Tom Carlson of Trinity Consultants, it takes less than a month for Mr. Carlson to complete his work.

Mr. Fox explained that once that work is complete, we also need to release the Draft Air Quality Conformity Analysis for a 30-day public comment period, likely during the month of December. Mr. Fox added that we would also need the Policy Board to adopt the MTP in conjunction with the Air Quality Conformity Analysis. Mr. Fox explained that we are looking at adoption in mid-January and transmittal to the Federal Highway Administration and Federal Transit Administration for their approval of the two documents. Mr. Fox explained that in past updates, we typically received an approval letter in less than two weeks, and they are aware of our deadline of January 31. Mr. Fox explained that we are running this right up against our deadline but that is what our schedule is at this time.

Vote on Motion: None opposed. Approved.

8. New Business

a. 5th Avenue Reconstruction Design and Utilities Funding Increase (Action Item)

Mr. Fox explained that Page 55 of the Meeting Packet showed the email from Ivet Hall of DOT requesting funding increases for the Design and Utilities Phases of the 5th Avenue Reconstruction Project.

Public Comment: No public comment.

Motion: To recommend to the Policy Board to approve the funding increase [for the 5th Avenue Reconstruction project] as outlined in the email. (Rogers/Zinza).

Discussion: Mr. Galligan asked Mr. Fox if FAST Planning if we typically used project offsets for these types of increases.

Mr. Fox explained that we do, but we do not have any offset money at this time.

Mr. Galligan explained that he was noticing that in the offsets at the end of the agenda. Mr. Galligan commented that it seems to him that if you are trying to get water out of dry well, you should find a different well. Mr. Galligan stated that it seems like there might be a little bit of an issue funding this request.

Mr. Fox explained that we do not have any offsets to cover this. Mr. Fox continued that he understood from John Netardus that some offsets may be coming that will assist with this or we could borrow money from next year to cover this increase. Mr. Fox explained that he would have to massage the numbers in the TIP to make the math work out. Mr. Fox stated that if the Technical Committee approved this increase today, we do not, at this time, have a funding source so that was something that he would have to figure out over the next month or two.

Mr. Galligan asked Mr. Fox if that would then impact the proposed TIP.

Mr. Fox explained that Mr. Galligan was correct, and it would impact the TIP if he had to use funds from the TIP instead of offsets. Mr. Fox explained that regardless of where the funds came from, they would likely not be available until December or January, and it would take some time to come up with this funding.

Ms. Hall commented that they were trying to finish the design of the project in the next couple months so she guessed she would keep her fingers crossed for offsets.

Mr. Fox asked Ms. Hall if they were able to come up with the funding for this if her priority would be the Design funding first and the Utility funding later.

Ms. Hall stated that she thought that would work but she would like to check to see if they could do it in pieces.

Mr. Fox stated that typically they had a funding source for these projects when they came up but this time they did not and at least they were going in with their eyes open.

Mr. Galligan commented that he guessed they could put Mr. Fox on it to see what magic he could work to come up with these funds, but he did not know if it was really good fiscal policy to be approving a cost increase without knowing where or if the funds would be available.

Mr. Fox responded that he understood Mr. Galligan's concern.

Mr. McKinley asked if Mr. Galligan could repeat his comment.

Mr. Galligan repeated that he asked Mr. Fox if they could postpone the motion until a funding was identified.

Mr. Weinberger asked if the process was to vote on where the money would come from, because some table would change in the TIP if that happened.

Mr. Fox stated that Mr. Weinberger was correct.

Motion: To defer action on the funding increase [for the 5th Avenue Reconstruction Project] until a funding source is identified.
(Weinberger/Galligan).

Discussion: Ms. Bailey asked Ms. Hall how delaying the project a month would affect the project.

Ms. Hall explained that she was in the process of trying to do the Professional Services Agreement (PSA) for the electrical services. Ms. Hall stated that she can hope that she has enough money to do that, but if she cannot get that done, then this project will not be able to be able to get finalized within the timeline. Ms. Hall stated that what she heard is that either there would be offsets available, or there would be some shuffling in the TIP to make this funding available. Ms. Hall stated that if she could have her two cents, she would rather have the increase approved today. Ms. Hall stated that they are finishing up the design of the project and everyone is pushing to get it done in the next month to a month and a half. Ms. Hall stated that putting all of it on hold is not that great for her. Ms. Hall stated that if they could get the Phase 2 fund increase that would be preferable.

