



TECHNICAL COMMITTEE

Meeting Minutes

March 4, 2026 • 12:00 – 2:00 P.M.

FAST Planning Office, 100 Cushman Street, Suite 215, Fairbanks, AK

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

Zoom Meeting Telephone Number: 1 (253) 215-8782 Meeting ID: 823-9227-7142

1. Call to Order

Jackson Fox, Chair called the meeting to order at 12:02 pm.

2. Introduction of Members and Attendees

The following were present:

Name	Representing
*Jackson Fox, Chair	FAST Planning
*Olivia Lunsford, Vice Chair	FAST Planning
*Corey DiRutigliano	FAST Planning
*Deborah Todd	FAST Planning
*Randi Bailey (absent)	DOT&PF Planning
*Don Galligan	FNSB Planning
**Michael Bredlie	FNSB Rural Services
**Jennifer Campbell	FNSB Planning Commission
**Michelle Denton	FNSB MACS Transit
**Kate Dueber	Alaska Railroad Corporation
**Tim Glidden	City of North Pole
**Alexa Greene	Eielson Air Force Base
**Brett Nelson	DOT&PF Planning
**Al Beck for John Netardus	DOT&PF Preconstruction
**Jason Olds	ADEC Air Quality
**Robert Pristash	City of Fairbanks Engineering
**Corey Richardson	Tanana Chiefs Conference
**Lt. Mike Roberts	Alaska State Troopers
**Tim Zinza for William Rogers	City of Fairbanks Engineering
**Kellen Spillman	FNSB Community Planning
**R.J. Stumpf	Fairbanks International Airport
**Jakob Theurich	University of Alaska Fairbanks
**John Weinberger	Fort Wainwright
Megan Flory	RESPEC
Emily Haynes	FHWA Alaska Division
*FAST PLANNING Staff members ** FAST PLANNING Technical Committee members	

3. Approval of the March 4, 2026 Agenda

Motion: To approve the March 4, 2026 agenda. (Pristash/Dueber).

Discussion: No discussion.

Vote on Motion: None opposed. Approved.

4. Approval of the February 4, 2026 Meeting Minutes

Motion: To approve the February 4, 2026 Meeting Minutes. (Spillman/Campbell).

Discussion: No discussion.

Vote on Motion: None opposed. Approved.

5. Staff/Working Group/Chair Report

At the February 25, 2026 meeting, the Policy Board:

- Approved Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) Amendment #2. It was transmitted to DOT&PF for inclusion in the Statewide Transportation Improvement Program (STIP).
- Postponed decision on the Electric Vehicle (EV) Charging station sites.
- The Chena Riverwalk Stage III project was referred to the Walk, Ride, and Roll Advisory Committee for recommendations.
- Approved the addition of safety improvements at Trainor Gate Road/F Street intersection to the FFY2026 FAST Improvement Program.

Ms. Lunsford was accepted to be part of the 16-week League of American Bicyclists Active Mobility Leadership Lab. A \$10K grant was also procured for quick build solutions and the Trainor Gate/F Street Intersection was chosen to have kids involved in decision-making for the safety improvements installed at Trainor Gate/F Street intersection.

FAST Planning has obtained the equipment to build a data bike. The purpose of this is to perform a condition assessment of bike/shared use paths in our community.

Mr. DiRutigliano has been working with Mayor O'Neall on the Just City Lab fellowship at the Harvard Institute of Design that she was accepted to. There are two virtual sessions and a final in-person event in April. The purpose of this organization is to connect mayors with people/resources to accomplish specific projects in their community. Mayor O'Neall is interested in making the downtown core area more accommodating.

6. Public Comment

No public comment.

7. Old Business

No old business.

8. New Business

a. FAST Planning Community Transportation Grant Program (Action Item)

Review of Program and Application Materials and Recommendation(s) to Policy Board for any Revisions and Approval

At the previous Technical Committee meeting, a draft of the new application form for the FAST Planning Community Transportation Grant Program was reviewed and revised. The

revised application is included in the meeting packet for further review and/or edits by the Technical Committee before forwarding it to the Policy Board for approval.

Public Comment:

No public comment.

Motion: To recommend to the Policy Board to adopt the FAST Planning Community Transportation Grant Program application materials and advertise it to the public. (Campbell/Pristash).

Discussion:

Ms. Campbell: I just wanted to say that I think this is great. When I started looking through the agenda last night, I was very excited. So, thank you for setting aside funds for this. I'm especially happy that it's for the disenfranchised areas of our community but what I wonder about is that "reach out" part, so I'll be thinking about how to send the word out when the time comes. At the Borough Assembly meeting last week afterward, one person came and testified about a park that is being built in her area. She was excited that the Borough was putting more money into "A Park a Year" and she was excited about that. So, I think this will just add to that so thank you.

