



Denali Commission
510 L Street, Suite 410
Anchorage, AK 99501

907.271.1414 tel
907.271.1415 fax
888.480.4321 toll free
www.denali.gov

**Denali Commission Transportation Advisory Committee (TAC)
Meeting Minutes for January 13-14, 2009**

Members Present:

Steve Ivanoff, Kawerak, Inc.
Mike Hoffman, Association of Village Council Presidents (AVCP)
Chuck Pool, Pool Engineering, Inc.
Chuck Quinlan, K'oyit'ots'Ina, Ltd.
Randy Romenesko, Nome
Carvel Zimin Jr., Bristol Bay Borough
Ray Richards, Doyon, Ltd.
Joel Neimeyer, Denali Commission Federal Co-Chair

Members Absent:

Walter Sampson, NANA Regional Corporation

Others Present:

Christopher Minovich, Department of Transportation, Office of Inspector General Office (DOT-OIG), via teleconference
Chris Riley, Federal Highway Administration (FHWA)
Stephanie Benson, Alaska Department of Transportation and Public Facilities (A -DOT&PF)
Andy Hughes, A-DOT&PF
Chase Nelson, DOWL HKM Engineers
Page Herring, Native Village of Eyak
Bruce Cain, Native Village of Eyak
Scott Madison, Native Village of Eyak
Don Fancher, A- DOT&PF
Dave Brown, Western Federal Lands Highway Division (WFLHD)

Andy Rasmussen, WFLHD
Duncan Fields, Old Harbor Native Corporation
Melanie Harrop, United States Army Corps of Engineers (USACE)
Bob Brock, USACE
Clarence Daniel, Association of Village Council Presidents (AVCP)
Sean McKnight, Kawerak, Inc.
John MacKinnon, Denali Commissioner, Association of General Contractors
Arne Fuglvog, Senator Murkowski, Legislative Assistant
Bob Pawlowski, Alaska State Legislature, Denali Commission
Tiffany Zulkosky, Senator Begich, Rural Director
Brian Pederson, Rodney P. Kinney and Associates
Arthur Fawcett, Metlakatla Indian Council (MIC)
Jeff Moran, MIC
Solomon Atkinson, MIC
Denise Michaels, City of Nome, Kawerak, Inc.

Agenda Item 1: Welcome, Introductions, Review of Agenda and Minutes, Denali Commission FY10 Funding Update

Meeting called to order at 9:07am.

Mr. Joel Neimeyer, the Commissions new Federal Co-Chair was introduced to the Committee. Mr. Neimeyer provided welcoming comments and provided the Committee his professional background.

Ms. Tessa Rinner, Director of Programs, introduced Ray Richards, a new committee member, to the Committee. Mr. Richards is a Materials Engineer for Doyon, Ltd. with over 15 years in the construction, residential, and oil field industries. Mr. Richards will fill the seat vacated by Mr. Norm Phillips. Committee members welcomed Mr. Richards, introduced themselves, and provided opening comments.

The Committee reviewed Agenda Day 1 and Day 2.

Motion to approve the agenda made by Mr. Pool, seconded by Mr. Quinlan, and passed unanimously.

The Committee reviewed Meeting Minutes for the November 16, 2009 Transportation Advisory Committee meeting.

Motion to approve the November 16, 2009 Meeting Minutes made by Mr. Romenesko, seconded by Mr. Quinlan and passed unanimously.

Agenda Item 2: Denali Commission FY10 Funding Update

Discussion Summary:

Ms. Rinner provided an update on the Commission's FY 2010 funding. Total funding for all Commission programs will be in the range of \$60,000,000, with roughly \$25,000,000 authorized for the Transportation Program. After rescissions and administrative fees, the available funds will be in the range of \$12,000,000 for roads and \$8,000,000 for waterfront development. The Commission also continues to work with the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) to receive \$8,000,000 in FY 2008-2009 funds that have yet to arrive to the Commission.

Agenda Item 2 Public Comments:

Discussion Summary:

Felipe Hernandez from the Native Village of Quinhagak, Duncan Fields with Old Harbor Native Corporation, Cynthia Burns with Old Harbor Native Corporation, Bruce Cain with the Native Village of Eyak, and Solomon Atkinson with The City of Metlakatla each spoke briefly about their nominated projects and notified the Committee that they would be available to answer questions during the project selection period. There were no additional public comments.

Agenda Item 3: Transportation Program Report

Discussion Summary:

Mike McKinnon referred to briefing material provided to the Committee prior to the meeting that staff prepared in response to issues discussed during the November 16, 2009 meeting including:

- Project delays, particularly FY 2006-2007 construction projects
- Staff workload
- Lower than expected project expenditure rates
- Agency partner project development timelines

Mr. McKinnon stated the briefings presented information to the Committee on:

- Project development history, especially the FY 2008-2009 project reassignment exercise of FY 2006-2007 projects, showing all projects are now on a clear path to project completion
- Program work load adjustments, including a sharper focus on project development tasks, and addition of new staff resources
- Updated project development timelines and sequencing, illustrating that the early efforts to be a faster, more streamlined development agency have largely been trumped by the need to meet Title 23 CRF requirements

Mr. McKinnon reported that the November discussion had prompted a full review of agency partner project development plans, which in turn had prompted renewed commitments by partners to establish clear project development calendars and to maneuver resources as needed to meet those calendars.

