COMMUNICATIONS
Wintermission Project Brief

Wintermission will coach three U.S. cities to plan, pilot, and implement creative solutions to increase social interaction and physical activity among children, newcomer families, and other vulnerable communities in public spaces during the coldest, darkest months of the year.

The project will train and advise three interdisciplinary teams of leaders to implement winter-friendly solutions for their respective cities. The teams will be selected through a competitive application process led and facilitated by 8 80 Cities. The training begins with a convening at the Winter Cities Shake Up conference in Saskatoon, SK on January 23-26, 2019.

8 80 Cities and their project partners (National League of Cities Institute for Youth, Education, and Families, and the Children and Nature Network) will then spend 18 months with each participating city to, first, host creative community engagement activities to collect public feedback and ideas about winter, and second, implement pilot projects to bring those ideas to life and test new winter-focused designs and programs in public spaces. Public spaces include but are not limited to parks, civic squares, libraries, community centers, school grounds, streets, and sidewalks—places that are free to access by anyone no matter their age, ability, or income level.

These activities will inform a winter city strategy to guide each city in reducing social isolation, specifically among vulnerable groups, through public space improvements in the future. 8 80 Cities will compile the lessons learned from the three participating cities in an online 8 80 Winter City Toolkit that will serve as the central knowledge and networking hub for winter city planning in North America.

Increasing Public Life in Winter Cities

Public life is broadly defined as social interactions that naturally happen when people spend time in public spaces such as parks, plazas, streets, and sidewalks. Research shows that public life declines in winter as fewer people venture outdoors to spend time in parks and public spaces. This contributes to lower rates of physical activity and social interaction which disproportionately affect vulnerable populations like children and newcomers.

Cities have the capacity to lead the charge in providing viable options for people to enjoy public spaces and public life during the time of year when people feel least inspired to do so. Building a culture of public life outside in winter, also helps build a culture of public life in all seasons. The public realm presents the greatest opportunity to create socially connected and physically active communities throughout the entire year. Streets, roads, sidewalks, parks, plazas, libraries, school grounds, and community centers belong to
everyone. We intend to leverage these publicly owned civic assets to reduce social isolation and enhance social and physical activity during the winter season.

**Reducing Social Isolation in Winter**

Even though most cities in the northern United States experience winter for substantial portions of the year, their built environments do little to embrace their climate. The lack of winter-friendly design and programming in public spaces discourages residents from spending time in public spaces during the cold season. This tendency can create a sense of social isolation which contributes to civic lethargy.

While some people may welcome the slowness and quietude that winter brings, others can feel trapped, isolated, and vulnerable. Research indicates that seasonal affective disorder (SAD) affects about 6 percent of the US population each year, 80 percent of whom are women. Those living further away from the equator are more likely to experience SAD. Symptoms of SAD include depression, social anxiety, a desire to avoid social contact, lethargy, sleep deprivation, etc. An additional 10 percent – 20 percent experience a mild form of SAD. Physician-recommended ways to prevent the effects of SAD include light therapy, increased exercise, and spending more time outside.

**Supporting Children and Newcomers**

*Children in particular* spend less time participating in unstructured play when the days are short. Older *adults* are most likely to use streets and sidewalks for their leisure physical activity, yet they *report* the most difficulty getting around in the winter.

Ethnic minority groups and newcomers in the US also have different relationships with winter. The clearest form of exclusion of ethnic minorities in winter culture is within the area of winter sports. Skiing, snowboarding, hockey, and curling are all sports that are dominated by whites. There are few efforts to increase access to these winter sports among ethnic minorities, and even fewer efforts to identify culturally-relevant ways for different ethnic groups to uniquely celebrate and connect to winter. Many newcomer settlement agencies offer classes on how to “survive” winter. While these are extremely important, we believe cities can go beyond helping people survive during winter, and instead dedicate efforts to helping people thrive during winter.

Through Wintermission, we want to bring warmth and a sense of community outside for people of all ages, and especially for children, newcomer families, and other vulnerable groups. Projects implemented as part of Wintermission will engage residents to not only enjoy public spaces during wintertime but also encourage citizens to be engaged with their communities throughout the year.
Project Partners

This project will be led by **8 80 Cities**. As a non-profit organization, we are led by a simple but powerful philosophy: if everything we did in our cities prioritized the safety and health of 8-year-olds and 80-year-olds, then we would create successful cities for all. 8 80 Cities has worked in 37 countries and over 200 cities across the world. We are international experts in creating safe, accessible, and engaged communities.

**Key collaborators and partners include:**

**Child and Nature Network:** The Children & Nature Network (C&NN) is leading the movement to connect all children, their families and communities to nature through innovative ideas, evidence-based resources and tools, broad-based collaboration and support of grassroots leadership. C&NN will partner on developing and delivering engagement strategies for children. Their expertise and participation will maximize project impacts on reducing social isolation for children and caregivers.

**National League of Cities Institute for Youth, Education, and Families (NLC):** Founded in 1924, NLC serves as a resource to and an advocate for the more than 19,000 cities, villages and towns it represents. NLCI, as the education and research affiliate of NLC, has extensive experience in designing and successfully implementing research, community assessment, leadership training, and technical assistance initiatives. The Institute for Youth, Education, and Families (YEF Institute), a special entity within NLCI launched in 2000, helps municipal leaders take action on behalf of the children, youth and families in their communities. The YEF Institute has provided technical assistance to hundreds of cities on topics such as health and wellness, early childhood development, economic opportunity, and youth and adult connections. Some of these technical assistance initiatives involve significant pass-through funds and intermediary responsibilities. Virtually all such initiatives have led to the publication of how-to or lessons learned reports and guidebooks enjoying wide use among municipal governments and city partners nationwide.

**The Network of Winter City Champions** will provide ongoing guidance to the core project team, and provide mentorship and technical support to the Winter City Vanguard teams through webinars and conference calls. The Network will be a multidisciplinary and international group of thought leaders and decision makers who are leading the field of winter city planning, programming, design and policy. Confirmed members of the Network include:
Susan Holdsworth, WinterCity Manager at the City of Edmonton:
As WinterCity Manager at the City of Edmonton, Susan oversees the implementation of the Edmonton's WinterCity Strategy across all departments and municipal programs. Susan will co-develop the Winter City Study Tour agenda, managing on-the-ground logistics, and co-hosting the tour in Edmonton.

J.P. Ouellette, Chief Administrative Officer at the Town of Cochrane:
Cochrane is a small town in Northern Ontario with a population of 5,400. 8 80 Cities collaborated with J.P. Ouellette and the Town of Cochrane in 2014 on the innovative Doable Neighbourhood Project, which supported a series of new programs and initiatives to encourage social interaction and physical activity. J.P. will provide expertise in scaling policies and programs to the small-town context.

Tina Saaby, City Architect at the City of Copenhagen:
The City of Copenhagen is widely recognized as one of the most livable, people-friendly cities in the world. They have achieved this status, in no small part, due to policies, design guidelines, public realm programs, and bike lane maintenance programs that acknowledge the importance of winter. As City Architect, Tina Saaby oversees Copenhagen's urban planning and urban design policies to ensure they comply with the city's high standard of all-season living.

Thomas B. Randrup, Swedish University of Agricultural Sciences (SLU):
Thomas is a professor at SLU and holds a PhD in Landscape Planning from the University of Copenhagen. He specializes in urban forestry, including parks and green spaces. Thomas has an intimate understanding of how seasonality interacts with the design and maintenance of green infrastructure in cities. As an advisor, he will provide expertise on the infrastructure design and maintenance issues that are pertinent to creating safe and inviting public spaces in winter.

Patrick Coleman, Winter Cities Institute:
Patrick Coleman is the Executive Director of the Winter Cities Institute, which was organized to identify and promote the positive attributes of winter living, new concepts in architecture and urban design, success stories from those places that are thriving in the north. Much of the Wintermission project idea directly builds on the winter cities work that Patrick has been spearheading since the 1980s. As an advisor, Patrick will ensure that Wintermission's work will adhere to best practices, and that project activities will enhance and amplify, rather than replicate, the work of the Winter Cities Institute.

Wintermission is generously supported by the Robert Wood Johnson Foundation Global Ideas Fund at CAF America. The views expressed here do not necessarily reflect the views of CAF America or the Robert Wood Johnson Foundation.
Competition Eligibility & Criteria

Eligibility FAQ

Are charitable and/or community organizations eligible to apply?
Yes, the lead applicants may be charitable or community organizations but they must include a senior-level government representative as part of the team.

How many people or organizations should be on our team?
There is no minimum or maximum number of team members. However, priority will be given to teams with strong partnerships representing diverse interests and areas of expertise.

Teams representing multiple municipal departments are encouraged. Preference will also be given to teams led or supported by senior-level municipal staff (i.e. heads of municipal departments, mayor's office staff, etc.).

What qualifies as a ‘winter city’?
For the purposes of the Wintermission project, a winter city is defined as any city or town that experiences winter climate conditions including cold weather and snowfall to an extent that it influences city building decisions and development.

Are there requirements related to population size?
No, we encourage applications from cities, towns, and communities of all shapes and sizes.

Proposal Evaluation

Proposals will be evaluated by representatives from 8 80 Cities, the National League of Cities Institute for Youth, Education, and Families, the Children and Nature Network, and our Network of Winter City Champions which include representatives from the City of Copenhagen, City of Edmonton, Town of Cochrane, Swedish University of Agricultural Sciences, and the Winter Cities Institute.

The following criteria will be considered:

1. Potential for impact
   • To what extent do winter conditions affect public life and social isolation in the city?
Who are most affected by the impacts of social isolation in winter? To what extent is the proposed team committed to reducing social isolation among children, newcomers, and other vulnerable communities?

Are there existing projects and initiatives that can be leveraged to enhance impact of Wintermission?

2. Composition of your team
   - Does the team lead have the capacity to guide the Wintermission project through each phase?
   - Does the project team represent diverse voices and perspectives, and possess relevant expertise?
   - Is there at least one representative of the municipal government on the project team?

3. Ambition
   - How well does the Vanguard team’s vision align with the goals of the Wintermission project?
   - Does the Vanguard team describe clear goals for their city with a focus of improving public life and reducing social isolation in winter?
Roles & Project Timeline

Roles and Responsibilities

The Winter City Vanguard teams will:

- Send three representatives to attend the Winter Cities Shake Up conference on January 23-26, 2019
- Coordinate community engagement meetings and events
- Support 8 80 Cities in developing the community engagement strategy and leading ongoing engagement efforts after the process is launched
- Develop and implement pilot projects based on community engagement findings
- Support 8 80 Cities in developing and implementing a pilot project evaluation strategy
- Co-develop a unique winter city strategy with 8 80 Cities and project partners
- Commit to implementing the winter city strategy after the Wintermission project is complete

8 80 Cities and their partners will:

- Convene Winter City Vanguard teams at the Winter Cities Shake Up conference
- Cover airfare, accommodation, and registration fees for three representatives from each team to attend the conference
- Support each Vanguard team to develop a community engagement strategy
- Travel to each Vanguard city to launch the community engagement strategy, and support the teams in continuing engagement efforts
- Support each Vanguard team to develop pilot project ideas and action plans
- Provide seed funding to be used towards materials and services related to the pilot projects
- Travel to each Vanguard city to document the outcomes and impacts of the pilot project phase
- Co-develop a unique winter city strategy with each Vanguard team
- Provide ongoing support and strategic advice to each Vanguard city team, and connect them to capacity building opportunities through the Winter City Champions mentorship network
Project Timeline

Wintermission is a two-year project. Milestones and key dates include:

Wintermission Competition: Nov. 1 – 29, 2018
Through the competition, 8 80 Cities will select three U.S. cities to become Winter City Vanguards. These cities will work with 8 80 Cities and project partners to become best practice examples of winter cities.

Competition winners notified: December 2018
Competition winners will be notified no later than mid-December. Winning teams will identify three representatives to attend the Winter Cities Shake Up conference (all travel expenses will be covered)

Winter Cities Shake Up 2019: January 23 – 26, 2019
Each Winter City Vanguard team will send three representatives to attend this conference. 8 80 Cities will convene all Wintermission partners and Winter City Vanguard representatives for a pre-conference meeting on January 23.

Community Engagement: February – March 2019
8 80 Cities will work with Winter City Vanguard teams to develop inclusive community engagement strategies to engage local stakeholders in conversations about public life and social isolation in winter. 8 80 Cities will travel to each city for 3-4 days to implement initial outreach and engagement.

Community Engagement Summary Reports: April – June 2019
8 80 Cities will develop community engagement summary reports for each Winter City Vanguard. These reports will be used to guide the pilot project phase.

Pilot Project Planning: July – September 2019
Winter City Vanguard teams will use results from the community engagement summary reports to develop plans and strategies for implementing pilot projects. Pilot projects may include temporary infrastructure, programming in public spaces, community events, and more.