Ms. Bailey asked Ms. Hall if it would delay the project if they used the funds on Phase 2 and held off on Phase 7.

Ms. Hall commented that she did not know if the Committee was open to it but if it had to be borrowed from the TIP and how the funding had to be shuffled but they had some projects that were waiting for additional funding and some project starts. Ms. Hall commented that she would not get project certification until the utility agreements are signed and she would not get the utility agreements signed until she had the funding for the Utility Phase, and then she cannot complete the design until she had funding to complete the design, so at this rate delaying the project might put it in jeopardy for construction next summer.

Mr. Netardus asked Mr. Fox about holding a special Technical Committee Meeting if a funding source was found prior to the next scheduled Technical Committee meeting.

Mr. Fox stated that they could hold a Special Technical Committee Meeting to vote if the funds were found prior to the next meeting.

Ms. Dueber asked Mr. Fox how soon he would know whether offset funding was available.

Mr. Fox explained that he thought there might be some project closure funds available in the next couple months.

Ms. Dueber commented that she thought that many of the Technical Committee members felt that using offset funding was preferable to shuffling projects around in the TIP.

Mr. Zinza asked Mr. Fox to clarify if that meant that if they voted yes on this, it meant that Mr. Fox would move forward to find the funding for this.

Mr. Fox explained that would be true for the original motion, but they would have to vote no on the motion to defer.

Mr. Zinza stated that obviously he was going to advocate to vote for the funds because he was working on this project, but it seems clear that the funds were needed, and the project needs to move forward so he just wanted to clarify that.

Ms. Bailey asked Mr. Fox if they deferred it to next month but in the meantime, they did not get offset funds, if they would still have to come up with the funds and vote whether to use those funds at the next Technical Committee Meeting.

Mr. Fox stated that Ms. Bailey was correct and even if the funds became available, the Technical Committee would have to meet to approve use of that funding.

Vote on Motion: Four in favor. Seven opposed. (Bailey, Czarnecki, Dueber, McKinley, Roberts, Rogers, Zinza). Motion Failed.

Discussion: Mr. Netardus asked Mr. Fox for clarification that if they voted for this, that meant that Ms. Hall could not spend the money until Mr. Fox identified the funds and said yes to her.

Mr. Fox stated that Mr. Netardus was correct.

Mr. Weinberger asked Mr. Fox if it the Technical Committee still had to vote on it unless it was below a certain threshold and how it matched with the thresholds.

Mr. Fox explained that for both of these, this item still has to go in front of the Policy Board and the Technical Committee was just making a recommendation today. Mr. Fox stated that if the Policy Board approves this same motion without identifying a funding source, it was up to him that when he found the funding, he used that funding.

Mr. Netardus asked Mr. Fox if that meant this was not approving the funding yet and Ms. Hall could not sign an agreement to hire someone.

Mr. Fox stated that Mr. Netardus was correct.

Mr. Weinberger asked Mr. Fox is this was a blank check.

Mr. Fox stated that it was specific to the amounts on Page 55 of the Meeting Packet: \$160,000 for the Utility Phase and \$175,000 for the Design Phase.

Mr. Weinberger stated that he guessed that it was a reverse blank check from whatever other funding source.

Mr. Fox stated the Mr. Weinberger was correct and it would authorize him to utilize whatever funding source he came up with to fund this increase.

Mr. Weinberger asked Mr. Fox if that meant that the Technical Committee and Policy Board would not have to vote on it again.

Mr. Fox explained that Mr. Weinberger was correct if the main motion was passed as stated, but amendments could be made to make it more specific.

Mr. Netardus asked Mr. Fox if he wanted the ability to break this up if he could not find that \$335K.

Mr. Fox explained that he believed he had the authority to approve up to this amount.

Ms. Hall explained that it seemed like the only way to get this funding right now is to change the proposed TIP. Ms. Hall stated that she was looking at the Minnie Street project and it showed \$1.1M in FFY23, which is this fiscal year. Ms. Hall stated that it was going to be a push to get this done this fiscal year because the

City is still working out the precise right-of-way opposition areas and they have to have those in order to evaluate the impact on the historic properties in the historic districts. Ms. Hall stated that they would have to have a consultation with the State Historic Preservation Office, and she would have to finish the environmental document so she did not think it would be a huge difference to the Minnie Street project if that funding got moved to 2024. Ms. Hall stated that they could still try to get this done, and it can be amended to be moved back if offsets become available. Ms. Hall stated that she had been in communication with Sarah Schacher and she expressed the concern that pushing the 5th Avenue by a year put the past funding at risk.