Mr. McKinnon announced that Jimmy Smith, a liaison to the Commission from the Department of Commerce and Community Economic Development (DCCED) will join the transportation team. Mr. Smith and program staff Adison Smith will share program tasks, including:

- Track project development and prepare project and program-level status reports
- Communicate with communities on project status and ensure that communities provide timely project approvals
- Work with communities as needed to resolve conflicts about project scope, etc.
- Work with communities and regional organizations across the state to bring more small communities into the annual Project Nomination Process
- Execute other program and project related tasks as directed by Ms. Rinner

Mr. McKinnon referred to the Project Development Timeline/Schedule Briefing Paper and provided further explanation on Project Development Timelines within the Commission. An analysis of project status at the time nominations are selected helped develop a new base timeline for project development. The analysis shows that construction-ready projects with funding in place will expend Commission funds within 12-18 months. New start projects and those that have not been designed to Title 23 CRF standards will generally take 18-24 months to bring to construction bids, with one to two construction seasons needed for completion, depending on site location, condition and bid schedules.

Mr. McKinnon then moved to a discussion about the importance of using the emerging primary partners, USACE and WFLHD. Despite many local sponsor successes, particularly by mid-sized coastal communities, the complexity of Title 23 CFR regulations have shown that the Commission needs to use partner agencies that have the capability to ensure that projects are held to FHWA-FTA requirements and funds are expended in a responsible timeline.

Committee members raised concerns about assigning future projects to USACE and WFLHD, and discussed the consequences of moving away from capacity-building efforts that have been integral to the Commission's mission. Ruling out tribal entities or small communities can take away from Community ownership, leaving communities feeling unable to be a part of government-to-government dialogue, and local government participation.

Mr. McKinnon acknowledged this problem was present in the agency-based project development strategy and explained efforts to maximize local control over projects. The Project Nomination Process will continue to focus on individual communities and regional organizations including boroughs and tribal non-profits. This initial planning and programming step allows for local control over project selection within a community/region. Mr. McKinnon outlined Commission staff efforts to work directly with communities and project development partners to coordinate project management and project completion.

Mr. McKinnon also outlined the emerging pattern of regional tribal non-profits and boroughs developing capacity to manage projects, and the Commission's efforts to turn over more project work, including design and construction management to these organizations. Communities not in a borough, or not compacted to a regional organization, and lacking capacity to administer funds or manage projects, will continue to see their work go to WFLHD for road projects and USACE for dock and harbor projects. In these cases, staff will work to ensure a direct local participation in ongoing project development tasks. Mr. McKinnon reported that under current staffing and mission, this approach is essential meeting Title 23 CFR regulations.

Committee members discussed providing technical assistance, and strategized on how to encourage communities to nominate projects for FY 2011. The Committee discussed the importance of working with Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA). Committee members also discussed how encouraging it has been to see that communities were not waiting for BIA help with transportation projects, and instead coming to the Commission directly.

The Committee stated that overall they were pleased with the evolution of the program and recognized that while there have been delays and project development challenges, Commission staff is successfully managing the program process and keeping to its mission of helping rural Alaska with transportation needs.

Mr. McKinnon began a new discussion on Transportation Program funding, providing an overview of the Safe Accountable Flexible Efficient Transportation Equity Act for Legacy Users (SAFETEA-LU). Mr. McKinnon stated that Congressional Continuing Resolution (CR) procedures extended SAFETEA-LU twice since October 1, 2009, and that CR extensions will likely continue through the remainder of FY 2010. As a result, fund transfers to the Denali Commission and all transportation agencies are coming in quarterly segments or other segments as directed by Congress. This fund transfer pattern will have increasingly significant impacts on funding for selected projects.

Mr. McKinnon then reported on obligations and expenditures, correcting the expenditure rate presented at the November 2009 meeting. That rate, (in the range of 11%) was low based on an error which did not include obligations for completed projects. The corrected analysis shows the program has obligated roughly \$94 million and has expended about 30% of those obligated funds. Mr. McKinnon reported that the 2010 construction season includes several long-delayed projects and that the expenditure rate is expected to be in the 40-50% range by November, a rate more in line with other transportation agencies.

Mr. McKinnon also provided the Committee with a draft of the new transportation program project tracking/status report. The document will be a single site resource for project scope-schedule-finance data. Mr. McKinnon asked the Committee members to review the draft and provide feedback. The Committee will review the report in detail prior to the April Committee meeting. During this meeting, the Committee provided initial feedback on how they would use the report:

- Discussions about projects that are not meeting schedules, expending funds or need funding/project development assistance
- Identifying State General Fund Match and other funding needed or in hand for each project
- Identifying directed appropriations and other special funding integral to projects

The Committee agreed that the updated project data base would be a useful tool and expect to see a final version at the April meeting.