Vote on Motion: None opposed. Approved.

b. Bridges & Safety Infrastructure for Community Spaces (BASIC) Act – Letter of Support to Congressional Delegation (Action Item)

Last fall the Secretary of Transportation, Sean Duffy, put out a request for information about what transportation infrastructure MPOs across the country wanted to see in the next transportation bill. The organizations that serve local governments and MPOs nationwide formed a coalition and drafted language for a new transportation bill and were able to get bipartisan support in the House of Representatives. The new bill doubles the amount of planning (PL) funds that would be available to Metropolitan Planning Organizations (MPOs). The bill increases the Surface Transportation Block Grant (STBG), would eliminate the local match funding requirements for a federal project, and increases the amount of Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP) funding. The bill continues the Bridge Formula Program allocation, reaffirms MPO project selection, strengthens consultation with areas below 50K in population, provides direct access to MPOs to the Federal Financial Management System (FMIS), protects suballocated funds from transfer, and provides dedicated funding to Regional Transportation Planning Organizations (RTPOs). Mr. Fox prepared a Letter of Support for this bill for review and recommendation by the Technical Committee to the Policy Board.

Public Comment:

Megan Flory: It sounds beneficial to our community and to local transportation planning in general. You mentioned trying to strengthen the letter. I think the recommendation is that the opening should be, "We are in support of the BASICS Act,

and we're asking you to also be in support." That sets the stage for everything that you've been discussing so far in this meeting.

Mr. Fox: Thank you, Megan. It sounds like you had that written up. Would you mind emailing that to me?

Ms. Flory: I can most certainly send that to you.

Motion: To forward this letter [Letter of Support for BASICS Act to Alaska Congressional Delegation] to the Policy Board for their approval. (Pristash/Campbell).

Discussion:

Ms. Campbell: One thing I think it's important to do is to make sure that the Delegation, during the conversations when it does hit the Senate floor, protect the things that we think are the most important, which is the nine percent match. Just because it hasn't been named, I think we need to flag for them to be aware of these things. I would make sure that we put that in that this is of special concern or special interest that we protect this match. The other question I had was in your letter to Duffy you mentioned this year-to-year carryforward was needed by us and probably every MPO across the country and I don't see that ever mentioned again. So, that might be another thing that Senators in D.C. probably don't realize how important that is. We're talking tens of thousands when they're looking at billion-dollar budgets, and they don't realize how important \$100K would be to us. The other thing that goes along with what Ms. Flory was saying was that the thing that was most important aspect of this BASIC Act is the transparency. I think that should be up in the beginning of the letter because this is going to be read by some staff member who is looking for key words. I'm curious to see what Ms. Flory has drafted up.

Mr. Spillman: I compared this to the letter we sent last year, and it seems like 60-70% of what we asked for is in there again. Honestly, that's better than I would have hoped for when we sent that letter. We might as well as for more. Right?

Mr. Fox: Yes.

Mr. Spillman: I'll say what I intend on doing and then I'll make the motion. The four things that I listed out that I think I would like to include are: still going forward with the 10-year requirement for the MTP, the carry forward or banking of the funds, the exemption criteria for non-attainment areas, and maintaining the nine percent local match for Alaska.

Amendment to the Motion: To amend the letter to include (1) extending the required cycle for Metropolitan Transportation Plan updates to every ten (10) years, (2) allowing year-to-year carryforward/banking of Federal funds, (3) expanding and updating the exemption criteria for air quality non-attainment areas, and (4) maintaining the 9.03% local match rate for Alaska. (Spillman/Campbell).

Discussion:

Mr. Spillman: I may be iffy on the non-attainment area requirements, but it would significantly help this community with federal sanctions and the conformity freeze that we just got out of. So, I see no harm in asking again with all the pains we saw as an organization during the last conformity freeze.

Mr. Priestash: Mr. Spillman, can you tell me about this ten-year time change? What was that?

Mr. Spillman: An MPO is required to update their Transportation Plan every five years.

Mr. Priestash: Five years.

Mr. Spillman: Because we're a non-attainment area, we have to do it every four years. I had the pains when I was on staff and I've had it at Planning. It seems like we finish one of these, like we're in right now, and then a couple of months later we start it again so we can be ready for four years. It's just so much, I don't want to say wasted effort because I think it's a good process, but I think it could be not as frequent, and we would get the same value out of it.

Mr. Fox: And just make amendments as necessary between those cycles.

Mr. Spillman: The cost of these Travel Demand Model runs, renewing the model, and populating it, etc. we're just spending so much money every couple of years on these.

Mr. Priestash: What about the non-attainment area? Can you explain what that is?

Mr. Spillman: I think Mr. Fox could probably talk a little more about this from some of his conversations with EPA on this. We're a non-attainment area for PM2.5. I think we all know that. Ninety-nine percent of the other PM2.5 non-attainment areas are due to vehicle/mobile source emissions. We have wood smoke issues. There are certain exemptions for things like wildfires, etc. So, we were just asking to look a little more at possible exemptions for our situation that really doesn't impact anyone else.

Mr. Priestash: You mean wood smoke? Is that part of it?

Mr. Spillman: Exactly. We're getting punished with getting our transportation funds potentially withheld when it's not a transportation issue.

Mr. Priestash: I see.