Pilot Project Implementation: October 2019 – March 2020
Winter City Vanguard teams will launch pilot projects that improve public life in winter. 8 80 Cities will advise teams and travel to each city to support with documentation of pilot project impacts.

Winter City Strategy Development: March – July 2020
8 80 Cities will work with Winter City Vanguard teams to develop a Winter City Strategy tailored to the unique challenges and opportunities of each city.
WORK SESSION
December 11, 2018
6:00 p.m.

Presentation by Community Planning staff and Shelly Wade of Agnew:Beck regarding the Salcha-Badger plan community input, draft goals, outreach and timeline with time for questions.
(Staff Contact: Melissa Kellner)

AGENDA
Immediately following the Work Session

A. ROLL CALL

B. MESSAGES
   1. Chairperson’s Comments
   2. Commissioner’s Comments
   3. Communications to the Planning Commission
   4. Citizen’s Comments – limited to three (3) minutes
      a. Agenda items not scheduled for public hearing
      b. Items other than those appearing on the agenda

C. APPROVAL OF AGENDA AND CONSENT AGENDA

   Approval of consent agenda passes all routine items indicated by asterisk (*) on agenda. Consent agenda items are not considered separately unless any Commission member or citizen so requests. In the event of such request, the item is returned to the general agenda.

D. *MINUTES


E. NEW BUSINESS

   1. Discussion about bike connectivity and potential recommendations on multi-modal goals and strategies to the Downtown Fairbanks Planning Working Group.
   2. Discussion on FNSB Department of Community Planning Fee Schedule.
   3. Election of Chair and Vice-Chair for 2019.
F. EXCUSE FUTURE ABSENCES

G. COMMISSIONER’S COMMENTS/COMMUNICATIONS

1. FMATS
2. Other

H. ADJOURNMENT

Any questions, please contact Community Planning at 907-459-1260 or via email at: FNSBPC@fnsb.us
FAIRBANKS NORTH STAR BOROUGH PLANNING COMMISSION

MINUTES
November 13, 2018

A regular meeting of the Fairbanks North Star Borough Planning Commission was held in the Mona Lisa Drexler Assembly Chambers, Juanita Helms Administration Center, 907 Terminal Street, Fairbanks, Alaska. The meeting was called to order at 6:21 p.m. by Mindy O’Neill, Chairman.

MEMBERS PRESENT: Wendy Presler  Chris Guinn
                   Doug Sims       Charles Whitaker
                   David Brandt    Eric Muehling

MEMBERS EXCUSED:  Mike Stepovich  John Perreault
                   Patricia Thayer

MEMBERS ABSENT:  Robert Peterson

OTHERS PRESENT:  Christine Nelson, Director of Community Planning
                 Manish Singh, Planner III
                 Ben Jaffa, Asst. Borough Attorney
                 Michelle Gutierrez, Administrative Assistant III

A. ROLL CALL

B. MESSAGES

   1. Chairperson’s Comments

   Chair O’Neill stated she will need to be excused from the meeting at 10pm to catch a flight.

   2. Commissioner’s Comments

   3. Communications to the Planning Commission

   4. Citizen’s Comments – limited to three (3) minutes

      a. Agenda items not scheduled for public hearing
      b. Items other than those appearing on the agenda

   5. Disclosure & Statement of Conflict of Interest

   Chair O’Neill determined Commissioner Muehling will be excused from RZ2019-001.

C. * APPROVAL OF AGENDA AND CONSENT AGENDA

   Approval of Consent Agenda passes all routine items indicated by asterisk (*) on agenda. Consent Agenda items are not considered separately unless any Planning Commission member or citizen so requests. In the event of such request, the item is returned to the general agenda.
MOTION: To approve the Agenda and Consent Agenda by Commissioner Sims, seconded by Commissioner Whitaker.

CARRIED WITHOUT OBJECTION

D. MINUTES

1. *Minutes from October 23, 2018 PC Meeting

E. QUASI-JUDICIAL HEARING

CU2019-005: A request by Terrell Towns DBA Tot's 'R' Us Childcare for conditional use approval of a day care facility in the Single-Family Residential 10 (SF-10) zone on Lot 11, Block 7, Taku Subdivision, First Addition (located at 1178 Nenana Street, on the west side of Nenana Street, between Ruby Avenue and Kuskokwim Avenue). Staff Contact: Manish Singh

OATH ADMINISTERED

Mr. Manish Singh provided a presentation of his staff report and recommendations on behalf of the Borough's Planning Department, and recommended approval with one (1) condition and three (3) findings of fact as listed in the Staff Report.

Questions by Commissioners

Commissioner Guinn asked if the conditional approval met the requirements of the complainant.

Mr. Singh explained the complaint was anonymous and no response was submitted by any DPO receiver that was against the conditional use, only one inquiry that was general in nature.

Commissioner Guinn questioned why the permit was for 12 children.

Mr. Singh explained it was to keep consistent with the state license.

Commissioner Muehling questioned the hours of operation and if any DPO’s were returned with negative comments.

Mr. Singh stated no negative comments from the interested persons were submitted.

Applicant’s Testimony

Applicant, Terrell Towns testified as follows:

- Works for TSA, the daycare is second job.
- Girlfriend is the owner and he is the administrator.
- Number of children fluctuates.
- Passionate to helping families that have a hard time finding childcare.
- Lots of the parents receive state funds for childcare.
- Service to the community.
• Contacted the surrounding neighbors prior to FNSB contacting them, everyone was in support.
• They did not know what a conditional use was prior to this process.
• They want to abide by the rules.
• Not a lot of males in the profession and sometimes children need that male role model.

OATH ADMINISTERED TO ALEJANDRA BARRAGAN

Alejandra Barragan, owner of Tot’s ‘R’ Us, testified as follows:

• 13 years of experience.
• Used to work for FNA Early Headstart.
• Wants to follow regulations and rules; they didn’t know about the process before.
• Not a lot of daycare facilities, so they want to help parents.
• Try to avoid all problems if possible, with neighbors.
• Daycare has yearly inspections and on call inspections.
• Daycare has fire reports every two years.
• Daycare hours can be changed, but parents need 2 week notice.
• Explained for 12 children, two employees are needed.
• Daycare has monthly fire drills.

Questions by Commissioners

Commissioner Presler questioned if another employee works at the daycare.

Ms. Barragan stated they have one worker that fills in for when Mr. Towns is at his other job.

Commissioner Sims asked if they are opened on the weekends.

Ms. Barragan and Mr. Towns said no; Monday to Friday only.

Commissioner Sims asked if a number of clients come from the immediate neighborhood or from outside the neighborhood.

Ms. Barragan stated that most of their clients are from different areas.

Commissioner Muehling asked if there were any issues with non-compliance with the state licensing regulations for the daycare.

Ms. Barragan and Mr. Towns said no.

Commissioner Guinn questioned the amount of traffic generated at pickup and drop-off times.

Ms. Barragan and Mr. Towns stated the drop off times and typically two or three cars at one time; some of the clients have multiple children, siblings, they drop off at once.

Chair O’Neall asked if they had any children of their own and if they are counted into the allowed number of 12 children.
Ms. Barragan stated she has two, one child that goes to school and one that stays home and is included in the total of 12 children.

Interested Person Testimony Opened

None

Interested Person Testimony Closed

MOTION: To approve the Conditional Use Permit (CU2019-005) for a day care facility with one (1) condition, and adopting the staff report, and three (3) findings of fact in support of approval by Commissioner Muehling, seconded by Commissioner Sims.

CONDITIONS

1. If any modifications are made to the site plan, maximum number of children, hours of operation or other operational characteristics, the applicant or holder of this conditional use permit shall submit revised documents to the FNSB Community Planning Department. If modifications are made to the conditional use, an amendment to the Conditional Use Permit may be required pursuant to FNSBC 18.104.050(D).

FINDINGS OF FACT

1. The proposed conditional use conforms to the intent and purpose of Title 18 and of other ordinances and state statutes:
   a. The purpose of Title 18 is met because the proposed conditional use is consistent with ‘Urban Area’ comprehensive plan land use designation. The conditional use is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan Community and Human Resources Goal 1, Strategy 1 because the day care facility serves the borough residents by providing essential childcare services.
   b. The intent of Title 18 will be met because the conditional use both protects private property rights and promotes public health, safety, and welfare.
   c. The applicant has obtained a state license for a day care facility from Child Care Licensing (CCL) Program. The applicant has obtained a business license from Division of Corporations, Business and Professional Licensing, Alaska Department of Commerce, Community, and Economic Development. The applicant has also obtained a business license from the City of Fairbanks. The applicant has provided information sufficient to show that they intend to meet the city and state regulations.

2. There are adequate existing sewage capacities, transportation facilities, energy and water supplies, and other public services to serve the proposed conditional use.
   a. The day care facility has adequate water supply because the property is served by Golden Heart Utilities.
   b. The facility has adequate sewage capacities because the property is served by Golden Heart Utilities.
   c. The facility has adequate fire services because the property is served by the City of Fairbanks Fire Department.
   d. The facility has adequate power supply because it is served by the GVEA grid.
   e. The facility is served by the City of Fairbanks Police Department for law enforcement.
f. The subject property has access from Nenana Street which is a local road maintained by the City of Fairbanks. Nenana Street can accommodate the small number of trip ends generated by the day care facility.
g. The site plan shows one parking space and a child drop-off area which are adequate for the day care facility.

3. The proposed conditional use protects public health, safety, and welfare because the day care facility complies with Title 18 standards for the SF-10 zone (FNSBC 18.44) as well as with other applicable land use related laws.
   a. The hours of operation for the day care facility do not negatively impact the residential neighborhood because the day care does not operate in the night. These hours of operation are consistent with the City’s noise ordinance. The late fee for late pick-ups incentivizes parents to pick up their children on time.
   b. The noise produced by the day care facility does not negatively impact the residential neighborhood because the day care is for a maximum of 12 children and the playtime is limited to 10 am to 12 pm and 4 pm to 6 pm.
   c. On December 4, 2017, the day care facility passed their fire inspection from City of Fairbanks Fire Department. The compliance with City of Fairbanks Fire Code and the availability of fire and rescue services through the City of Fairbanks Fire Department minimize fire and other safety risks.

Discussion on the Motion

Commissioner Muehling stated the daycare is fulfilling the need of the community, the applicant stated they are in compliance with state licensing and regulations and there have been no complaints from the neighborhood about their operations.

Commissioner Guinn stated his initial concern for increased traffic but nobody from the neighborhood showed up to complain and reiterated the need the daycare is fulfilling to the community.

Chair O’Neall stated the applicant has a good traffic control flow with the staggered pickup and drop-off times

ROLL CALL

Seven (7) in Favor: Presler, Sims, Brandt, Guinn, Whitaker, Muehling and O’Neall

Zero (0) Opposed:

MOTION PASSED

F. PUBLIC HEARING

RZ2019-001: A request by Don Duncan (Master Guide License #136) DBA Alaska Private Guide Service to rezone approximately 420 acres from Rural Residential (RR) to Outdoor Recreational (OR) or other appropriate zone. The area proposed to be rezoned include parcels described as Shuros Subdivision – Block 2, Schroeder Property Waiver – Tract B and Tract C, Section 28 T1N R1W F.M. – TL-2805, Section 29 T1N R1W F.M. – TL-2914 and GL-16 (located on the south side of Farmers Loop Road, near milepost 6). Staff Contact: Manish Singh

[Commissioner Muehling and Commissioner Brandt left the dais]
Mr. Manish Singh provided a presentation of his staff report and recommendations on behalf of the Borough’s Planning Department, and recommended approval with eight (8) findings of fact as listed in the Staff Report.

Questions by Commissioners

Commissioner Sims questioned what zoning Echo Acres is.

Mr. Singh stated Rural Estates.

Commissioner Sims asked if the proposed rezone to OR would be considered a commercial venture.

Mr. Singh stated no and further explained his reasoning and how the proposed rezone would align with existing uses.

Chair O’Neall asked if individuals could ride their snow machines through the area with the current zoning.

Mr. Singh clarified who would need a permit to use a snow machines within Creamers Field.

Commissioner Guinn asked if a conditional use permit will be presented to the commission in the near future.

Mr. Singh stated the applicant addressed that he would be applying for a conditional use permit and reminded the commission and public that once a rezone is approved you are not bound by the application anymore; the rezone is one step and then the property owner could propose any of the permitted or conditional uses that are listed within the zoning description.

Commissioner Guinn asked if the applicant runs his snow machine business if a conditional use permit is needed.

Mr. Singh stated yes.

Commissioner Whitaker asked if the applicant sells the property and if it would be allowed that the new owner wanted to put in a conditional use permit for a shooting range which will have no noise or lighting restrictions.

Mr. Singh stated if the rezone is approved, the applicant could sell his property and the new property owner may apply for a conditional use permit for one of the uses listed in the description.