Community Outreach

Discussion Summary:

The Committee informed Commission staff about BIA Recovery Act funds that are available for tribes. BIA has up to \$2 million available for any construction-ready project, but tribes need to have their applications in to BIA by January 20, 2010. Steve Ivanoff shared with the Committee that there will be a second round of funding and requested that Commission staff present a list of

upcoming projects that would be eligible for this funding opportunity to BIA. Mr. McKinnon responded that the Commission is working with Alaska Department of Transportation & Public Facilities (DOT&PF) and BIA to identify opportunities to combine Commission and Recovery Act funds on upcoming projects.

The Committee moved on to discuss ways to ensure that more communities provided project nominations during the Commission's annual call for projects. Mr. McKinnon reviewed ways staff intends to enhance community outreach including:

- Contact coastal communities directly to ensure staff and the Committee are aware of construction-ready projects
- Host regional project nomination application meetings, invite communities, non-profit tribal organizations and others to discuss projects in their regions and look for opportunities to share resources where appropriate
- Host regional project coordination and project development meetings, invite stakeholders to suggest improvements to current systems
- Encourage organizations come to the Commission anytime during the year to present projects they would like to nominate during the annual call for projects
- Attend regional organization annual meetings, and include separate workshops on the project nomination process where practical
- Improve the technical assistance component of the program, making project nominations a year-round function of the program

Mr. McKinnon committed to prepare an update on this set of recommendations for the April meeting.

Prioritization with Partners

Discussion Summary:

Mr. McKinnon provided an overview of the priority order of development process used for projects assigned to the Commissions primary partners. After the Committee recommends a suite of projects to the Federal Co-Chair, and the Federal Co-Chair develops a list of approved projects, staff develops a project assignments plan. Projects are assigned to local sponsors with capacity for project development, and to agency partners in those cases where local capacity is not available. In an annual meeting, Ms. Rinner and Mr. McKinnon request program partners take on selected projects and confirm the request in writing after an initial agency review. USACE and WFLHD, and staff work to confirm scope and proposed budget. In a subsequent meeting, after partners have had design and/or construction management teams review all projects, Commission staff and the engineering/project development teams prioritize the projects using the following as guidelines:

- In general, construction is a priority over design phase projects
 - Projects ready to go to bid are a top priority
 - Projects that need minor additional fieldwork to confirm or explore conditions are a top priority

- Final design is generally a priority over new starts
 - Design field seasons help determine priorities. Arctic and subarctic areas with shorter field seasons will be prioritized over southern areas of the state with a longer field season
 - Project remoteness influences priority
 - Ability to get field data from A-DOT&PF, USACE and others developing projects in an area
 - Amount of fieldwork needed to move project to construction phase, extensive fieldwork can mean a two season efforts which would move a project start into priority position
 - Ability to bundle project design efforts can bring lower priority projects up to a higher priority status due to proximity
 - Construction phase fabrication-staging-shipping sequences can determine design schedule effort, pushing a project back a year or seeking to push ahead by a year
 - Full construction phase funding availability elevates project priority
 - Complexity of project, especially those requiring Environmental Assessment over Categorical Exclusions to clear NEPA may get a more measured schedule
 - Discovery process during early design can show the need to slow project development to address complex environmental, geo-technical or other aspects of the design process

Mr. McKinnon reported that agency partner staff resources are rarely a development consideration as both WFLHD and USACE have term contract arrangements that can and are applied to projects. All projects currently in the program are in active status, with the exception of one project without available Commission funding. Adjustments to project schedules are generally a function of the design discovery process wherein additional work, especially in environmental, geo-technical or Right of Way can push a project into a second field season.

Partner Project Status Update

USACE

Discussion Summary:

Melanie Harrop, USACE Project Manager, provided an overview of Commission projects assigned to USACE. Ms. Harrop provided updated FY 2010 Work Plan and status report to the Committee. The Committee requested that as USACE completes studies or designs funded by the Commission, the agency provide briefing papers with cost structures and recommendations on how to move forward with next steps.

Ms. Harrop also provided an update on the Barge Landing Design Phase II Study. The study covers the Alaska Peninsula/Aleutian Chain, Lower Cook Inlet, Prince William Sound and Southeast Alaska. A draft report will be submitted for review by August 2010. As was the case in Phase I, USACE and the Commission will use quantitative methods to rank and prioritize barge landing needs in the Phase II study area. The final report will present a proposed high priority construction phase including scope of work and planning level budget. The Committee asked questions about USCAE contracting and funding capabilities once the studies are complete. Ms. Harrop answered that once the studies are complete, USACE will provide the study to the Commission for evaluation of next steps. Ms. Harrop reported that USACE is unable to provide funding for any of these projects unless the project is a direct appropriation from Congress. Mr. McKinnon stated the study will provide the Commission and communities with a tool for seeking funding and will provide the Commission with technical data to help guide funding decisions.