Mr. Fox explained that by doing that, that would provide the necessary funding to cover this increase.

Amendment to the Motion: To delay the final design start on the Minnie Street Upgrade project from 2023 to 2024 to provide the necessary funding in 2023 for the 5th Avenue project funding increase for the utilities and design phase. (McKinley/Rogers).

Discussion: Mr. Zinza commented that they are still not in the right-of-way process on Minnie Street and there are certain issues with Minnie Street, so it makes sense to move the funding to 5th Avenue and push that project out a year.

Ms. Hall stated that delaying the funding for Minnie Street Project would not affect the Minnie Street Project and she offered that because she thinks it is a win-win for both projects.

Vote on Amendment to the Motion: None opposed. Approved.

Vote on Motion as Amended: None opposed. Approved.

Amended Motion: To recommend to the Policy Board to approve the funding increase [for the 5th Avenue Reconstruction project] as outlined in the email and delay the final design start on the Minnie Street Upgrade project from 2023 to 2024 to provide the necessary funding in 2023 for the 5th Avenue project funding increase for the utilities and design phase.

Motion: To extend the meeting until 2:20 pm to get through Item 8b and postpone the rest of the items on the Agenda until the next meeting. (Netardus/Zinza).

Discussion: No discussion.

Vote on Motion: None opposed. Approved

b. Cooperative Agreement Between State of Alaska and FAST Planning on the Formation of a Regional Planning Organization (Action Item)

Mr. Fox explained that the State of Alaska provided a Cooperative Agreement in consideration of FAST Planning's signature on it. This Cooperative Agreement is similar to the one that was signed between the Copper Valley Regional Corporation and the State of Alaska which is the first regional corporation to be set up in the state. This agreement is general as far as the scope and responsibilities of FAST Planning and the State. This Agreement formalizes a process for establishing a Regional Planning Organization and alludes to the idea that at some point FAST will developing some type of Operating Agreement between the cooperating agencies This Agreement only comes with \$30K to do the work. The DOT has established a Rural Planning Organization Pilot Program in the STIP and it would not require local match funding. The work that would be

completed for the \$30K would cover the staff time to host meetings between the Borough, FAST Planning, and DOT Staff to discuss the formation of a Regional Planning Organization, would cover staff time to work with the Borough Assembly on a budget proposal for local match contributions to do this work, it would provide enough funding to put together an annual work program with a detailed budget for the funding needed to actually do this work, it would provide enough funding for staff time to make some amendments to our Bylaws, add a new Article in the Bylaws for establishment of a Rural/Regional Policy Committee, add additional seats for rural representatives on the Technical Committee, and then begin drafting a Scope of Services for the Long Range Transportation Plan for the 16 rural communities outside the MPO boundaries.

Public Comment: No public comment.

Motion: To recommend to the Policy Board to authorize the Executive Director of FAST Planning to sign the Cooperative Agreements between the State of Alaska and FAST Planning for the formation of a Regional Planning Organization. (Rogers/Weinberger).

Discussion: No further discussion

Vote on Motion: None opposed. Approved.

- c. **Pavement & Bridge Condition Performance Measure Targets (Action Item)**
 - **Consideration of Supporting the State's 2024 & 2026 Targets**
This agenda item was postponed to the December 7, 2022 meeting.
- d. **Approval of FAST Planning 2023 Meeting Calendar (Action Item)**
This agenda item was postponed to the December 7, 2022 meeting.

9. Other Issues

No other issues.

10. Informational Items

a. Infrastructure Investment & Jobs Act (IIJA) Update

This agenda item was postponed to the December 7, 2022 meeting.

b. Obligations and Offsets

This agenda item was postponed to the December 7, 2022 meeting.

11. Technical Committee Member Comments

- No Technical Committee member comments.

12. Adjournment

Motion to Adjourn: (Netardus/Zinza). The meeting adjourned at 2:17 p.m. The next Technical Committee meeting is Wednesday, December 7, 2022.

Approved:  Date: 12/7/22
Jackson Fox, Chair
FAST Planning Technical Committee