Discussion ensued between Commissioner Sims and Mr. Singh in reference to taking a perimeter lot, zoned RR and changing it to OR in reference to consistency with the comprehensive plan and land use map.

Commissioner Sims questioned why Farmers Loop Road was listed as adequate buffer.
Mr. Singh stated the impression of buffer is subjective and stated his professional opinion that Farmers Loop Road provides some buffer and where it is adequate or not depends on the use across the road.

Commissioner Presler asked for clarification on if the zone changes, would the applicant have to apply for a conditional use permit to operate his business, even though the applicant currently has a permit from Creamers Field and asked if going forward would the public would still be able to use their snow machines on Creamers Field.

Mr. Singh stated the applicant has a current permit to operate his business through Echo Acres Drive and if he uses his own property for access and puts a trail head and/or a restroom for his customers then he will require a CUP from the FNSB and stated the way the public uses within the Creamers Field are not likely to change.

Applicant’s Testimony

Applicant, Don Duncan testified as follows:

- Thanked Mr. Singh for educating him on the process.
- He mentioned he offered Fish & Game to build a parking lot for them on Midnight Sun Drive for public use.
- There is a trail in the middle of his property that has been there for many years that people access.
- He has a permit that will allow him to connect his property with Fish & Game’s trail.
- His intention is to allow an increased public use of the area.
- He never had intentions to make it a shooting range or anything else.
- Mentioned the 100ft well that has crystal clear, pure water that is on his property.
- The property has 3 artesian wells.
- The building on the property is not in good condition.
- Primary use of the property will be for the snow machine business that will help cut time with not having to trailer snow machines every day.
- Mentioned the fear of conflict between snow machiners, dog mushers, skijorers and fat tire bikers but they had a meeting with Fish & Game to resolve the fears that never materialized.
- No major conflicts in the past five years.
- His snow machines on the trails are going slower than the dog mushers on the trails.
- Spent 100s of man hours keeping the trails open.
- Mentioned the guided tours are not allowed to run free and they are under control as best as possible.
- Gave his word that he will not ask for a conditional use permit to make it a shooting range.
- Mentioned the trails are multi-use and snow machines are allowed.
- The snow machines he uses grooms the trails.
- He doesn’t plan on using dog teams on the property.
- Mentioned he cleared trees for the safety of people just learning to ride a snow machine.
- Stated the property is down low that acts as a double buffer.
- He doesn’t think noise will be a problem.
- Uses snow machines that don’t have tuned exhaust, they are not loud.
- He doesn’t use paddle track snow machines cause it pulls up snow that could harm the dogs paws.
- Has been operating his business for 4-5 years.
• If he thought it would be a negative impact, he wouldn’t be asking for the rezone.
• Thinks his business and what he does for the public is an overall good impact.
• There is a 19 mile trail junction on the property, where all the trails come together.
• He bulldozed it and it is permafrost.

**Questions by Staff**

**Mr. Singh** asked if he had any plans to expand his operation in the near future or to acquire additional land.

Mr. Duncan stated he made two offers to the property to the east of his but was unacceptable to the land owner. The property just east of that eastern property, next to the Fish and Game properties, was willing to join the rezone but is out of town for work. Mr. Duncan stated he couldn’t afford the property right next to his.

**Questions by Commissioners**

**Commissioner Whitaker** asked how many snow machines are in his fleet and how many clients are taken out at a time.

Mr. Duncan stated he has 40 to 45 snow machines and the busy season can range up to 40 people but on average outside of the busy season, it is an average tour group of two people here and there. He reiterated the need for a central base operation for days that it’s just two people to avoid hauling work.

**Commissioner Presler** asked how long a typical snow machine tour is and how many people are taken out at once during the busy season.

Mr. Duncan stated it is typically a one hour tour and stated he has one guide per every four to six snow machiners and if it is more than six people, you need another tour guide.

**Commissioner Sims** asked if the Echo Acres area has any structures or parking lots or outhouses and asked why he is moving from Echo Acres to the proposed rezone location to facilitate his business.

Mr. Duncan said his permit from Fish & Game didn’t allow for an outhouse but he built one because the girls were having to walk across the street, through the woods and have to do their business in front of someone’s property, which he felt was wrong. He stated Echo Acres is perfect in a lot of ways and he doesn’t know if he would abandon entirely and continued to explain how the road is one of the last to be maintained and it is not an easy road to trailer a 8 ½ ft wide trailer full of snow machines on.

Discussion ensued between **Commissioner Sims** and Mr. Duncan in regards to his snow machines being two stroke machines and not tuned exhaust pipes and how his machines are not loud.

**Commissioner Sims** asked if he briefs his clients of trail etiquette.

Mr. Duncan said yes, they have an online training video and they walk them through everything and explained how they received a grant to make signs for the trail.
Commissioner Whitaker questioned if some of the dog walkers are unhappy with him in that area.

Mr. Duncan said not that he knows of.

Commissioner Whitaker queried the amount of blue smoke in the air if quite a few machines are idling and asked how long they would sit idling before the tour.

Mr. Duncan stated they are started and warmed up on the trailer first, then they are put onto the starting line and they are then shut off and then they are restarted when it’s time for the tour and if they are able to be at the property as proposed, then they would only need to be started once.

Public Testimony Opened

Susan Miller, Viewpointe neighborhood, testified as follows:

- Strongly requested the rezone be denied.
- Mr. Duncan’s request should have been a spot zone and denied.
- Creamer’s field is inappropriately zoned RR.
- The applicant’s property is 1% of the rezone and the residents shouldn’t be subjected to a nearby business.
- Let the state request the rezone and not by a private land owner.
- She didn’t see how tourism will be improved.
- Mentioned the noise, and air pollution of the business which is not conducive of the health, safety and welfare of the neighborhood.
- Requested a denial to maintain a stable and quiet area.

Patrick Marlow, 1418 Farmers Loop Road, testified as follows:

- Uses the trails often.
- The snow machine tours are extremely well behaved and the business is well ran.
- Mr. Duncan clears the trails.
- The neighborhood uses the trails to walk their dogs, etc.
- Hard to believe that the business will go unheard or unseen.
- When it comes time to sell his property, if there is a commercial use in the area, he may not get the same value out of the property.

Kathryn Baird, Viewpointe Subdivision, testified as follows:

- Urged the commission to deny the request.
- Rezoning the property would allow a potential archery range, camp ground, minor communications tower, or a shooting range.
- The potential uses if rezoned are not compatible with the environment of the neighborhood.
- The applicant’s property is a small part of the rezone request.
- The state didn’t ask for the rezone.
- The area is not appropriate for 40 people practicing how to use a snow machine, so close to houses.
- If there is an increase in tourism, the traffic would also increase.
- If the applicant already has a successful business, then the rezone wouldn’t impact it.
Matthew Banning, owner of 1311 Farmers Loop Road, testified as follows:

- Against the proposed rezone.
- It’s basically a spot zone according to the definition.
- It will have a negative impact to the area.
- There will be a conflict of interest with the surrounding property owners.
- To say the property cannot be used for residential premises is not accurate; he owns rentable cabins.
- If the applicant chooses to use the land as zoned or not is his choice.
- The business already exist and to move it from one place to another for the owner’s convenience is a detriment to the community.
- Contacted the Core of Engineers and found out the applicant did not file proper paperwork.
- The applicant cleared the land with a dozer and there is an ongoing investigation with the Core of Engineers for this violation.
- If the applicant has no regard for protocol, how will the Planning Commission keep him within his conditional use permit?
- The rezone will have a negative impact to the surrounding community.

Siegmar Siebeneich, 1304 Farmers Loop Road, testified as follows:

- Recently purchased their property for residential area, not to have a commercial use nearby.
- Cannot justify the rezone application based on 40 snow machines being across the road from his property.
- Questioned the hours of operation and suggested it would be at 11pm when people are sleeping.

Alan Jubenville, 1300 Shuros Drive, testified as follows:

- Uses the property in the winter time.
- The rezone will change the area dramatically.
- RR is the best zoning for the area because nothing has taken place in the area for a long period of time since Creamers Field existed.
- There will be more congestion in the area if rezoned.
- The rezone will cause conflict.
- Before anything is done, a wetland permit is required and no one has applied for one.
- Most of the 400 acres is wetlands.
- The area is currently very enjoyable.
- If rezoned, there will be a lot more noise in the area and more demand for trail development.
- The rezone is not suitable.

Audra Brase, 725 Ridge Point Drive, testified as follows:

- Represented the Alaska Department of Fish and Game as the Regional Supervisor, Division of Habitat.
• ADF&G has been delegated land management authority for the Creamer’s Field Migratory Waterfowl Refuge from the ADNR.
• Division of Habitat is responsible for issuing Special Area Permits for activities that occur within the refuge.
• The proposed rezone will place a portion of Creamer’s Field into a more appropriate category as the principal activities that take place at the refuge are providing habitat for wildlife and year-round public recreation on the multi-use trails.
• If the rezone is approved, ADF&G has no plans to make any changes to currently allowed uses on the lands.
• If the rezone is not approved, ADF&G may pursue rezoning the Creamer’s Field lands in their entirety, with a future request.
• ADF&G has no objection to the rezoning of the portions of Creamer’s Field currently designated as RR to the category of OR.
• ADF&G continues to have no objection to the rezoning of the adjacent private parcel.

Questions by Commissioners

Commissioner Guinn asked if there is any requirement for a Core Permit.

Ms. Brase stated what is currently going on, being just trails, there is no Core Permit needed.

Commissioner Whitaker asked if she was supervisor when the original snow machine permit was issued for the applicant and asked what the application process was.

Ms. Brase said yes and explained the process of a new application.

Discussion ensued between Commissioner Whitaker and Ms. Brase about the uses of the parking lot on Echo Acres and the idea of putting outhouses on the barn side of things.

Commissioner Presler asked for clarification on Ms. Brase testimony of ADF&G pursuing the rezone to OR if the proposed rezone is not approved.

Ms. Brase said yes, they did not realize how it was currently zoned and if they wanted to put in new trails it would potentially not be allowed.

Commissioner Presler asked if the rezone is approved, will they still look into bringing the rest of the zoning up to something that is more appropriate for the use.

Ms. Brase said yes they have discussed that.

Taylor Englert, 1640 Cottonwood Street, testified as follows:

• Neighbor to the applicant and offered to work for him to help trim the trails.
• Advocated for the rezone.
• Currently it is hard to get into the refuge.
• The current zoning is wrong.
• The tourism is increasing and finding stuff closer to town to entertain them is important.
• Most people don’t want to smell dog feces on a trail.
• Picture of a moose to a Chinese person is invaluable.
• Stated the applicant wants everyone to use the trails and not for his business only.
• Plans to possibly buy the applicants business in the future.

Jennifer Gehrke, 1402 Farmers Loop Road, testified as follows:

• Uses the trails often.
• Main issue is with air quality and the snow machines creating a health impact while idling.
• Purchased their property because nothing was developed commercially in the area.
• Concerned about property values.

Glen Hemingson, 1011 Denali Street, Anchorage, testified as follows:

• Operations manager for Alaska Skylar Travel with offices in Fairbanks, Anchorage and China.
• Supports the rezone.
• The applicant is the primary vendor for snow machine tours for Skylar Travel and they value their partnership and know the applicant to be honest, ethical, hardworking and committed to the company.
• The tour service requires the applicant to transport snow machines daily to Echo Acres.
• The applicant purchased the property in hopes to eliminate the arduous daily task.
• The applicant intends to apply for a CUP in the hopes of building a permanent structure on the property for storage, guest restrooms and for guests to have a place to change.
• Requested approval of the rezone which will improve the business operations which will continue to grow tourism.

Cory Jackman, 1185 Farmers Loop Road, testified as follows:

• Many problems with the proposed rezone, which he deemed inappropriate for the area.
• Houses all around that have a problem with road noise and with diesel pollution from school buses.
• Huge difference between the uses of OR and Commercial operations utilizing OR.
• People purchase homes in the area thinking they will have a nice, safe surrounding with clean air.
• 40 loud snow machines is asinine.
• Moose run off if they encounter a snow machine.
• Every other person utilizing the trails is affected by the snow machine fumes.

Chris VanDyke, 1325 Shuros Drive, testified as follows:

• Opposed to the rezone.
• Purchased his property specifically because there were no commercial businesses in the area and for the access to the trails.
• Uses the trails along Midnight Sun on a daily basis in the winter.
• The road is opposite from a buffer because you line of sight of the property with no trees for a sound buffer.
• The passing of the rezone would diminish the value and the enjoyment of his property.
• Stated there is nothing forcing the applicant to keep his promises, and if he sells his business there is nothing preventing others using tuned exhaust.
• The only benefit of the rezone would be for the applicant and his business partners and not to the public.

Questions by Commissioners

Chair O’Neall asked if in the event that Fish and Game in the future asks to change the zone, if his opinion would change about the use.