The Committee asked how USACE works with other contractors and State/Federal Agencies on these projects. Ms. Harrop answered that they work with agencies and contractors in the field to share resources and reduce costs. During design and construction bid preparation, USACE notifies contractors about project opportunities so contractors in the area of planned projects can work to provide expedited construction opportunities.

WFLHD

Discussion Summary:

Andy Rasmussen, WFLHD Project Manager, provided an overview of Commission projects assigned to WFLHD. Mr. Rasmussen provided an information paper that outlines the WFLHD project development approach to Commission projects, lists design and construction projects with funding and status, and outlines the WFLHD FY 2010 Workplan for these projects.

The Committee asked questions about individual projects and raised concerns about project development time. The Committee shared their understanding of the process from earlier discussions of Title 23 CFR regulations.

Agenda Item #4: FY 2010 Road Projects Evaluation-Working Lunch

Discussion Summary:

Mr. McKinnon provided an overview of Road and Waterfront Development project selection procedures and methods, with the Committee asking for clarification on some issues and discussing other selection process elements. Mr. McKinnon reminded the Committee that members are required to abstain from voting when reviewing/ranking a project nomination that would provide direct benefit to a committee member or their employer.

The Committee members discussed the Roads scoring criteria. Revisions in the program's focus, from construction-ready projects to also seeking new starts in small communities without adequate resources for substantial partner funding needs to be reflected in criteria. Minor modifications to the existing criteria were recognized and articulated. The Committee and staff agreed to add ranking criteria revisions to the April strategic planning meeting.

The Committee identified that the Waterfront Development element did not need criteria adjustments as barge landings, the primary remote community waterfront development need, are prioritized and ranked through a USACE/Commission process reviewed and approved by the Committee.

Motion to modify the ranking criteria for the purposes of this project selection meeting was made by Mr. Quinlan, Mr. Pool seconded, passed unanimously.

The following is the project list including, the title of the project, total cost of project phase, Denali Commission funding request, Committees score, meeting minutes associated with project discussion/scoring, and funding amount suggested to the Federal Co-Chair for the project. Please note, the project list below is contingent upon receipt of final approval from the Federal Co-Chair Roads:

Project Name/Description	Total Cost	Requested DC Funding	Score	Meeting Minutes	Amount Recommended
SOUTH CENTRAL					
Cordova Whitshed Road	\$ 1,899,598	\$ 1,000,000	106.9	Project scored per standard procedures	\$1,000,000
Pedro Bay Road Project and Bridge Replacement	\$ 3,844,611	\$ 1,500,000	73.6	<i>Due to a lack of extenuating circumstances, the funding request was reduced from \$1,500,000 to the standard limit of \$1,000,000 - Motion by Mr. Pool to score the project as adjusted, Mr. Romenesko seconded, passed unanimously.</i>	\$0
SOUTHEAST					
Klawock Tribes Community Streets Paving	\$ 6,708,176	\$ 1,500,000	100	<i>Due to a lack of extenuating circumstances, the funding request was reduced from \$1,500,000 to the standard limit of \$1,000,000 - Motion by Mr. Pool to score the project as adjusted, Mr. Romenesko seconded, passed unanimously.</i>	\$1,000,000

Project Name/Description	Total Cost	Requested DC Funding	Score	Meeting Minutes	Amount Recommended
Elfin Cove Boardwalks Phase II	\$ 150,000	\$ 136,455	94.6	Project scored per standard procedures	\$136,455
Hoonah Pelican Road Reconnaissance Engineering	\$ 486,333	\$ 442,418	Tabled	<i>Absence of participation by major land owner, US Forest Service - Motion by Mr. Pool to table the project, Mr. Romenesko seconded, passed unanimously.</i>	\$0
Ketchikan - 4TH & 7TH Avenues/Jackson & Monroe Streets Reconstruction	\$ 2,384,100	\$ 1,000,000		Project withdrawn by sponsor during staff research due to incompatibility with primary program goals of addressing small community street needs.	\$0
Ketchikan - Alaska Avenue Street Reconstruction	\$ 1,081,000	\$ 1,000,000		Project withdrawn by sponsor during staff research due to incompatibility with primary program goals of addressing small community street needs.	\$0

Project Name/Description	Total Cost	Requested DC Funding	Score	Meeting Minutes	Amount Recommended
Metlaktla - Walden Point Road Paving	\$ 8,200,000	\$ 1,000,000	101	Project scored per standard procedures. Project budget updated to \$10.5 million. No other funds currently available, under project selection procedures, no funds will be assigned to project.	\$0
Pelican Board Roads Reconstruction Phase IV	\$ 400,000	\$ 363,880	Tabled	Committee discussed previous years' funding already provided to project; agreed that the project has met the \$1 million dollar cap. Motion to table the project by Mr. Pool, Mr. Romenesko seconded, passed unanimously.	\$0
Port Alexander Boardwalk Phase II	\$ 325,000	\$ 295,653	83.7	Committee discussed problems of projects coming in phases, agreed that future projects need to arrive at Commission with a complete scope. Federal Co-Chair recommended this issue be discussed at April retreat. Mr. Zimin moved to score project, Mr. Pool seconded, passed unanimously.	\$295,653

