MVP for Transportation
MPO Technical Committee Meeting

MEMBERS
Adeyemi Alimi, ADEC
Alex Strawn, MSB
Ben White, ADOT&PF
Bob Charles Jr., Knik Tribe
Brian Lindamood, ARRC
Brian Winnestaffer, Chickaloon Native Village
Clint Adler, ADOT&PF
Crystal Smith, MSBSD
Dan Tucker, RSA Representative
Erich Schaal, City of Wasilla
Jude Bilafer, City of Palmer
Lawerence Smith, Trucking Industry Advocate
Randy Durham, MSB TAB
Stuart Leidner, Mobility Advocate
Tom Adams, MSB
<mark>Vacant, Public Transit</mark>

Minutes
Tuesday, June 11th, 2024
2:00 - 3:30pm

1.   Call to Order

The meeting was called to order at 2:00pm with a quorum.

2.   Introduction of MPO Technical Committee Members and other Attendees

Members Present
Brian Lindamood, ARRC
Stuart Leidner, Mobility Advocate
Richard Martin, Knik Tribe (proxy for Bob Charles Jr.)
Ben White, Alaska DOT&PF
Alex Strawn, MSB
Brian Winnestaffer, Chickaloon Native Village
Crystal Smith, MSBSD
Dan Tucker, RSA Representative
Erich Schaal, City of Wasilla
Jude Bilafer, City of Palmer
Clint Adler, Alaska DOT&PF
Randy Durham, MSB TAB
Tom Adams, MSB

Members Absent
Adeyemi Alimi, ADEC

Guests Present
Elise Blocker, RESPEC
Donna Gardino, Gardino Consulting Services
Kim Sollien, MPO Coordinator
Sharon Johnson, Alaska Legislative Office
Adam Bradway, Alaska DOT&PF
Jody Simpson, Alaska Senate
Kate Dueber, ARRC
Megan Flory, RESPEC
<mark>Brad Swortz</mark>, MSB

3.   **Approval of the June 11th, 2024 Agenda – (Action Item)**

*Motion to approve the June 11th, 2024 agenda **(Winnestaffer),** seconded. No discussion. Passed unanimously.*

4.   **Approval of the May 14th, 2024 Minutes – (Action Item)**

*Motion to approve the May 14th, 2024 minutes **(Winnestaffer),** seconded. No edits. Passed unanimously.*

5.   **Committee/Working Group Reports (Including the Staff Report)**
   a.   **Staff Report**

The staff report is in the meeting packet. Kim Sollien provided highlights from the Special Meeting on May 22, 2024 and is working with Ben White on FY 24 and FY 25 funding. An overview of completed tasks is listed in the Schedule of Topics which is also located in the meeting packet.

6.   **Voices of the Visitors (Non-Action Items)**

None

7.   **Old Business**
   a.   **Statewide Transportation Improvement Plan Update**

The State of Alaska DOT&PF is planning to release the STIP amendment on Friday, June 14th, 2024. There were no additional comments or questions.

   b.   **Unified Planning Work Program (Action Item)**

*Motion to recommend to the Policy Board to release the Unified Planning Work Program for a 30-day public comment period with edits **(Schaal),** seconded. Motion Passes.*

Kim Sollien provided a staff report on the Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP). Sollien noted that the Policy Board would be receiving an updated, redlined version of the UPWP at their next meeting.

Clint Adler: I see that there is a program for Sign Management Plan and a Streetlight and Intersection Management Plan, and I was wondering what the thinking was for not having a specific Pavement and Bridge or at least a Pavement Management Plan developed.

Kim Sollien: The Sign Management Plan and the Streetlight and Intersection Management Plan are true planning projects. For the Improvement Program, later in the agenda we have a draft policy for inviting and prioritizing projects for that program.

Clint Adler: It would better serve the MPO if there was an inventory and condition assessment of your pavement and road assets instead of relying on people's opinions.

Donna Gardino: The borough had said they wanted to do some sign, striping, and streetlight replacement so instead of starting those projects we are doing these management plans. As far as pavement, the borough is starting to do some of that work so we can add to that work in future years, but we wanted to get with the borough and figure out what they are doing.

Tom Adams: I met with staff today about our meeting next week with Fugro and we are contracting with Fugro to collect data about our pavement assets to be more objective about identifying pavement rehabilitation projects in the future. Right now, we are just funding one

year of activity with Fugro, we are looking to do about one third of our paved miles in the next year.