Mr. VanDyke said as long as the private portion was not included, he would be fine with it.

Discussion ensued between Chair O’Neall and Mr. VanDyke in regards to the public access of trails.

Eric Muehling, Po Box 84415, testified as follows:

• Testifying as an effected resident and not in any official capacity and will not be using any inside information and had no expectation of any special consideration, the information he used is available to any and all residents.
• Strongly opposed to the proposed rezone.
• Stated that with the applicant’s original application, he couldn’t get what he wanted due to the spot zoned restrictions so he expanded his request to include public land.
• The general public may be thinking, what gives the applicant the right to request a rezone since he doesn’t have any ownership interest in the 416 acres of public land, at least no more property interest than any other citizen.
• According to public records, the applicant is currently permitted to operate a commercial guide business in the waterfall refuge on Echo Acres and because of that, the comprehensive economic development goals already being satisfied with the applicants activity.
• There is little or no change in the economic impact to the FNSB if the business moves from one location to another, no financial hardship but there would be an impact on the residents in the area.
• Mentioned the applicant stated his property is not buildable because it has permafrost; He owns 10 lots within 1500 feet of the applicant’s property, his house and cabins were all successfully built over the past 40 years on the same permafrost on pads and pilings.
• There is already a public trailhead on the applicant’s west property line, a parking lot on Midnight Sun Street and Farmers Loop Road has signs posted by Fish and Game that directs walk-in hunters and other trail users where to park.
• The rezone for the applicants residential property to OR would be the first step on a path to commercial or other high end activities that are not compatible in the residential neighborhood.
• Urged the commission to deny the request.

[Brief at ease was taken]

Public Testimony Closed

Rebuttal by Applicant

Mr. Duncan responded to testimony and stated that he doesn’t need a Core of Engineers permit to clear his own trees on his property, his hours of operation would be somewhere
between 10am to 5pm and later in March, and stated most days his business would not have 40 snow machines fired up and during November to March, most days won’t have any snow machines running. Reiterated his intentions to eliminate trailering the snow machines back and forth. Mr. Duncan stated the Midnight Sun trail is narrow and has a turn into trees that someone could hit. He mentioned people use his trail which he believes is better. He mentioned the road is 15-20 feet high and has a berm in front of that and he believes that they won't be able to see or hear his business much.

MOTION: To recommend approval of the rezone (RZ2019-001) of Shuros Subdivision – Block 2, Schroeder Property Waiver – Tract B and Tract C, Section 28 T1N R1W F.M. – TL-2805, Section 29 T1N R1W F.M. – TL-2914 and GL-16 from Rural Residential (RR) to Outdoor Recreational (OR), and adopt the staff report and eight (8) Findings of Fact in support of the recommendation of approval by Commissioner Sims, seconded by Commissioner Presler.

FINDINGS OF FACT

1. The FNSB Regional Comprehensive Plan designates approximately 96% of the area proposed to be rezoned as Open Space/Natural Area. “Open space is an undeveloped area in a natural state, golf course, park, or cemetery, along a road that provides some visual relief from urbanization and public recreation. Open space may or may not be improved, but it does serve to interrupt more intense land uses. Natural area is an area left in natural state deemed not suitable for development. Natural areas may be minimally improved, i.e., to provide access to or through them, or to accommodate a trail, but basically they are left to their natural state.” The FNSB Regional Comprehensive Plan designates approximately 4% of the area proposed to be rezoned as Perimeter Area.

2. The current RR zone is not consistent with the Open Space/Natural Area designation. The RR zone is intended for low density residential development and does not protect the existing recreational use of the Creamer’s Field Refuge. The land uses in the Open Space/Natural Area designation (such as recreational open space, golf courses, and trail facilities) are not allowed in the RR zone.

3. The proposed OR zone is more consistent with the Open Space/Natural Area designation. The OR zone is intended to protect outdoor recreational uses on public lands or on private lands if requested by the property owner. The OR zone would better protect the predominant outdoor recreational uses in the rezone area.

4. The rezone conforms to the following FNSB Regional Comprehensive Plan goals because it would better protect the existing outdoor recreational uses within the refuge and outdoor recreational uses are essential to support the winter tourism market in the Borough:
   a. Economic Development Goal 1, Strategy 4, Action C which refers to promoting tourism and hospitality.
   b. Economic Development Goal 2, Strategy 6, Action C which refers to promoting the characteristics of the Borough that have potential for economic development.
   c. Environment Goal 3, Strategy 8, Action A which refers to providing for opportunities to enjoy the outdoors.
   d. Land Use Goal 4, Strategy 10 which refers to minimizing land use conflicts. The conditional use public hearing process required for higher impact land uses help minimize the land use conflicts.

5. The rezone conforms to the following FNSB Comprehensive Economic Development Strategy (CEDS), Industry Cluster Development Goal 3 (Tourism) which refers to
increasing winter tourism. The CEDS identifies tourism industry cluster with strong potential for growth as winter tourism expands in the Borough.

6. The rezone conforms to the public health, safety or welfare because:
   a. The proposed OR zone would be more consistent with the Open Space/Natural Area land use designation and would better protect the existing predominant recreational use of the rezone area.
   b. The proposed OR zone permits recreational uses such as recreational open space, boat launch, community garden, skiing facilities etc. that could be compatible with the surrounding rural residential development.
   c. The OR zone would protect the existing recreational uses within the Creamer’s Field Refuge. The refuge would continue to be compatible with the nearby rural residential development by providing recreational opportunities.
   d. The Farmers Loop Road would act as a buffer between the existing residential uses on the west side and the proposed outdoor recreational uses on the east side. The Farmers Loop Road provides direct access to other OR zoned property with recreational uses such as the Fairbanks Gold Course.
   e. The FNSB zoning code also requires a conditional use permit for high impact land uses within the OR zone such as commercial outdoor recreation, outdoor shooting ranges, convention centers, organized trail facilities, stadiums etc. Any conditional uses in the OR zone require a public hearing with the FNSB Planning Commission and thereby, help protect health, safety and welfare of the surrounding property owners.
   f. This rezone request does not have the potential to significantly increase the current traffic and trip generation levels associated with the road and the Creamer’s Field Refuge.

7. The rezone is not a spot zone or a reverse spot zone because:
   a. The rezone is consistent with the comprehensive plan. The OR zone would protect the predominant outdoor recreational uses in the rezone area, which would be more consistent with the Open Space/Natural Area land use designation. Additionally, the existing outdoor recreational uses within the Creamer’s Field Refuge, along with the applicant’s proposed snowmachine tour business, would help advance FNSB Regional Comprehensive Plan and FNSB Comprehensive Economic Development Strategy (CEDS) goals.
   b. The rezone benefits both property owners within the rezone area. The State wants to correct the zoning within a portion of the refuge which is inappropriately zoned RR. The applicant intends to apply for a conditional use to operate a snowmachine tour business from his 3.8-acre private property.
   c. The rezone of the 416-acre western portion of the Creamer’s Field Refuge benefits all surrounding property owners because the OR zone would be more consistent with the existing recreational use of the refuge. The OR zone would protect the existing recreational uses within the Creamer’s Field Refuge. The refuge would continue to be compatible with the nearby rural residential development by providing recreational opportunities.
   d. The rezone of the 3.8-acre private property may not benefit the surrounding property owners to the north and west though, because their properties are developed residentially and the snowmachine business might have certain incompatible land use impacts. The FNSB zoning code requires a conditional use permit for high impact land uses within the OR zone such as commercial outdoor recreation, convention centers, organized trail facilities, stadiums etc. In a conditional use public hearing, the surrounding property owners could express their concerns about the specific conditional use proposal. The FNSB Planning Commission is required to
make findings of fact regarding the protection of public health, safety and welfare to support their decision. The required conditional use process would protect the health, safety and welfare of these surrounding property owners.

e. The FNSB residents have developed a land use vision for the area through the comprehensive planning process which designated this area predominantly as Open Space/Natural Area. The implementation of the land use plan is a benefit to the community.

f. The case law provides guidance that parcels over 13 acres are almost always found not to be a spot zone. The 420-acre rezone area is significantly more than 13 acres and therefore, does not constitute a spot zone.

g. The area within the remainder RR zone boundary is estimated to be more than 1,000 acres. Therefore, this rezone does not constitute a reverse spot zone because this rezone does not single out parcels of RR zoned land totally different from that of the surrounding area.

Discussion on the Motion

Commissioner Sims stated he disagreed with some of what staff analyzed in the staff report with respect to it not being a commercial use and had a proximity issue; a potential commercial use too close to a well-established residential area and he also contended that a perimeter area lot zoned RR and then changed to OR is not consistent with the comprehensive plan by virtue of it being a potential commercial use located outside of the Urban Preferred Commercial area. Mr. Sims stated he understands why the applicant wants to move and stated he also had air quality concerns. Mr. Sims stated there is an alternative site that is usable and available, presently and expressed that he is on the fence on the decision. Mr. Sims stated it would be wise for the state to come forward for the rest of their refuge and zone it appropriately.

Commissioner Presler expressed her initial agreement with the rezone and has been back and forth throughout the evening for different reasons. Ms. Presler's initial agreement was because of the large portion being Creamer's Field which is the most appropriate zone for the refuge. Ms. Presler stated the discussion was not in regards to the conditional use, it was for the rezone and after hearing the concerns from the testimonies in opposition to the one personal property and was unsure of where she stood on the matter.

Commissioner Guinn stated the Creamer's Field property should be rezoned to OR and mentioned the business being operated on the private property by the applicant will be discussed under a conditional use permit at a future date. Mr. Guinn stated if rezoned, any future CUP request will be with conditions and stated he felt the private property was not an ideal candidate for OR and stated he wanted to see it removed from the proposed rezone.

Commissioner Whitaker stated his support of the state rezoning their property but did not support Mr. Duncan's request. Mr. Whitaker reiterated the testimonies stating they want to protect the character of the neighborhood.

Commissioner Sims asked legal if a rezone application fails at the Planning Commission would it still forward to the Assembly.

Mr. Jaffa stated the commission had a few options, one is to recommend approval, it is simply a recommendation that goes before the Assembly, or recommend disapproval or to recommend reclassification to a more appropriate zone which can include certain parcels but when doing that the commission will need to do an independent spot zone analysis if the commission
intends to remove Farmers Loop frontage parcels from the rezone. Mr. Jaffa explained that the request would go before the Assembly as written along with the commission’s recommendation and the Assembly could go with the recommendation or they could go with the original request or they could determine a different zone as being more appropriate. Mr. Jaffa explained that if the commission chose to remove certain parcels there would need to be specific factual findings different from findings in the staff report that are written in support of the rezone.

ROLL CALL

Zero (0) in Favor:

Five (5) Opposed: Guinn, Whitaker, Presler, Sims, and O’Neall

MOTION FAILED

MOTION: To recommend disapproval of the rezone (RZ2019-001) of Shuros Subdivision – Block 2, Schroeder Property Waiver – Tract B and Tract C, Section 28 T1N R1W F.M. – TL-2805, Section 29 T1N R1W F.M. – TL-2914 and GL-16 from Rural Residential (RR) to Outdoor Recreational (OR), and adopt one (1) Finding of Fact in support of the recommendation of disapproval by Commissioner Sims, seconded by Commissioner Presler.

FINDING OF FACT

1. The proposed rezone of the Farmers Loop perimeter lots to Outdoor Recreational (OR) is not consistent with the FNSB Regional Comprehensive Plan designation of Perimeter Area.

Discussion on the Motion

Commissioner Guinn asked for clarification on the perimeter lots.

Chair O’Neall stated there are three.

Commissioner Whitaker clarified the process of the recommendation going forward to the Assembly.

ROLL CALL

Five (5) in Favor: Whitaker, Presler, Sims, Guinn, and O’Neall

Zero (0) Opposed:

MOTION PASSED

G. LEGISLATIVE HEARING

ORDINANCE NO. 2018-40: An Ordinance Amending FNSBC 18.108.040(A) To Allow Reconstruction Of A Nonconforming Building. Staff Contact: Christine Nelson

[Commissioner Muehling returned to the dais]
Ms. Nelson provided her staff report on behalf of the Borough’s Planning Department in support of the purpose and intent of the Ordinance. She expressed some concerns about the lack of a definition for a permanent foundation and recommended several amendments to clarify administration of this code section.

Questions by Commissioners

Commissioner Muehling asked where it was appropriate to start listing all types of foundations that would not be considered permanent and can a list be complete.

Ms. Nelson stated it gives better direction about those ends of the spectrum of what is and is not a permanent foundation, and it narrows the gray area that has to be interpreted by the public. Since the FNSB doesn’t have building codes, we can’t refer to any foundation that meets IBC residential codes. The list will further clarify what a permanent foundation is.

Commissioner Sims asked what the difference is between a full poured concrete or masonry foundation and a slab foundation; excluding slab confused him.