Mr. Fox: I've tried to attack this from a few different angles. Right now, there are exemption criteria for projects, and I want that project list expanded. A safety project is exempt. Adding a roadway shoulder is exempt. A sidewalk/bike path project and road resurfacing are exempt. I just feel like there are a lot of other project categories out there that could be added to that list that don't have any negative impact towards air quality. Also, there is the separate issue of, I was trying to get into this threshold of tons per day or percent of emissions or something like that, so that if vehicle emissions are not the primary contributor to your air quality problem, then we would be exempt from highway sanctions in the future. If cars are not causing the problem, then you can't withhold our federal highway funding.

Mr. Priestash: Does anyone regulate wood smoke? Is there something like that?

Mr. Fox: The highway sanctions are tied to our air quality issue. Period. It doesn't matter what the source is.

Mr. Pristash: Okay. But what was the tie to the vehicles then?

Mr. Fox: I'm trying to get in a de minimus exemption so that if vehicles are less than five or ten percent of the contribution to the air quality problem, we get a de minimus exemption and we would not be subject to highway sanctions if our area didn't meet attainment and air quality standards. They need to use a different hammer. They can't use that hammer on us if vehicles are not causing the problem.

Mr. Pristash: Right.

Mr. Fox: I flew to D.C. and talked to EPA staff about this. We don't have the silver bullet yet because nobody wants to open up the Clean Air Act and change the language from fifty years ago. So, we're trying to get something in the bill where we can get an offramp for it. We have this fleshed out in our letter from last fall and previous letters we've sent directly to the EPA. I can reference those in this bullet but not go into all the detail that's already been provided and just provide copies of what we've asked for in the past.

Mr. Nelson: It looks like most of the asks from last time, like Mr. Spillman said, were picked up, so you just need to rework them into this.

Mr. Fox: Right. Basically, with the amendment that's on the table here, if I was to add those four bullets, I would have another paragraph and I would add those four bullets and say that we support what's in the bill and would like them to strengthen the bill and add those four things that we asked for and haven't seen yet.

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

Amendment to the Motion: To amend the beginning of the letter to add the language, "We are writing you to express our support for the BASICS Act and to encourage each of you to support and strengthen the bill as it moves through Congress. We appreciate that this Act addresses many of our past comments about federal transportation programs and hope you will consider improving the bill with the additional items detailed in this letter." (Glidden/Zinza).

Discussion:

Mr. Glidden: I think it's important that we lead with the positive that we appreciate what they have done. I'd hate if we were really aggressively forgetting about all the work that they've put in and saying give us this other stuff also. I feel like we'd be happy with just getting this, so I'd hate to make it sound like in the letter we're not happy with what's happening. We just gave some grants out in North Pole. After the grant was given out, they came back and said we didn't give them enough money, and it ruined their event. I felt like we shouldn't have given them any money because they weren't satisfied that we gave them something, so I'd hate for our letter to sound like that, like we feel entitled.

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

Amendment to the Motion: To amend the letter to move the language, “We would also like to highlight; however, what we think is the most important aspect of the BASICS Act – ensuring transparency and collaboration among Federal, State, regional, and local partners in Federal transportation investments and project delivery.” to the first paragraph of the letter. (Campbell/Theurich).

Discussion:

Mr. Pristash: I want to leave it at the bottom. It kind of seems like a negative thing to me. Opening with it might be a little bit salt in the wound kind of thing.

Ms. Campbell: It would be nice if we could write it out and see how it sounds.

Mr. Fox: I’ll take all these edits and there will be an updated version by next week. You can look at the letter in the Policy Board packet and make suggestions to the Policy Board about how you want it to be written.

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

Discussion:

No further discussion.

Vote on Main Motion as Amended: None opposed. Approved.

c. Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP) Schedule Update and Base Project List

The MTP is currently being updated by R&M Consultants working with Michael Baker and RSG. There are some delays that are going to prohibit the consultant team from completing the full update of the Plan as required by regulation. Due to the Travel Demand Model update, the availability of employment data into that model due to closure of government offices, and the decision to change software for the Travel Demand Model. The old Travel Model is outdated, and we do not have an approved Metropolitan Planning Area (MPA) Boundary yet. The Plan update has to use the new MPA Boundary. The proposal is to do what is called an Interim MTP Update. The schedule for the Interim MTP, which will include the new MPA boundary, is outlined in the meeting packet. A draft project list is also included in the meeting packet.

9. Informational Items

a. FFY2026 Obligations & Offsets

Mr. Fox explained the FFY2026 Obligations and Offsets.

10. Other Issues

No other issues.

11. Committee Member Comments

Mr. Zinza: I just wanted to say that I know this is a lot of work. I don’t know who does it but thanks. It’s a lot of work and I recognize it.

Mr. Spillman: I thought it came up at the Policy Board last fall that it was in March that the boundary update might be submitted to the Governor for approval. I was hoping that we could get an update on the status of that.

Mr. Fox: I had another request from two Policy Board members. I have it on the March 18, 2026 Policy Board meeting agenda.

Motion to Adjourn: (Zinza/Beck). None opposed. Approved.

The meeting was adjourned at 1:36 p.m. The next Technical Committee Meeting is

Wednesday, April 1, 2026.

Approved:  Date: 4/1/2026
Jackson C. Fox, Chair
FAST Planning Technical Committee