Project Name/Description	Total Cost	Requested DC Funding	Score	Meeting Minutes	Amount Recommended
Wrangell Cassiar Road Improvements	\$ 903,095	\$ 903,095	Tabled	Mr. McKinnon began discussion about City of Wrangell’s three road project nominations, outlining priorities based on conversations with City Engineer. #1 priority is Wrangell Cassiar Road Improvements. Mr. Andy Hughes DOT&PF informed Committee that DOT&PF #1 priority is Wrangell Downtown Revitalization - Front Street Construction. <i>Motion by Mr. Pool to table all Wrangell projects except the Downtown Front Street, Mr. Romenesko seconded, passed unanimously.</i>	\$0
Wrangell Downtown Revitalization - Front Street Reconstruction	\$ 9,340,000	\$ 1,000,000	89.9	See Wrangell Cassiar Road Improvements meeting note above. Project scored per standard procedures	\$1,000,000
Wrangell Evergreen Road Reconstruction	\$ 560,000	\$ 560,000	Tabled	See Wrangell Cassiar Road Improvements meeting note above.	\$0

Project Name/Description	Total Cost	Requested DC Funding	Score	Meeting Minutes	Amount Recommended
ALEUTIANS EAST BOROUGH					
Akutan Access Road	\$ 1,200,000	\$ 795,000	Tabled	Committee recommended staff work with Akutan to develop more realistic scope-schedule-budget for project and bring back for future consideration. Motion by Mr. Quinlan to table project, seconded by Mr. Pool, passed unanimously.	\$0
BRISTOL BAY					
King Salmon & Naknek - School Bus Route Roads Rehabilitation	\$ 1,050,000	\$ 1,000,000	81.7	Committee and staff discussion results in recommendation to staff work with communities on project scope/design and come back with FY 2011 construction nomination. Motion by Mr. Pool, to rank project as a design phase, Mr. Romenesko seconded, passed unanimously. Mr. Zimin abstained from voting because he is familiar with the project and is from the region.	\$150,000

Project Name/Description	Total Cost	Requested DC Funding	Score	Meeting Minutes	Amount Recommended
YUKON/KUSKOKWIM					
Dillingham - Tower Road Reconstruction	\$ 1,850,000	\$ 925,000	109.3	<p>Project scored per standard procedures.</p> <p>Mr. Romenesko abstains from voting because he is a City of Dillingham Contract Consultant.</p>	\$925,000
Alakanuk Community Streets	\$ 500,000	\$ 500,000	92.3	<p>Overall design phase cost reduced to \$216,000 during staff discussions with AVCP engineering staff subsequent to project nomination submittal. Project scored per standard procedures at the sponsor-adjusted funding level.</p> <p>Mr. Hoffman abstains from voting because of his position with AVCP.</p>	\$216,000
Crooked Creek Barge Access Road	\$ 432,935	\$ 60,000		<p>Staff research subsequent to nomination shows significant unresolved R/W and land use issues. Project withdrawn by sponsor.</p>	\$0

Project Name/Description	Total Cost	Requested DC Funding	Score	Meeting Minutes	Amount Recommended
Hooper Bay Community Streets Reconstruction	\$ 500,000	\$ 500,000		Sponsor communication with staff subsequent to nomination requested Commission withdraw project due to AVCP decision to use other funding sources.	\$0
Kwethluk East Loop Road	\$ 500,000	\$ 500,000	Tabled	Committee and staff discussed existing projects in Kwethluk and agreed, under standard project selection considerations, to table nomination until current projects are complete. Motion by Mr. Pool to have Kwethluk re-nominate project in FY 2011, Mr. Hoffman seconded, passed unanimously.	\$0
Napakiak - Community Streets Reconstruction	\$ 500,000	\$ 500,000		Sponsor communication with staff subsequent to nomination requested Commission withdraw project due to AVCP decision to use other funding sources.	\$0

Project Name/Description	Total Cost	Requested DC Funding	Score	Meeting Minutes	Amount Recommended
Quinhagak Material Site Access Road	\$ 1,218,857	\$ 1,000,000	Tabled	Committee and staff discussed sponsor re-nominating project in FY 2011 when design is complete with existing BIA funds. Committee directed Mr. McKinnon to work with sponsor to ensure BIA design also meet FHWA Title 23 requirements. <i>Motion by Mr. Pool to table the project, seconded by Mr. Hoffman, passed unanimously.</i>	\$0
Scammon Bay Community Streets Reconstruction	\$ 500,000	\$ 500,000	92.3	Overall design phase cost reduced to \$215,000 during staff discussions with AVCP engineering staff subsequent to nomination submittal. Project scored per standard procedures at the sponsor-adjusted funding level. Mr. Hoffman abstained from voting because of his position with AVCP.	\$215,000
Tuntutuliak Boardroad Reconstruction/ Extension	\$ 2,846,798	\$ 1,000,000	123	Project scored per standard procedures. Mr. Hoffman abstained from voting because of his position with AVCP	\$1,000,000