Ms. Nelson said closed perimeter; the difference is that there actually is a perimeter versus a slab that is flat. Ms. Nelson also stated this contrasts with a post and pier foundation. You would have to have a continuous edge, you don’t have to have a complete poured foundation that covers all the dirt but you would have to have a perimeter and a slab doesn’t have a perimeter, it goes from edge to edge but there is no enclosure.

Commissioner Presler stated a slab does have a thickened edge if it is a foundation.

Ms. Nelson explained that a number of foundation definitions were reviewed which many referred to building codes and asked for clarity and direction from the commission.

Commissioner Sims asked if the builders association was spoken to.

Chair O’Neill asked for clarification that it was brought to the attention by a couple of Assembly members.

Ms. Nelson stated the ordinance as it currently is written was and the amendments came from the Department of Community Planning because they don’t know what they meant by an existing permanent foundation.

Ms. Nelson further discussed the amendment put forth by the Department of Community Planning.

Commissioner Muehling asked what happens if the building is not completed in the timeline.

Ms. Nelson stated it would be a code violation and if the commission doesn’t want to put a timeline on an extension then they would have to come back and explain to the Assembly why they can’t get it done in 3 years and the Community Planning Director along with the Assembly have the option of giving them no extension up to an indefinite amount of time and stated that 5 years is a long time to work on a building even if constructed out of pocket. Ms. Nelson stated the general purpose of having nonconforming language in the code is to eventually comply with the community vision of what they want to see in the future.
Commissioner Muehling stated the nonconforming timeline is liberal and reasonable.

Discussion ensued between Commissioner Muehling and Ms. Nelson in regards to potentially adding a definition to another section of code because the ordinance title is very limited to referencing about one section of the code.

[Chair O’Neall recused herself and left the dais]

[Commissioner Muehling proceeded as acting chair]

Public Testimony Opened

None

Public Testimony Closed

MOTION: To recommend that the FNSB Assembly approve Ordinance No. 2018-40 with two (2) amendments by Commissioner Presler, seconded by Commissioner Sims.

MOTION TO AMEND: To amend amendment #1 to read “Foundation permanent” means a supporting substructure of a building permanently affixed to the ground such as a concrete or masonry foundation, thickened edge slab-on-grade, driven or drilled piles, spread footings, and continuous footing. This definition excludes skids or other non-permanent moveable support substructure by Commissioner Presler, seconded by Commissioner Sims.

Discussion on the Motion

Chair Muehling asked if any of those definitions in the code.

Ms. Nelson stated there are no definitions of these foundation types in Title 18 but they are generally well understood terms in the construction industry and will give the Department of Community Planning considerable direction on what is and what is not considered a permanent foundation.

Commissioner Whitaker asked if a geodesic foundation would be considered spread footing.

Commissioner Presler said yes and explained what spread footings are.

ROLL CALL

Five (5) in Favor: Presler, Sims, Guinn, Whitaker, and Muehling

Zero (0) Opposed: MOTION TO AMEND PASSED

Discussion on the Motion
Chair Muehling stated 3 years is a liberal time to build a foundation or to rebuild on top of an existing foundation.

Commissioner Guinn agreed.

Discussion ensued in regards to exterior shell.

**MOTION TO AMEND:** To amend line 53 of the ordinance to add “of the exterior structure” after the word “reconstruction” by Commissioner Muehling, seconded by Commissioner Sims.

Discussion on the Motion

Chair Muehling stated it better explains what is meant by reconstruction.

**ROLL CALL**

Four (4) in Favor: Sims, Guinn, Whitaker, and Muehling

One (1) Opposed: Presler

**MOTION TO AMEND PASSED**

Discussion ensued in regards to the word “occur” not being clearly understood.

**MOTION TO AMEND:** To amend line 53 of the ordinance to replace the word “occur” with the words “be complete” by Chair Muehling, seconded by Commissioner Guinn.

**ROLL CALL**

Five (5) in Favor: Guinn, Whitaker, Presler, Sims and Muehling

Zero (0) Opposed:

**MOTION TO AMEND PASSED**

Discussion ensued in regards to the extension period not necessarily needing to be defined which will allow flexibility in an unusual situation.

**MOTION AS AMENDED:** To recommend that the FNSB Assembly approve Ordinance No. 2018-40 with three (3) amendments by Commissioner Presler, seconded by Commissioner Sims.

**ROLL CALL**

Five (5) in Favor: Presler, Sims, Guinn, Whitaker, and Muehling

Zero (0) Opposed:

**MOTION AS AMENDED PASSED**

H. **EXCUSE FUTURE ABSENCES**
I. **COMMISSIONER’S COMMENTS**

1. FMATS

   Chair Muehling relayed information regarding ongoing projects at FMATS.

2. Other

Commissioner Guinn stated the RR/RE Subcommittee plans to have a work session at the January 8, 2019 Planning Commission meeting.

J. **ADJOURNMENT**

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 10:21 p.m.
NEW BUSINESS

Discussion about bike connectivity and potential recommendations on multi-modal goals and strategies to the Downtown Fairbanks Planning Working Group.
Solutions Toolkit

Non-motorized transportation projects are an important aspect of providing a safe, efficient, secure, and interconnected multi-modal transportation system for all users in the FMATS area. FMATS strives to incorporate a “Complete Streets” concept into all projects so that all modes of transportation are considered.

Purpose

This document compiles standards, guidelines, and best practices for pedestrian and bicycle facility design from agencies across the country. It is intended for use as a planning tool for developing pedestrian and bicycle facilities for the FMATS area. The solutions shown are inherently flexible to allow implementation as appropriate. Each situation is different and further engineering analysis, design, and public input must be conducted at the time a specific project is developed.

Considerations

Fairbanks experiences unique challenges and opportunities in developing bicycle and pedestrian infrastructure, such as:

- Unstable subsurface conditions (e.g., permafrost)
- Extreme climatic conditions
- Prolonged periods of darkness
- Off-road vehicle use adjacent to non-motorized facilities

This toolkit includes FMATS-specific considerations for each facility to help planners identify potential treatments for their particular situation.

Bicycle and pedestrian facilities and enhancements that are new to the Fairbanks area may encounter some public resistance and will likely require education efforts. For example, motorists may not recognize a bike box as a refuge for bicycles and may inadvertently park on it.
Likewise, planners should also consider that many of the existing bicycle and pedestrian facilities in FMATS are multi-use, with cyclists and pedestrians sharing facilities, including sidewalks. The public’s acceptance of separated facilities in Fairbanks may take some time and education.

Existing policies that should be consulted during project development include:

- Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) Accessibility Guidelines for Buildings and Facilities
- Alaska Traffic Manual (ATM)
- Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices (MUTCD)
- American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials (AASHTO) Guide for the Development of Bicycle Facilities
- AASHTO Guide for the Development of Pedestrian Facilities
- State of Alaska Department of Transportation & Public Facilities (ADOT&PF) Highway Preconstruction Manual
- U.S. Access Board Proposed Accessibility Guidelines for Pedestrian Facilities in the Public Right-of-Way (PROWAG)

Further valuable information and recommendations about treatment types is provided in the National Association of City Transportation Officials (NACTO) Urban Bikeway Design Guide (2011) and on the web at www.trafficcalming.org.

**Bicycle Facilities**

Bicycles are a popular form of transportation in the Fairbanks and North Pole areas, with peak use occurring in the summer. Appropriately designed and located bicycle facilities enhance the safety of bicycle travel, may minimize maintenance requirements, reduce traffic congestion, and improve air quality.

**Pedestrian Facilities**

The benefits of walking include improved personal health, reduced traffic congestion, and economic savings. The Fairbanks and North Pole areas see the greatest pedestrian traffic by both residents and visitors during the summer, but year-round maintenance is important to keep walking routes safe and accessible for winter users as well. Planning, designing, and maintaining quality roadways and pedestrian facilities are critical for establishing a pedestrian-friendly environment.
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## Shared Roadway

A road where cyclists must share a travel lane with motor vehicles or ride on the shoulder; may have wider travel lanes (on a multi-lane road, this could involve striping the outer lane wider than the inner lane), shared lane markings and signs, or paved shoulders to facilitate use by bicycles.

### Initial Construction Cost:
- LOW to MEDIUM

### Ongoing Maintenance Cost:
- LOW

### Advantages
- Easily maintained together with the adjacent roadway: snow removal in the winter, street sweeping and gravel removal in the spring, and pavement restoration all occur on the normal road maintenance schedule
- Easy to incorporate into transportation projects
- Can typically be fit into existing right of way, or else require minimal right of way

### Disadvantages
- No physical separation between bicycles and motor vehicles
- Does not follow the same standards for width and intersection markings as a bike lane
- Does not provide for exclusive use by cyclists
- Less adept riders may not be comfortable using these facilities on high-speed or high-volume roadways

### Special Considerations
- On-street parking, drainage, bridge expansion joints, railroad crossings, and guardrail locations must be considered
- Roadway classifications and types of cyclists will need to be considered

---

**Source:** www.pedbikeimages.org / Dan Burden

**Shared roadway**

---

**Source:** www.pedbikeimages.org / Heather Bowden

**Shared travel lane with pavement markings and sign**
Conventional Bike Lane

A signed and striped lane, reserved for bicycles, between the vehicle lane and the curb or pavement edge.

---

**ADVANTAGES**

- Clearly identifies where bicycles are expected to be present
- Shares the same structure and condition as the road and should last about as long before resurfacing or reconstruction is needed
- Easily maintained together with the adjacent roadway: snow removal in the winter, street sweeping and gravel removal in the spring, and pavement restoration can all occur on the normal road maintenance schedule

**DISADVANTAGES**

- Provides minimal separation and no physical barrier between bicycles and motor vehicles
- Pavement markings identifying the bike lane may not be visible year-round and need to be augmented with signage

**SPECIAL CONSIDERATIONS**

- Requires specific pavement markings identifying the bike lane
- On-street parking, drainage, bridge expansion joints, railroad crossings, and guardrail locations must be considered
- Roadway classifications and types of cyclists will need to be considered
- Should be one-way, located on the right side of the roadway; short segments of contra-flow may be used to accommodate right-of-way or environmental constraints

---

*Source: [www.pedbikeimages.org](http://www.pedbikeimages.org) / Dan Burden
Source: [www.pedbikeimages.org](http://www.pedbikeimages.org) / Carl Sundstrom*
Buffered Bike Lane

Bike lane that is physically separated from motor vehicle lanes by a striped buffer zone.

**Initial Construction Cost:**
Low to Medium

**Ongoing Maintenance Cost:**
Low

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ADVANTAGES</th>
<th>DISADVANTAGES</th>
<th>SPECIAL CONSIDERATIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clearly identifies where bicycles are expected to be present</td>
<td>Pavement markings identifying the bike lane may not be visible year-round and need to be augmented with signage</td>
<td>Requires specific pavement markings identifying the bike lane and buffer zone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provides separation between bicycles and motor vehicles</td>
<td>Requires more right-of-way than a conventional bike lane</td>
<td>On-street parking, drainage, bridge expansion joints, railroad crossings, and guardrail locations must be considered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provides space for a cyclist to pass another cyclist</td>
<td></td>
<td>Should be one-way, located on the right side of the roadway; short segments of contra-flow may be used to accommodate right-of-way or environmental constraints</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appeals to a wider cross-section of cyclists than a conventional bike lane</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Easily maintained together with the adjacent roadway: snow removal in the winter, street sweeping and gravel removal in the spring, and pavement restoration all occur on the normal road maintenance schedule</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Buffered bike lane
Source: Kittelson & Associates

Buffered bike lane alongside on-street parking
Source: www.pedbikeimages.org / Steven Faust
Contra-Flow Bike Lane

Bike lane along the left side of a one-way traffic street that allows bicycles to travel in the opposite direction from motor vehicles (making it a two-way street for bicycles but a one-way street for cars).

**Initial Construction Cost:** MEDIUM

**Ongoing Maintenance Cost:** LOW

**ADVANTAGES**
- Easily maintained together with the adjacent roadway: snow removal in the winter, street sweeping and gravel removal in the spring, and pavement restoration all occur on the normal road maintenance schedule
- Only affects one side of the street; could coexist with on-street parking
- Reduces out-of-direction travel for cyclists
- Reduces wrong-way riding in travel lanes or on sidewalks

**DISADVANTAGES**
- Provides minimal separation between bicycles and motor vehicles
- Contrary to cyclist education about riding in same direction as motor traffic
- Pavement markings identifying the bike lane may not be visible year-round and need to be augmented with signage
- Motorists may use the lane for left turn maneuvers

**SPECIAL CONSIDERATIONS**
- Drainage, bridge expansion joints, railroad crossings, and guardrail locations must be considered
- Requires regulatory signs, warning signs, plaques, object markers, and specific pavement markings identifying the contra-flow bike lane
- None currently installed in Fairbanks; would require public education for both motorists and cyclists to ensure correct use
Left-Side Bike Lane

Conventional bike lanes placed on the left side of one-way streets or two-way median-divided streets.