Clint Adler: Will your data collection include assets in the cities?

Tom Adams: No, it would only be outside the cities and not just restricted to the MPA. It would be areawide. We can carry on that conversation in the future.

Clint Adler: The pavement asset management plan might be a higher priority than signs, intersections, and streetlights.

Tom Adams: I'm not going to dispute that, but as Donna said earlier, we're trying to look at ways of obligating these funds. I've already got a program going, if we want to try to find a way to nominate it for the MPO to participate I'd welcome that, but there is the disparity between MPA and the rest of the borough. One last thing, I want to recognize that the UPWP says on page 8 that you are looking for the MTP to be largely influenced by the borough's LRTP but you've also recognized that in that LRTP the borough has been fairly successful in exhausting our projects. Alex and I have been talking about instigating a project to update our LRTP, but that's probably not something that we're going to do in the near term. It wouldn't start until the fall at the earliest. How do you see that being a weakness in developing the MTP when the LRTP has a lot of projects that have already been completed?

Donna Gardino: As part of the scope of work for the MTP, we will look at the LRTP and review what has been accomplished and what has not been accomplished because that will be a good start for identifying a list of projects. But we will also look at the travel model and identify deficiencies in the network and we will find new needs that need to be addressed as well. One aspect of developing an MTP or LRTP is that you also develop a list of projects that you have accomplished, it's not just a plan that sits on the shelf.

Tom Adams: The borough knows we need to update our LRTP, and the travel demand model will probably help us when we update it.

Adam Bradway: The Mat-Su Borough LRTP was a joint project between DOT&PF and the MSB specifically to get the MSB thinking in the way an MTP is structured. The fiscal constraint piece of the LRTP is basically the same as what the MTP will have. The projects in the LRTP will get updated but a lot of the content hasn't changed and that can be used for the MTP. I would encourage the borough and all of the cities and the tribes to have their own priorities because the MTP is going to have priorities for everyone in the MPO, not just the borough.

Kim Sollien: I've said it before, but we are making edits to this document, and we will present the edited version to the Policy Board. What we are looking for from you all is to recommend that we release the draft for public comment, considering the edits the policy board will make.

Alex Strawn: It seems like there are a lot of edits that need to be made. Is this something that could be postponed for a later meeting?

Kim Sollien: We are under timelines that are out of our control. What I promise that none of the edits are substantive. Everything in the UPWP is staying, the budget totals are not changing, though some of the items may move around in their tables, and then there are grammar and punctuation changes. We are asking for trust that nothing crazy is going to show up if you approve it knowing the edits will be shown to the Policy Board. You are welcome to attend the Policy Board meeting to see the redline version. We are trying to get this approved, so we are ready for action when the budget turns over in October.

Donna Gardino: I would prefer that you just provide us with comments on the document and you don't have to have an action item today. We don't actually need a recommendation from the Technical Committee for the Policy Board, you can just provide comments and we will

make the changes and bring them to the Policy Board. If you are not comfortable making a recommendation today on this draft, I would recommend that you don't.

Tom Adams: Donna answered my question. So, Clint or I could make a comment suggesting we add the pavement management plan as one of your supplementals?

Donna Gardino: The problem with that is that right now we don't have a TIP, so we need to get this program of projects approved by next week and it has to include all of the things like the streetlights and sign management plan, so we would have to add that into the fiscal year 2025 program as well. So, it would affect not only the UPWP but also the STIP and DOT&PF would have to add that project into the STIP. Just to let you know that it is not just changing this document, it's changing the STIP as well which we are hearing is going out for public comment on Friday.

Tom Adams: These other two plans, are they not also intended to go in as part of the STIP?

Donna Gardino: Yes.

Tom Adams: So Adam, Clint, Ben, what's the difference? If we all see value in prioritizing pavement management, I guess I'm looking for what the difference is from what we're doing for sign and intersection management.

Adam Bradway: Ultimately, all of these documents are supposed to be fiscally constrained, so in order to put it in the UPWP you need funding from somewhere, which would be in the Program of Projects that you are going to take up next. This conversation really happens in the next action item, and you are going to have to make sure there is enough money to do all of the things you want to do. I think you do, but the Program of Projects is at the mercy of whatever happens with the STIP.