Project Name/Description	Total Cost	Requested DC Funding	Score	Meeting Minutes	Amount Recommended
Tununak - City Streets and Airport Road Reconstruction	\$ 200,000	\$ 200,000	86.4	Project scored per standard procedures.	\$200,000
St. Mary's & Pitkas Point Dust Control	\$ 500,000	\$ 250,000	94.3	Project scored per standard procedures.	\$250,000
NORTHWEST ARCTIC BOUROUGH					
Noatak-Delong Mountain Terminal Winter Access Route	\$ 500,000	\$ 396,000	82.9	Project scored per standard procedures.	\$400,000
Noorvik Native Community Cemetery Road	\$ 2,339,846	\$ 957,650	94.9	Project scored per standard procedures.	\$957,650

Project Name/Description	Total Cost	Requested DC Funding	Score	Meeting Minutes	Amount Recommended
Selawik Board Road Improvements	\$ 2,037,725	\$ 418,450		In staff discussions with project sponsor subsequent to project nomination, the project was withdrawn. Selawik asks approval to rescope existing \$359,000 award for boardwalk construction materials to a \$270,000 design and materials project to access new housing. Committee approved reduced funding, and change in scope to allow design and construction for the revised project. Motion by Mr. Pool to allow a change in scope, Mr. Quinlan seconded, passed unanimously.	\$0
INTERIOR					
Fort Yukon - Design to replace Ivars Bridge			Tabled	Committee and staff reviewed project scope and status, concluding the project was not ready for construction funding. Significant design effort, including resolution of substantial R/W issues is required. Staff directed to work with Fort Yukon on design scope-schedule-budget for potential design phase project nomination in FY 2011. Motion by Mr. Qunilin to table project, Mr. Pool seconded, passed unanimously.	\$0

Project Name/Description	Total Cost	Requested DC Funding	Score	Meeting Minutes	Amount Recommended
INTERIOR					
Healy Community Roads Surfacing	\$ 1,000,000	\$ 500,000	103.5	Committee and staff discussed with DOT&PF the importance of the four DOT&PF-nominated projects - Healy, Northway, Tanacross and Teller. Committee agreed projects are similar and scored projects the same. Motion by Mr. Quinlan to score the projects the same, Mr. Romenesko seconded, passed unanimously.	\$500,000
Northway Access Road Improvements	\$2,000,000	\$ 1,500,000	103.5	Project scored per standard procedures. See Healy meeting note. Mr. Richards abstained from voting on the Northway project due to his position with Doyon Ltd.	\$500,000
Tanacross Road Improvements	\$ 1,000,000	\$ 500,000	103.5	Project scored. See Healy meeting note	\$500,000

Project Name/Description	Total Cost	Requested DC Funding	Score	Meeting Minutes	Amount Recommended
Gambell Community Streets	\$ 9,200,000	\$ 1,000,000	120	Committee and staff reviewed project nomination funding outline and raised concern that project is already fully funded. Continued discussion showed that DOT&PF has been able to meet cost needs on Gambell evacuation road project, a project that contains Commission funds in the same amount as the Community Streets nomination request. Staff was directed to work with sponsor to redirect the unused FY 2009 Evacuation Road funds over to the Community Streets project. Project scored per standard procedures to confirm value.	\$0
Teller Airport Road Dust Control	\$ 150,000	\$ 75,000	103.5	Project scored per standard procedures. See Healy meeting note.	\$75,000
Total Funding Requested for Roads					
Roads Total Funding	\$ 65,308,074	\$ 22,778,601			\$10,320,758

Waterfront Development:

Project Name/Description	Total Cost	Requested DC Funding	Score	Meeting Minutes	Amount Recommended
KODIAK ISLAND BOROUGH					
Port Lions City Dock and Ferry Terminal Repairs	\$ 350,000	\$ 350,000	Tabled	Staff discussion with Committee outlines that the next logical step in project development is USACE Decision Document. USACE is already working on City Dock, and staff proposes amendment to the existing award for \$150,000 to bring project to an engineered decision on structure type and configuration . Motion by Mr. Pool to allow the amendment, Mr. Romenesko seconded, passed unanimously.	\$150,000
Old Harbor City Dock Project	\$ 8,137,260	\$ 1,500,000	142	Staff reported to Committee that discussions with project sponsor subsequent to project nomination resulted in sponsor recognition of Commission standard project limit of \$1,000,000 and a request to adjust project budget to standard limit. Project scored per standard procedures.	\$1,000,000
SOUTH CENTRAL					
Whittier Small Boat Harbor Renovations - Phase I	\$ 5,633,000	\$ 990,000	122	Project scored per standard procedures.	\$990,000