**ADVANTAGES**
- Improves cyclist visibility to motorists because the bike lane is on the driver’s side of the road
- Eliminates cross-traffic left turns from a right-side bike lane at intersections
- Easily maintained together with the adjacent roadway: snow removal in the winter, street sweeping and gravel removal in the spring, and pavement restoration all occur on the normal road maintenance schedule
- Could coexist with on-street parking

**DISADVANTAGES**
- Provides minimal separation between bicycles and motor vehicles
- Pavement markings identifying the bike lane may not be visible year-round and need to be augmented with signage

**SPECIAL CONSIDERATIONS**
- Requires regulatory signs, warning signs, plaques, object markers, and specific pavement markings identifying the left-side bike lane
- None currently installed in Fairbanks; would require public education for both motorists and cyclists to ensure proper use
- Most appropriate on one-way streets with buses, many right-turning vehicles, or other conflict points along right side of road
One-Way Protected Cycle Track

Bike lane at street level that is physically protected from road traffic by some type of barrier (bollards, fence, jersey barriers, median, landscaping, etc.).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ADVANTAGES</th>
<th>DISADVANTAGES</th>
<th>SPECIAL CONSIDERATIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| - Physically separated from both roads and sidewalks, which encourages exclusive use by bicycles if a sidewalk is also present  
- Physically protected from motor vehicle traffic  
- Shares the same structure and condition as the road and should last about as long before resurfacing or reconstruction is needed  
- Provides landscaping opportunities | - Requires additional right of way beyond that needed for road and sidewalks  
- Harder to maintain than conventional bike lanes; special equipment is needed for snow removal and sweeping  
- Requires special treatment (such as phasing into a conventional bike lane with identifying markings) at intersections | - Could require public education to separate bicycle and pedestrian traffic  
- Most appropriate on roads with long blocks and few cross streets or driveways |

Initial Construction Cost: MEDIUM to HIGH  
Ongoing Maintenance Cost: MEDIUM to HIGH
# Two-Way Cycle Track

Cycle track that allows bicycles to travel in both directions along one side of the road.

**Initial Construction Cost:** MEDIUM to HIGH  
**Ongoing Maintenance Cost:** MEDIUM to HIGH

---

## ADVANTAGES

- Physically separated from both roads and sidewalks, which encourages exclusive use by bicycles if a sidewalk is also present  
- Reduces risk of car doors opening into the path of cyclists  
- Offers greater comfort and perceived safety to cyclists, and thus attracts a wider cross-section of riders  
- Shares the same structure and condition as the road and should last about as long before resurfacing or reconstruction is needed  
- Additional right of way is all on one side of the road

## DISADVANTAGES

- Requires additional right of way beyond that needed for road and sidewalks  
- Harder to maintain than conventional bike lanes; special equipment is needed for snow removal and sweeping  
- Requires special treatment (such as phasing into a conventional bike lane with identifying markings) at intersections

## SPECIAL CONSIDERATIONS

- Could require public education to separate bicycle and pedestrian traffic  
- Most appropriate on roads with long blocks and few cross streets or driveways

---

**Two-way protected cycle track**  
Source: Kittelson & Associates  

**Diagram of two-way cycle track**  
Source: NACTO Urban Bikeway Design Guide
**Raised Cycle Track**

Bike lane that is vertically separated from road traffic, usually by a curb; can also be further separated from roadway with physical barriers such as fencing, bollards, or landscaping.

---

**ADVANTAGES**

- Physically separated from both roads and sidewalks, which encourages exclusive use by bicycles if a sidewalk is also present
- Reduces risk of car doors opening into the path of cyclists as compared to an on-street bike lane
- Offers greater comfort and perceived safety to cyclists, and thus attracts a wider cross-section of riders

**DISADVANTAGES**

- Requires additional right of way beyond that needed for road and sidewalks
- Harder to maintain than conventional bike lanes; special equipment is needed for snow removal and sweeping
- Requires special treatment (such as phasing into a conventional bike lane with identifying markings) at intersections

**SPECIAL CONSIDERATIONS**

- Could require public education to separate bicycle and pedestrian traffic
- Most appropriate on roads with long blocks and few cross streets or driveways
- If cycle track shares the same structure and condition as the road, it should last about as long before resurfacing or reconstruction is needed

---

*Initial Construction Cost: MEDIUM to HIGH*

*Ongoing Maintenance Cost: MEDIUM to HIGH*
# Intersection Bike Box

Designated area at the head of a traffic lane at a signalized intersection that provides cyclists with a safe and visible way to get ahead of queuing traffic during the red signal phase.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>ADVANTAGES</strong></th>
<th><strong>DISADVANTAGES</strong></th>
<th><strong>SPECIAL CONSIDERATIONS</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Increases visibility of cyclists at intersections</td>
<td>Offers no physical protection for cyclists</td>
<td>None currently installed in Fairbanks; would require public education for both motorists and cyclists to ensure proper use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilitates left-turn positioning for cyclists</td>
<td>Pavement markings identifying the bike box may not be visible year round and need to be augmented with signage</td>
<td>Should not be too shallow for bicycles, but if too wide, vehicles may encroach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduces bicycle conflict with right turning vehicles</td>
<td>Colored pavement (if used) could be costly to maintain</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduces vehicle encroachment into crosswalk</td>
<td>Cyclists approaching as signal turns green may not have enough time to position themselves to use the box</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintained concurrent with roadway</td>
<td>Drivers turning right on red may not see approaching cyclists</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Intersection Crossing Markings

Pavement markings that indicate the intended path of cyclists through an intersection or across a driveway or ramp and provide a clear boundary between paths.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ADVANTAGES</th>
<th>DISADVANTAGES</th>
<th>SPECIAL CONSIDERATIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| ▪ Increases visibility of bicycle routes to motorists and keeps bicycles traveling in uniform and predictable paths  
▪ Raises awareness of potential conflict areas for both cyclists and motorists  
▪ Guides cyclists through the intersection and reduces conflict between cyclists and turning vehicles | ▪ Pavement markings identifying the bike crossing may not be visible year-round and need to be augmented with signage  
▪ Markings may be costly to maintain | ▪ Could require public education to ensure correct use |

- **Initial Construction Cost:** LOW
- **Ongoing Maintenance Cost:** LOW

---

*Bicycle and pedestrian routes through intersection indicated with pavement markings*
*Source: www.pedbikeimages.org / Laura Sandt*

*Bicycle route through intersection indicated with colored pavement and striping*
*Source: Kittelson & Associates*
Two-Stage Turn Queue Box

A designated area within an intersection that offers cyclists a safe place to wait between signals while making a left turn from a right-side bike lane (or a right turn from a left-side bike lane) at a multi-lane signalized intersection.

**Initial Construction Cost:** LOW

**Ongoing Maintenance Cost:** LOW

**Advantages**
- Improves safety for cyclists making left turns from a right-side bike lane, as they do not have to merge into traffic
- Offers some protection for cyclists by keeping them out of the path of moving cars

**Disadvantages**
- Increases bicycle delay times, since cyclists must wait for two green cycles, one to cross the street they are turning onto in order to enter the turn queue box and then another to make the left turn and cross the street they were originally traveling on
- Pavement markings identifying the bike box may not be visible year-round and need to be augmented with signage

**Special Considerations**
- Would require public education to ensure correct use

---

Bike box adjacent to protected cycle track
Source: NACTO Urban Bikeway Design Guide

Bike box adjacent to conventional bike lane
Source: NACTO Urban Bikeway Design Guide
Through Bike Lane at Intersection

Bike lane to the left of a vehicle right-turn lane (or to the right of a vehicle left-turn lane) to allow bicycles to proceed straight through an intersection without interfering with turning traffic.

**ADVANTAGES**

- Enables cyclists to correctly position themselves to the left of right turn lanes or to the right of left turn lanes so as not to conflict with turning traffic in the intersection
- Signifies location for through cyclists to merge left and right turning vehicles to merge right
- Leads to more predictable cyclist and motorist travel movements

**DISADVANTAGES**

- Offers no physical protection for cyclists
- Pavement markings identifying the bike lane may not be visible year-round and need to be augmented with signage

**SPECIAL CONSIDERATIONS**

- Requires regulatory signs, warning signs, plaques, and object markers to direct attention to the path of the bike lane, as pavement markings could be covered up by snow in winter
- Through bike lane can be combined with vehicular right turn lane to save space
- None currently installed in Fairbanks; would require public education to ensure correct use
Bicycle Signal Head

Electronic light signal specifically for bicycles; typically follows the same green-yellow-red sequence as vehicular signals but uses stenciled bicycle shapes.

**Initial Construction Cost:** HIGH

**Ongoing Maintenance Cost:** LOW

---

**ADVANTAGES**

- Separates bicycle movements from conflicting movements by other traffic (motor vehicle and/or pedestrian)
- Can be used to facilitate bicycle movements by prioritizing timing sequences
- Helps to simplify bicycle movements through complex intersections

**DISADVANTAGES**

- Adjusting timing sequences to accommodate bicycles may lengthen wait times for motorists

**SPECIAL CONSIDERATIONS**

- Use of bicycle signal heads could help encourage separation of bicycle and pedestrian traffic
- Appropriate at locations with high bicycle volumes and/or crossings where non-motorized traffic may be the only movement (e.g., path crossings)

*Signal head with separate pedestrian and bicycle signals*

*Source: www.pedbikeimages.org / Charlie Zegeer*

*Dedicated bicycle signal head*

*Source: www.pedbikeimages.org / Dan Burden*
Signal Detection and Actuation

Detection of bicycles at traffic signals, via either push buttons or automated sensors, used to alert the signal controller of a cyclist crossing demand on a particular approach.

### ADVANTAGES
- Helps to accommodate bicycle travel through intersections
- Adjusting the sensitivity of an existing sensor to detect bicycles is not expensive

### DISADVANTAGES
- New sensors are expensive to install
- Automated sensors must be calibrated specifically for bicycles
- Push buttons are often located such that bicyclists must dismount and walk onto the sidewalk to activate the signal

### SPECIAL CONSIDERATIONS
- Many of the signals within the city of Fairbanks are pre-timed and bicycle detection is not necessary at these locations
- Cyclists must know where to position themselves to be detected, which could be difficult when pavement markings are covered by snow

---

*Signal with push-button activator*
*Source: PDC Inc. Engineers*

*Pavement markings indicating bicycle sensor location*
*Source: Kittelson & Associates*
Active Warning Beacon

A set of user-activated flashing amber lights that supplement warning signs at unsignalized intersections, mid-block crosswalks, or other locations where motorists should be especially careful to watch for bicycles.

**Initial Construction Cost:** HIGH

**Ongoing Maintenance Cost:** LOW

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ADVANTAGES</th>
<th>DISADVANTAGES</th>
<th>SPECIAL CONSIDERATIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>▪ Lower installation cost than traffic signals and hybrid beacons</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Encourages drivers to yield to bicycles and pedestrians at crossings (certain beacon types are nearly as effective as hybrid beacons)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Cyclists may assume it is safe to go upon activating the beacon without waiting for vehicles to yield</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Should not be used if a signal or hybrid beacon is warranted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*User-activated flashing beacon*  
Source: [www.pedbikeimages.org](http://www.pedbikeimages.org) / Dan Burden

*Crosswalk with flashing beacon*  
Source: [www.pedbikeimages.org](http://www.pedbikeimages.org) / Dan Burden
Non-Buffered Sidewalk

Concrete walkway set flush against the curb or street shoulder.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ADVANTAGES</th>
<th>DISADVANTAGES</th>
<th>SPECIAL CONSIDERATIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Traditional use</td>
<td>Provides limited separation between pedestrians and motor vehicles</td>
<td>Not exclusive to pedestrians in Fairbanks; bicycles use as well</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Requires less right of way</td>
<td>Snow removal on sidewalks is often dependent on adjacent property owners</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>than a separated facility</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Buffered Sidewalk

Concrete walkway located adjacent to the roadway but separated from it by some sort of physical barrier (fence, jersey barriers, landscaping, etc.).