Kim Sollien: Who is doing all of the planning and managing all of the consultants and making sure the projects get done? If we add another regional project, can the borough manage that project along with the other ones or is the expectation that MVP will manage it? We need to have a conversation about whether it is feasible for MVP to manage the MTP, the TIP, the travel model, the household survey, the signage, and so on. This isn't our only year that we'll get funding and I wonder if in the MTP development, some pavement and road management things might show up.

Tom Adams: We don't have to take the action; the borough already has an intent to do this outside the cities. It does deserve conversation about how we look at this from the entirety of the MPA rather than just the borough's obligations. I want to make sure we continue to coordinate to make sure our actions now align with what we're going to need in the future.

Alex Strawn: Any final comments?

Adam Bradway: This is going out for public comment, so there may be other comments and edits and you will get another chance to look at it before it gets approved.

An amendment to the motion was discussed that would recommend adding a Pavement Management Project to the UPWP, but it was decided that it would be more appropriate to amend the Program of Projects and the amendment was withdrawn.

c. **Program of Projects (Action Item)**

*Motion to support the Program of Projects as presented **(Adler)**, seconded. Approved as amended (none opposed).*
*Motion to amend the Program of Projects to move funds programmed for FFY24 for MVP Advance Project Definition (NID 34531), MVP Sign Management Plan (NID: 34533), and MVP Streetlight Intersection Management Plan (NID: 34534) to FY25 **(White)**, seconded. None opposed.*

MVP for Transportation
Pre-MPO Steering Committee Meeting

Amendment to add the Pavement Management Plan to FFY25 for $200,000 and reduce the MVP Sign Management Plan and MVP Streetlight Intersection Management Plan to $300,000 each in FFY25 **(Adler),** *seconded. None opposed.*

Donna Gardino, Adam Bradway, and Ben White provided a staff report for the Program of Projects and the context of the STIP amendment. The timeline of the STIP amendment makes it difficult to change or add projects at this time. If the Policy Board does not approve a Program of Projects in June, it will be very difficult to include MVP projects in the STIP amendment for public comment.

Alex Strawn: Could we have a special meeting to reconvene and discuss the Program of Projects?

Donna Gardino: What we could do is recommend approval of the Program of Projects with the following modifications: move the Advance Project Definition, the Sign Management Plan, and the Streetlight Intersection Management Plan to FY25 and add in a Pavement Management Plan to FY25 so we have something to present to the Policy Board. Someone will need to come up with a cost estimate for the Pavement Management Plan by tomorrow so we can get it into the meeting packet. Someone will need to step up to manage that plan, as well. The answer might be to do the Pavement Management Plan in FY26 to spread things out, or you could remove the other two plans and replace them with the Pavement Management Plan.

Tom Adams: Why is it that we think we need to move those other plans out of FFY24? From my perspective, the borough is already doing what we need to do for pavement this year. We could wait for another STIP amendment and put pavement management in FY25 or FY26. I don't see how that's going to harm much. I understood earlier that if we were going to have a Pavement Management Plan in FY24 it was going to have to displace something else, but if we're if we're not going to put it in FY24 we can leave FY24 alone, could perhaps leave FY25 alone, and then just add the Pavement Management Plan to FY26. The borough's pavement project was about $200,000 this year and we'll program about the same amount next year, so if we want to program it for FY25 we would have to find $200,000 to displace.

Adam Bradway: I can explain why things are moving. In looking at the UPWP, it set off some alarms because the UPWP is for FY25 and FY26 and we have the planning projects programmed for FY25 in that document, but they are listed in FY24 in the Program of Projects, so we need to match them up in FY25.

Brad Swortz: I had a question about what MVP is supposed to cover. Do you need to cover ownership of all roads? Our pavement assessment program was intended to only cover borough roads, but if you need to cover DOT roads also, or if DOT is doing their own, we may be covering roads that you can include without having to change the Program of Projects.

Clint Adler: As I understand it, DOT would continue to cover our own roads.

Donna Gardino: I would not recommend doing the DOT roads since they are doing them.

Alex Strawn: Any other questions for staff?

Tom Adams: What are we doing with the allocations we expected for FY24 then? Are we just blanking out FY24 and not putting anything there and shifting everything to FY25 and FY26?

Kim Sollien: Only for the planning projects.

Adam Bradway: The ones that have "planning" next to them need to be in the UPWP, so it would just be those three planning projects that would move over.