Project Name/Description	Total Cost	Requested DC Funding	Score	Meeting Minutes	Amount Recommended
SOUTHEAST					
Angoon Barge Landing	\$ 50,000	\$ -	Tabled	Staff explained that USACE Barge Landing Analysis is currently examining region’s barge landing needs, including those at Angoon. Recommendation is to allow USACE to complete work. Committee agreed USACE Barge Landing Study Phase II would provide priority ranking. Motion to table all barge landing projects by Mr. Romenesko, Mr. Pool seconded, passed unanimously.	\$0
Angoon Ferry Terminal Passenger Facility	\$ 75,000	\$ 68,228	81.9	Committee discussed Angoon and Kake ferry terminal passenger facilities are an unusual nomination. By funding these projects, the program is expanding program eligibility that could result in a number of future shelter nominations being brought to the Commission. Nonetheless, final discussion between the Committee and DOT&PF resulted in an agreement that shelters are a real need. Projects scored per standard procedures. Motion to score Angoon and Kake Ferry Terminal Passenger Facilities by Mr. Qunilin, seconded by Mr. Zimin, passed unanimously.	\$68,228

Project Name/Description	Total Cost	Requested DC Funding	Score	Meeting Minutes	Amount Recommended
Hoonah Barge Facility	\$ 350,000		Tabled	See Angoon Barge Landing note and Committee motion.	\$0
Kake Ferry Terminal Passenger Facility	\$ 150,000	\$ 136,455	81.9	See Angoon Ferry Terminal note and Committee motion.	\$136,455
Ketchikan Thomas Basin Finger Floats Replacement	\$ 1,800,000	\$ 900,000	105.3	Project scored per standard procedures.	\$900,000
Ketchikan - Knudson Cove Harbor Launch Ramp Replacement	\$ 1,600,000	\$ 800,000	102.1	Project scored per standard procedures.	\$800,000
Pelican Barge Facility	\$ 150,000	\$ 136,455	Tabled	See Angoon Barge Landing note and Committee motion.	\$0

Project Name/Description	Total Cost	Requested DC Funding	Score	Meeting Minutes	Amount Recommended
Skagway Small Boat Harbor	\$ 925,000	\$ 525,000	Tabled	Committee recommended Skagway complete Design with existing funds to develop scope-schedule-budget for construction phase and nominate project for construction phase in FY 2011-2012. Mr. Romenesko motion to table project, Mr. Hoffman seconded, passed unanimously.	\$0
Tenakee Springs Ferry Dock Improvements	\$ 450,000	\$ 409,365	104.9	Project scored per standard procedures.	\$409,365
Tlingit and Haida Indian Tribes of Alaska -THITA Dock & Shipyard	\$ 1,000,000	\$ 1,000,000	Not eligible	Staff discussions with sponsor and property owner subsequent to project nomination revealed the project is a joint-venture, but is on private property for private sector operations. Project sponsor understood that upon review, the nomination was not eligible for funding.	\$0
Thorne Bay - Davidson Landing Phase I Mooring Floats	\$ 1,235,761	\$ 562,761	112.3	Project scored per standard procedures.	\$562,761

Project Name/Description	Total Cost	Requested DC Funding	Score	Meeting Minutes	Amount Recommended
Wrangell Marine Service Center Uplands Paving	\$ 5,832,061	\$ 1,000,000		Staff discussions with sponsor subsequent to nomination submission revealed that project would not score well under standard procedures and requested Commission withdraw the nomination.	\$0
Wrangell City Dock Rehabilitation	\$ 238,000	\$ 238,000	80.4	Project scored per standard procedures	\$238,000
AELUTIANS EAST BOROUGH					
Akutan City Dock Fendering Improvements	\$ 40,000	\$ 36,338	Tabled	Staff discussions with DOT&PF subsequent to project nomination, showed the project may not have a cost-effective solution due to height differences between the dock and AMHS vessels on the route. Committee directed staff to work with Alaska Marine Highway System (AMHS) on a scope of work before providing funding. Motion to table project by Mr. Pool, Mr. Romenesko seconded, passed unanimously.	\$0

Project Name/Description	Total Cost	Requested DC Funding	Score	Meeting Minutes	Amount Recommended
Sand Point New Harbor Float	\$ 1,399,900	\$ 1,000,000	125.6	Project scored per standard procedures.	\$1,000,000
BRISTOL BAY					
Ugashik Dock/Cannery Rehabilitation	\$ 3,862,612	\$ -	Tabled	Staff research subsequent to project nomination showed dock was likely a private dock, which would make it ineligible for Commission funds. Committee members familiar with area confirmed the dock is private. <i>Motion to table project by Mr. Zimin, Mr. Pool seconded, passed unanimously.</i>	\$0
YUKON/KUSKOKWIM					
Bethel Small Boat Harbor Dredging	\$ 299,000	\$ 239,200	123.3	Staff reported on the regional use and character of the Bethel harbor and the need for repairs/upgrade. Discussions with USACE regarding overall scope of work revealed project funding request is insufficient for full design effort. Staff recommended and Committee approved ranking project based on \$500,000 budget. Committee, staff and Bethel representatives discussed pros and cons of USACE taking on project. Decision was made to assign project to USACE. Project scored per standard procedures. Mr. Hoffman abstained from voting due to his use of harbor facilities.	\$500,000