**Initial Construction Cost:**
HIGH

**Ongoing Maintenance Cost:**
HIGH

### ADVANTAGES
- Provides horizontal separation from motor vehicles
- May provide a physical barrier between pedestrians and motor vehicles
- Provides landscaping opportunities

### DISADVANTAGES
- Requires more right of way than non-buffered sidewalk
- Snow removal on sidewalks is often dependent on adjacent property owners
- May require additional lighting

### SPECIAL CONSIDERATIONS
- On existing roads, a lighting study is needed to see if the streetlight poles can be retrofitted with an additional arm and luminaire
- Not exclusive to pedestrians in Fairbanks; bicycles use as well

---

*Buffered sidewalk separated from street traffic with landscaping*
Source: PDC Inc. Engineers

*Buffered sidewalk separated from street traffic with landscaping and street light poles*
Source: PDC Inc. Engineers
# Shared Roadway

A road where pedestrians must walk on the shoulder or in the travel lane. Roads without sidewalks or nearby shared-use paths are de facto shared roadways.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ADVANTAGES</th>
<th>DISADVANTAGES</th>
<th>SPECIAL CONSIDERATIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>▪ Easily maintained together with the adjacent roadway: snow removal in the winter, street sweeping and gravel removal in the spring, and pavement restoration all occur on the normal road maintenance schedule</td>
<td>▪ No physical separation between pedestrians and motor vehicles</td>
<td>▪ On-street parking, drainage, bridge expansion joints, railroad crossings, and guardrail locations must be considered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Easy to incorporate into transportation projects</td>
<td>▪ Does not follow the same standards for width and intersection markings as sidewalks, multi-use paths, or crosswalks</td>
<td>▪ Roadway classifications and pedestrian traffic volume will need to be considered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Can typically be fit into existing right of way, or else require minimal right of way</td>
<td>▪ Does not provide for exclusive use by pedestrians</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ Pedestrians may not be comfortable using these facilities on high-speed or high-volume roadways</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Intersection Crosswalk

Marked crosswalks indicate a preferred crossing location to pedestrians, as well as alerting drivers to an often-used crossing. Not all crossings require crosswalks, but busier, wider streets and those closest to schools should be marked with high visibility markings. Wide, ladder-style crosswalks are easiest for drivers to see.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ADVANTAGES</th>
<th>DISADVANTAGES</th>
<th>SPECIAL CONSIDERATIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>▪ Easily maintained in conjunction with road maintenance such as snow removal and street sweeping</td>
<td>▪ Striping must be repainted frequently, because road markings get scraped away during winter snow plowing or worn off in wheel paths</td>
<td>▪ Should not be implemented alone on high-speed or high-volume roadways; at these locations, enhancements such as a raised refuge island, flashing beacons, or traffic calming measures should be installed as well</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Crosswalk at roundabout
Source: www.pedbikeimages.org / Tom Harned

Crosswalk at signalized intersection
Source: www.pedbikeimages.org / Dan Burden
Mid-Block Pedestrian Crossing

Marked street crossings at designated points between intersections

- **Initial Construction Cost:** MEDIUM
- **Ongoing Maintenance Cost:** LOW to MEDIUM

**ADVANTAGES**

- Pedestrians only need to look one way at a time to cross safely when a median refuge is provided
- At-grade crossing accommodates ADA requirements and use by bicycles more easily than a pedestrian overpass

**DISADVANTAGES**

- Striping must be repainted frequently, because road markings get scraped away during winter snow plowing or worn off in wheel paths
- May require additional lighting
- Refuge areas, if used, require special maintenance

**SPECIAL CONSIDERATIONS**

- Requires signage and beacons or signals to alert drivers to the pedestrian crossing
- Consider signalization or hybrid beacons for high-volume, multi-lane mid-block crossings

*Mid-block pedestrian crossing*
Source: www.pedbikeimages.org / Lyubov Zuyeva

*Mid-block pedestrian crossing*
Source: www.pedbikeimages.org / Dan Burden
**Pedestrian Overpass**

An elevated pedestrian facility, typically a bridge, over a major street, highway, or railroad.

**Initial Construction Cost:** HIGH

**Ongoing Maintenance Cost:** MEDIUM

---

**ADVANTAGES**
- Physically separates pedestrian and vehicle traffic routes
- Only the sidewalk approach needs snow removal if the stairwell and bridge are covered

**DISADVANTAGES**
- Could require considerable additional right of way to accommodate ADA requirements

**SPECIAL CONSIDERATIONS**
- Needs to be high enough to accommodate traffic passing beneath it (e.g., commercial trucks)
- Personal security can be a concern if stairwells, ramps, and bridge are not well lit and visible from the road
- May need barriers to prevent at-grade crossing
- Most appropriate at locations with high pedestrian traffic and high-volume, high-speed motor vehicle traffic

---

*Commercial truck passing underneath pedestrian overpass*

Source: PDC Inc. Engineers
Raised Crosswalk

A speed hump with a flattened top and crosswalk markings installed at a pedestrian crossing location.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ADVANTAGES</th>
<th>DISADVANTAGES</th>
<th>SPECIAL CONSIDERATIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Forces drivers to reduce speed as they approach the hump</td>
<td>Requires special attention during snow removal</td>
<td>Requires signage to alert drivers to slow down before they reach the hump</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improves visibility of pedestrians crossing the street</td>
<td>Boundary between the sidewalk and street can be difficult for the visually impaired to detect, unless tactile cues are installed</td>
<td>Needs to be positioned at an appropriate distance from any other speed humps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Easier for most pedestrians to cross</td>
<td></td>
<td>Must consider impacts to roadway drainage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not obscured by snow in winter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Initial Construction Cost:** LOW to MEDIUM

**Ongoing Maintenance Cost:** LOW

*Raised crosswalk in an airport terminal loading zone*
Source: www.pedbikeimages.org / Dan Burden

*Raised crosswalk in a school zone*
Source: PBIC Image Library
## Center/Crossing Island

A raised island located along the centerline of the road.

**Initial Construction Cost:**
- LOW to MEDIUM

**Ongoing Maintenance Cost:**
- LOW

---

**Pedestrian crossing island and curb extensions at T-intersection**

Source: [www.pedbikeimages.org](http://www.pedbikeimages.org) / Dan Burden

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ADVANTAGES</th>
<th>DISADVANTAGES</th>
<th>SPECIAL CONSIDERATIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Allows pedestrians to focus on crossing each direction of traffic separately&lt;br&gt;• Slows traffic by slightly deflecting its trajectory (to go around the island)</td>
<td>• Not easily maintained because they are elevated above the street surface&lt;br&gt;• Potential for vehicles to run into/over the island during adverse weather</td>
<td>• May require turning movement restrictions if used at an intersection</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Pedestrian Waiting Area with “Stand Back” Line

A large concrete area on the inside curb radius, often delineated with paint, colored concrete, or signage, that provides a waiting area away from the edge of the curb at crosswalks with high pedestrian volumes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ADVANTAGES</th>
<th>DISADVANTAGES</th>
<th>SPECIAL CONSIDERATIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Provides a safe area for pedestrians waiting to cross a signalized intersection</td>
<td>May require additional right of way</td>
<td>Could require signage or public education to ensure correct use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>May require utility relocation</td>
<td>Could be especially helpful in icy conditions, when pedestrians prefer to be further back from sliding or fishtailing cars</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“Stand Back” line may be difficult to see in the winter and may require supplemental signage</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Initial Construction Cost: LOW

Ongoing Maintenance Cost: LOW

School crosswalk with “stand back” line
Source: Mike Cynecki

Crosswalk with circular waiting area for pedestrians
Source: www.pedbikeimages.org / Dan Burden
Pedestrian Signal with Intersection Countdown Timer

Automated or user-activated signal device with countdown timer to indicate time remaining for pedestrians to complete the crossing.

**Initial Construction Cost:**
MEDEDIUM to HIGH

**Ongoing Maintenance Cost:**
LOW

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ADVANTAGES</th>
<th>DISADVANTAGES</th>
<th>SPECIAL CONSIDERATIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>▪ Gives pedestrians more information than a basic walk/don't-walk signal to help them decide whether to begin crossing the street or wait until the next signal cycle</td>
<td>▪ May require special programming to accommodate visually impaired users</td>
<td>▪ Installed at most traffic lights in Fairbanks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ Motorists often assume the countdown timer is coordinated with the traffic signal timing</td>
<td>▪ Required at all new signals under the 2009 MUTCD</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Traffic Signal Timing with Leading (or Exclusive) Interval for Pedestrians

Traffic light programmed to stay red for a few seconds (or longer) after cross traffic stops to allow pedestrians time to enter the crosswalk (or finish crossing) before vehicle traffic begins moving.

**Initial Construction Cost:**
LOW

**Ongoing Maintenance Cost:**
LOW

**ADVANTAGES**
- Improves pedestrian visibility and safety
- Adjusting signal timing costs very little and requires only a few hours of staff time to accomplish

**DISADVANTAGES**
- Lengthens traffic signal cycles or decreases the amount of green time per cycle provided to motor vehicles

**SPECIAL CONSIDERATIONS**
- Could be especially helpful in winter, when pedestrians must walk more slowly to avoid slipping on ice
- Prohibiting right turns on red (either at all times or at certain times of the day) improves safety for pedestrians but can result in longer vehicle queues at busy intersections
High-Intensity Activated Crosswalk (HAWK) / Pedestrian Hybrid Beacon

High-intensity activated crosswalk (HAWK) beacon, consisting of a signal-head with two red lenses above a single yellow lens, to mark a crossing where cars must only stop to yield to crossing pedestrians.

**Initial Construction Cost:** HIGH

**Ongoing Maintenance Cost:** LOW

**ADVANTAGES**
- Enables protected pedestrian crossings while stopping road traffic only as needed
- When installed at mid-block locations, removes conflicts between pedestrians and turning vehicles
- Research has shown that motorists comply with the HAWK beacon as readily as with conventional traffic signals

**DISADVANTAGES**
- Expensive to install

**SPECIAL CONSIDERATIONS**
- None currently installed in Fairbanks; would require public education to ensure correct use
- Should be set up to have a rapid (almost immediate) response
- MUTCD stipulates that these be installed at least 100 feet away from intersections

*HAWK with center refuge island at a school entrance*
Source: www.pedbikeimages.org / Mike Cynecki

*HAWK installed on Mendenhall Loop Road in Juneau*
Source: ADOT&PF
Rectangular Rapid-Flash Beacon (RRFB)

User-actuated beacon with amber LEDs that flash in an irregular pattern similar to that of emergency flashers on police vehicles; supplements warning signs at un-signalized intersections or mid-block crosswalks.

**Initial Construction Cost:** MEDIUM to HIGH

**Ongoing Maintenance Cost:** LOW

### ADVANTAGES
- More effective at drawing drivers’ attention to crossing pedestrians than signs, markings, or passive beacons alone
- Much less expensive than a HAWK beacon, and research has shown that driver yield rates are not much lower

### DISADVANTAGES
- Pedestrians may assume it is safe to go upon activating the beacon without waiting for vehicles to yield

### SPECIAL CONSIDERATIONS
- Would require public education to ensure correct use
- Should not be installed where a signal or hybrid beacon is warranted

---

*Source: [www.pedbikeimages.org](http://www.pedbikeimages.org) / Dan Burden*
Reduced-Radius Street Curb

Nearly square corners at intersections, which both shorten the crossing distance for pedestrians and force motorists to slow down to make the turn.

**Initial Construction Cost:**
LOW to MEDIUM

**Ongoing Maintenance Cost:**
LOW

- Forces motorists to make turns more slowly
- Shortens crossing distance for pedestrians
- ADA-compliant ramps can be installed at the same time as the extended curb
- ADA-compliant ramps can be installed at the same time as the extended curb
- Pedestrian crossing phase of signal timing can be reduced, which may shorten the overall signal cycle
- May slow right-turning emergency vehicles
- Difficult for trucks and larger vehicles to maneuver without mounting the curb, which can damage the sidewalk
- Vehicles that make wide turns may encroach on opposing lanes of traffic
- Can decrease intersection capacity
- May require elimination of some on-street parking near the intersection
- Must consider drainage
- Not appropriate on narrow streets or streets with high bus or truck volumes

Dotted line shows proposed reduction in curb radius
Source: PDC Inc. Engineers

Street corner with tight radius
Source: www.pedbikeimages.org / Dan Burden
Curb Extension

Extension of sidewalk curbs (bulb-outs and chokers) to narrow the street at specific locations.