Tom Adams: So, does that mean you would replace those dollars in FY24 with something else? Could you advance some dollars that were intended for Fishhook repaving into FY24, or should we find ways to use those funds in FY24?

Donna Gardino: We are going to move the money with them.

Tom Adams: Understood.

*Motion to extend the meeting to 4 pm **(Adler)**, seconded.*

Clint Adler makes the motion to approve the Program of Projects and there is discussion about the amendments to the motion. Clint Adler asks about removing the two Management Plan projects from FY25 to allow for the Pavement Management project and Tom Adams recommends reducing the budgets for the two planned Management Plan projects instead. Adam Bradway requests clarification on whether Tom Adams anticipates using the proposed $200,000 for an MVP Pavement Management Project in FY25 exclusively for borough roads and clarifies that the roads need to be within the MPA. Tom Adams says that his understanding is that this project would allow the MPO to pick up the responsibility and include more than MSB roads.

8.   **New Business**
   a. **Policy for MVP Improvement Program (Action Item)**

*Motion to recommend to the Policy Board the approval of the Policy for MVP Improvement Program **(Adler), seconded. None opposed.***

Donna Gardino provided a summary of the Policy for MVP Improvement Program. The policy described how projects will be scored and selected.

Clint Adler: Is the scope in bullet 2 exactly the same as the improvement program in Northern Region? The language about illumination and storm drains is not what I heard in the presentation we received.

Donna Gardino: That is the same scope as in FAST Planning.

Clint Adler: We will need to take a critical look at anything including drainage or illumination as potentially not being easy to do.

Donna Gardino: Yes, part of the process is to look at each project to see if it fits the bill, and if it doesn't it can't be considered for inclusion under this program.

Tom Adams: To follow Clint's comment, should item two mimic DOT's PCM? I think it does say that it has those types of projects in there.

Clint Adler: It is very closely mimicking what it says in our 1R process, but what's giving me comfort here is that it says, "work *may* include." We will need flexibility in this program to say the nature of the work for a project is too much for the program.

Donna Gardino: Right, that's what this allows you to do. The subcommittee will get back together after the estimates are done and the DOT will tell us "this isn't an easy thing" and we can't do it.

Tom Adams: My second question is, in item four, it says that the subcommittee will be made up of representatives of the Policy Board.

Donna Gardino: No, representatives of the Policy Board stakeholders, not the Policy Board. We want people like you and Erich on the subcommittee, not the Policy Board.

Tom Adams: I missed "stakeholders"

Erich Schaal: If a project is selected through this process, does it have to be fully funded by this program or could ineligible sections be funded by the applicant?

Donna Gardino: I would have to have an example but that could be the case.

Erich Schaal: An example would be, if storm drains were a problem could the program fund 80% of the project and the applicant would have a match?

Clint Adler: My understanding is that the intent of the program is to tackle very simple projects, so if we start adding on to that then we've defeated the purpose.

Erich Schaal: Thank you.

b. **Policy and Procedure: Alaska DOT&PF Comprehensive, Continuing, and Cooperative (3C) (Action Item)**

Kim Sollien provided an overview of the 3C's redline and the response memo.

Motion to approve the Policy and Procedure: Alaska DOT&PF Comprehensive, Continuing, and Cooperative (3C) **(Winnestaffer),** *seconded. No objections. Motion passed.*

9. **Other Issues**

None

10. **Informational Items**
    a. **Articles Of Incorporation/Non-Profit Organization Paperwork Update**

    The Articles of Incorporation are in route to the State of Alaska to be filed.

    b. **Transit Update – Presented by Maija DiSalvo, Mat-Su Borough Planning**

    Maija DiSalvo provided a transit update.

    c. **Jennifer Busch Technical Committee Application for Public Transit Advocate**

    Jennifer Busch's application and resume to fill the Transit Advocate vacancy on the Technical Committee are in the meeting packet.

11. **Technical Committee Comments**

Tom Adams: I would like to request that the meeting packet go out to members a week ahead of the meeting to allow time for review.

Alex Strawn: If the agenda is packed, please plan the meeting accordingly ahead of time to respect people's time.

12. **Adjournment**

The meeting adjourned at 4 pm.

Next Scheduled MPO Technical Committee Meeting – **July 9th, 2024, from 2:00 pm-3:30 pm** to be held via Microsoft TEAMS Meeting