Project Name/Description	Total Cost	Requested DC Funding	Score	Meeting Minutes	Amount Recommended
Crooked Creek Barge Landing	\$ 432,935	\$ 60,000		Staff research subsequent to nomination shows this project is tied to the Crooked Creek Barge Landing Access Road nomination, and shares the significant unresolved R/W and land use issues associated with the road. Project withdrawn by sponsor.	\$0
NORTHWEST ARCTIC					
Kotzebue Swan Lake Harbor Expansion	\$ 3,000,000	\$ 3,000,000	103.6	Staff reported that like the Bethel Harbor, the Kotzebue Harbor provides local and regional services. It will also soon be the relocation site for a large number of vessels being displaced from Kotzebue Front Street by a new road project at that site. Discussions with the project sponsor subsequent to the nomination showed that there is not design underway at this time. The sponsor requested staff report to the Committee the need to modify the nomination to reflect a \$500,000 design phase. The Committee accepted the sponsor recommendation. Project scored per standard procedures.	\$500,000
Total Funding Requested for Waterfront					
Waterfront Total Funding	\$37,010,529	\$12,601,802			\$7,254,809
Total Funding Requested for Roads and Waterfront					
Roads & Waterfront	\$102,318,603	\$35,380,403			\$17,425,567

Update from Arne Fuglvog, Legislative Assistant for Senator Murkowski's Office

Discussion Summary:

Mr. Fuglvog provided the Committee with an update on Congressional efforts related to the new legislation that would replace SAFETEA-LU. The work is likely to take 1-2 years to complete and in the meantime, Congress is extending SAFETEA-LU through Congressional CR. It is expected that SAFETEA-LU may be extended to the end of FY 2010 in the next CR, and it is also likely the SAFETEA-LU will extend into FY 2011 due the existing work load in Congress, and the difficulty meeting revenue needs associated with proposed legislation. Mr. Fuglvog stated that the delegation is working to include the Commission transportation program in future transportation legislation.

Agenda Item #5 Special Consideration Projects

Discussion Summary:

Ms. Harrop, USACE Project Manager, provided an overview of the FY 2010 construction season projects for Committee review and approval. The Committee directed that staff submit future annual construction plans prior to the project selection meeting along with all other nominations. This will ensure the Committee has the opportunity to evaluate barge landing construction projects along side all other nominations for that year. Ms. Harrop will provide the additional information to staff within a week and staff will provide the list to the Committee for review and recommendation to the Federal Co-Chair.

Agenda Item #6 Closing Comments

Discussion Summary:

The Committee identified that in both program elements, there was a remaining balance in the range of \$600,000 after project selections were complete. The Committee questioned staff about how those funds would be obligated. Mr. McKinnon responded that as selected projects scope were developed and initial fieldwork was conducted, final design and/or construction budgets would be established and fund balances would be assigned to projects based on need. All fund obligations would be complete by August 1, 2010.

The Committee questioned staff about the possibility of receiving stimulus money through the transportation program, and if it possible, how would the Commission manage those funds. Mr. McKinnon responded that the Commission is working with DOT&PF and BIA on Recovery Act opportunities and FHWA and/or BIA would assign funds to projects through their respective projects nominations processes. Ms. Rinner explained that the Commission has systems in place for administrating and reporting Recovery Act funds should they be received.

Mr. Pool commented that the program needs additional staff to administer upcoming projects.

Agenda Item #7 Staff Assignments

- Provide Committee with FY 2010 USACE Construction Plan email by February 1
- Report to Committee with revised document of timeline and eligibility for nominations
- Provide Committee with a revised criteria document reflecting requested changes
- Report to Committee on projects with low expenditures, within a one year timeline
- Report to Committee on projects that were submitted, and have cost share pending
- Provide a follow up on the ownership of the Ugashiak dock.
- Provide a summary document of federal transportation funds
- Assign projects to project development partners, or communities
- Send FY 2010 approval/non-approval letters to applicants
- Assign funding to selected projects
- Contact BIA/DOT&PF about construction coordination opportunities
- Work with partners and communities to host project plan meetings May-June
- Schedule spring strategic planning session
 - Cost Structures Analysis of partner agencies
 - Final Program Status Report document
 - Identification of Recovery Act projects with DOT&PF-BIA
 - Plan for Regional Outreach, including list of upcoming conferences
 - Analysis of village resources for the upcoming construction season
 - Coordination with US Coast Guard on project needs
 - Coordination with FAA on Commission funding for airport shelters
 - Update on USACE/WFLHD completed designs moving into construction
 - Update on highway legislation, state legislative action and other funding
 - Update on Program staffing and work load adjustments
 - Update on Consulting Engineers meeting presentation

Motion to adjourn made by Mr. Ivanoff, Mr. Hoffman seconded, passed unanimously.

Meeting adjourned at 6:04 pm