**Initial Construction Cost:**
LOW to MEDIUM

**Ongoing Maintenance Cost:**
LOW

---

**ADVANTAGES**

- Has traffic calming effect
- Shortens pedestrian crossing distances
- Helps define areas where curbside parking is available
- Keeps vehicles from parking at the corners and obscuring sight distance
- ADA-compliant ramps can be installed at the same time as the extended curb

**DISADVANTAGES**

- May slow right-turning emergency vehicles
- Difficult for trucks and other large vehicles to maneuver without mounting the curb, which can damage the sidewalk
- Vehicles may run into/over the curb extension during adverse weather
- Makes snow removal more difficult
- May accumulate trash
- Reduces on-street area available for bicycle travel, which may lead to bicycle/vehicle conflicts
- May require elimination of some on-street parking near the intersection

**SPECIAL CONSIDERATIONS**

- Must consider drainage
- Not appropriate on narrow streets or streets with high bus or truck volumes
Shared-Use Paths

Paved pathway designed for use by both bicycles and pedestrians; typically physically separated from the roadway by some type of barrier (fence, jersey barriers, sidewalk curb, landscaping, etc.).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ADVANTAGES</th>
<th>DISADVANTAGES</th>
<th>SPECIAL CONSIDERATIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>▪ Provides cyclists and pedestrians with significant physical separation from motor vehicles</td>
<td>▪ Requires more right of way than shared roadway or conventional bike lanes</td>
<td>▪ Dependent on ROW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Allows non-motorized users to travel without being intimidated by motor vehicle traffic</td>
<td>▪ Constructed independently of road typical section, usually resulting in poor quality since permafrost and/or poor soils are typically not removed or otherwise addressed</td>
<td>▪ Should be constructed with a section similar to that used for roadways</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Attracts novice cyclists and families with small children</td>
<td>▪ Harder to maintain than conventional bike lanes; special equipment is needed for snow removal, sweeping, and brush clearing</td>
<td>▪ Requires guide signs/plaques</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Provides landscaping opportunities</td>
<td>▪ Requires additional lighting</td>
<td>▪ Can be used to provide parallel routes separated from high-speed, limited access facilities where non-motorized travel is prohibited</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>▪ Fencing could be used to prevent motorized vehicles from encroaching on path</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Initial Construction Cost: HIGH
Ongoing Maintenance Cost: HIGH

*Sidewalk merging into shared-use path*
Source: PDC Inc. Engineers

*Shared-use path with bike route signage*
Source: PDC Inc. Engineers
Bicycle/Pedestrian Underpass

A road or railroad crossing that passes underneath a bridge span.

**Initial Construction Cost:**
MEDIUM to HIGH

**Ongoing Maintenance Cost:**
MEDIUM to HIGH

---

### ADVANTAGES
- Separates pedestrians and cyclists from vehicle traffic routes

### DISADVANTAGES
- Requires special maintenance
- Requires lighting
- Depending on location and purpose, could require longer bridge spans or additional right of way

### SPECIAL CONSIDERATIONS
- Personal security can be a concern if stairwells, ramps, and bridge are not well lit and visible from the road
Street Lighting

Adequate lighting of pedestrian routes is essential to pedestrian safety and comfort, particularly in the winter darkness. Many walkways are located adjacent to lighted roadways and no specific or separate lighting is required. Often, however, the roadway spill light is inadequate for the comfort and safety of pedestrians on the walkway.

**ADVANTAGES**
- Increases visibility of all facility users

**DISADVANTAGES**
- Can be expensive to install and operate

**SPECIAL CONSIDERATIONS**
- On existing roads, a lighting study may be needed to see if light levels are adequate and, if more light is needed, whether streetlight poles can be retrofitted with an additional arm and luminaire.

*Initial Construction Cost: HIGH*
*Ongoing Maintenance Cost: MEDIUM*

*Walkway lighting*
*Source: Kittelson & Associates*

*Walkway lighting supplementing street lighting*
*Source: Kittelson & Associates*
Wayfinding Signs for Cyclists and Pedestrians

Signs to help people successfully navigate a pedestrian or multi-use facility.

**Initial Construction Cost:** MEDIUM

**Ongoing Maintenance Cost:** LOW

---

**WAYFINDING SIGN CONSIDERATIONS**

- Accommodation of non-English-speakers and the disabled
- Distinct, consistent, uncluttered visual appearance
- Resistance to vandalism
- Ease of maintenance and updating
- Positioning so as not to obstruct traffic
- Placement at trip origins, destinations, and points where route may not be obvious

---

**SPECIAL LOCAL CONCERNS**

- Extra maintenance or lighting may be needed in winter to ensure signs are not obscured by snow or darkness
- Street connectivity/route finding
- Seasonal changes in open hours for destinations

---

**PLACEMENT OPPORTUNITIES**

- Morris Thompson Cultural & Visitor Center (MTCVC) signing
- North Pole signage could build off the Christmas theme
- Major events such as the Yukon Quest, the Midnight Sun Festival, and Golden Days
- Downtown Fairbanks walking guide
- Routes designated on FMATS Bikeways map
Bicycle Lanes and Paths:
Good or Evil?

What's food to one may be fierce poison to others.

—LUcretius

During the “Bike Boom” of the early 1970s, Americans started taking bicycles out onto the car-clogged roads in significant numbers, and the results weren’t all that pretty. The cyclists didn’t know how to ride in traffic, and the drivers didn’t know how to deal with cyclists. Wouldn’t it be great, folks started to wonder, if we could build separate facilities for all these bicycles, keep them off the roads and out of the way, and simultaneously make things safer and more pleasant for cyclists? Cyclists as well as drivers were asking this question. At about the same time, as the country experienced a fuel crisis and generally stank like a tailpipe, Congress allocated funds for alternative transportation projects, including bicycle facilities. Cities and states started to build bike paths and paint bike lanes on their streets. These were popular projects all around.

Before too long, problems became apparent with the new facilities. Bike lanes and bike paths were packaged and sold to the public as safer facilities for cyclists, when in fact the best available statistical evidence showed that use of these facilities was actually more dangerous than riding on the road. By one estimate, cyclists were 2.6 times more likely to experience an accident while riding on a bike path. The bad news about the danger of bike paths did not fit well with the goal of urban transportation engineers—to get bikes out of the way of motor traffic—so they just ignored it and kept building.

Structurally, the early asphalt paths were crude. They were often as narrow as suburban sidewalks, about 6 feet across and didn’t endure well. They cracked badly and gave cyclists a very rough ride. The typical off-street bike path was really just a glorified sidewalk known as a “side path.” Side paths—which are still being built today—repeatedly send cyclists into intersections, which explains much of the elevated accident rate for separate facilities. Cyclists on side paths are less noticeable to motorists and tend to be seduced by a false sense of security. They carry this false sense of security into the intersections and get crushed. Invisible and blind—it’s an unfortunate combination. The first generation of painted bike lanes also had some unsafe design features. At intersections, the lanes often guided riders into slots to the right of right-turning vehicles, leading to conflicts and collisions.
This illustration depicts three cyclists trying to negotiate a tricky intersection at the entrance to a popular mall. As shown, the cyclists all own the right-of-way through the intersection. Each is in a position to find out exactly how little that means.

Cyclist One is riding against traffic on the side path and must contend first with right-turning motorists in the near lane (A). These motorists look almost exclusively to the left and are patently unaware of any cyclists approaching from their right. For this reason, the rider is smart to pass behind this vehicle. Next, Cyclist One will have perfect vision of those turning right into the mall (B, F), which is good, but will also have the critical task of keeping tabs on frantic left-turners (C) over the right shoulder. If Cyclist One makes it across, hazards on the other side include the awkwardly placed signal box (D), on a raised concrete pedestal, and the ever-popular man being dragged by dog on long leash (E).

Cyclist Two enters the intersection from the other side, lulled into complacency by the sight of the little green man on the walk signal. Displaying a troubling lack of awareness, Cyclist Two is somehow surprised by the right-turning Yukon (B) and must swerve to avoid contact. Passing behind the right-turner (A), this rider will be in a prime position to collide with Cyclist One.

Cyclist Three is able to avoid some of these problems by riding in the street but will not be immune to the normal hazards of busy crossings. The soccer mom in the Honda Passport (C), for example, might be overwhelmed by sheer excitement at the thought of shopping, and might try to sneak across prematurely. Cyclist Three will also be obligated to cross uncomfortably in front of the right-turner (A). In addition, Cyclist Three might draw the ire of impatient motorists behind, like the lane changer (F), while having to depend on the awareness and goodwill of these same motorists. Less than ideal.

Side paths and roads each bring their own sets of problems. Choosing one over the other often boils down to a matter of personal style. The side path might be the best option for a patient rider who is prepared to stop often—for dogs, pedestrians, left- and right-turning vehicles, other cyclists.... If time is an issue, and the rider hopes to keep moving, the road is probably the way to go. Unfortunately, in typical fashion, the local law bans cyclists from this particular boulevard. Even though the man with the dog (E) yells “Get off the sidewalk!” at every cyclist he sees, the side path is actually the only legal option. Cyclist Three, therefore, is riding illegally.
As the decades passed, the engineers corrected some of their mistakes, but not all of them. Bike lanes were repainted to the left of right-turn lanes, but they still tend to lure inexperienced cyclists into the Door Zone (see The Door Zone, on page 112). Off-street paths, for the most part, evolved into smooth cement surfaces. The paths are much wider now—the typical modern bike path is a 10-foot-wide behemoth. But side paths still send cyclists awkwardly into the street and cause confusion at intersections. And the paths are still crowded with inattentive joggers and walkers, novice riders who can barely stay upright, and those distributors of four-legged chaos commonly known as dogs.

Modern-day urban riders are much better off than their old-school ancestors, because of a new generation of bicycle paths that flow right under or over streets, just like urban highways. Such a path is known as a "fully separated facility," and it's a beautiful thing. One is tempted to call these paths "bicycle highways," but since almost all of them are shared with pedestrians, joggers, and in-line skaters, and pedestrians in fact hold the all-time right-of-way on them, these paths still have much more in common with sidewalks than highways. Still, if such a path cuts across town and takes you reasonably close to where you need to go, use it. Use it because there will be no interactions with motors, and no stop signs or red lights, along its entire length. Judicious use of a fully separated bike path could reduce travel time and stress, even with the greater chance of minor collisions.

Experienced riders understand that they will be faced with hazards on bike paths that they would never see on the road. They know that they are more likely to hit something on the bike path than the street. But for some reason, many experienced riders still appreciate bicycle facilities, seek them out, and happily put them to good use.

Even the painted bike lanes are popular, although the riders who enjoy them may find it difficult to explain the attraction. The advantages of bike lanes are primarily psychological. Most of these lanes are painted on streets that are wide enough for cycling anyway, but the presence of the white lines gives cyclists an unmistakable territory of their own. This can be quite helpful around drivers who don't understand the law or don't respect cyclists as legitimate road users. Bike lanes might also serve as some legal protection for careful cyclists in case of a wreck—who can argue with a cyclist in the bike lane? There is an unfortunate corollary to this, that cyclists, conversely, might be legally compromised on streets with no bike lanes. Whatever psychological protection they might provide, bike lanes of course provide nil in the way of actual physical protection. Remember that bike-car wrecks usually involve vehicles that are turning or crossing, and a street rider will have to deal with these dangers, bike lane or no bike lane. Motorists smash into cyclists in bike lanes all day long.

Admiration for bike lanes and paths is not universal among cyclists, to say the least. Led by John Forester, who was the first to mess up the program by pointing out the increased danger of separate facilities back in the 1970s, proponents of so-called vehicular cycling argue that bicycles belong on the roads, and only the roads. Although they can cite practical concerns, one gets the feeling that the vehicular cyclists are virulently opposed to separate facilities on principle alone. They argue to this day that bike lanes and paths represent the "ghetto-ization" of cyclists. The more dogmatic among them feel that riding on a bike path is a shameful act, and that riders who use separate facilities are unwitting dupes in a long-term plan to push cyclists off the public roadways for good.

Unfortunately, the vehicular cyclists' warnings about the insidiousness of bike facilities cannot be wholly dismissed. Indeed, a disturbing process seems to be at work that can be linked to the psychological implications of bike-path construction. As traffic increases on the roads, so does the frequency of conflicts. More people start to ask—what are those cyclists doing on the road anyway? Didn't we, the taxpayers, spend X-million dollars last year building the [insert name of path here] multiuse rail-trail? Didn't the bicycle people themselves beg to get this path built? So why are they still on the roads? Tantrums like this flare up from time to time among folks who have no understanding of the history of cycling in America or the needs of utility cyclists. But they find out soon enough that cyclists are entrenched on the public roadways. Cyclists are surly and politically connected enough as a group that bike-banning efforts are shouted down if they refuse to die quietly. In the future, we can expect more of these scattered antibike efforts to succeed, as motorists get angrier and more paths are constructed, and certainly we can expect future builders of major roadways to exclude the simplest on-street provision for cyclists, the wide curb lane, in favor of pushing cyclists onto off-street
paths, even the dreaded side paths. In this way, the construction of separate facilities can lead directly to a decrease in cyclists’ safety and options. So far, however, the fears of the bike path haters have not been realized. There is no widespread organized movement to remove cyclists from the nation’s existing roadways, and, on the whole, the use of separate facilities is still voluntary.

The reality is that cyclists may be near the historical peak for access in urban areas, with nowhere else to go but down. Cyclists currently enjoy a unique, some might even say privileged, status in the transportation realm. With a few exceptions here and there, we are allowed to ride on pretty much any street that would be worthwhile to ride. When barred from a new boulevard (that we would likely try to avoid anyway), there is almost always a sidewalk, side path, or some other sneaky way to two-wheel it. We can ride streets with painted bike lanes if we wish, but are not required to. We can also ride on the separate paths, if we wish, but are (usually) not required to. With a legitimate place in both the vehicular and pedestrian realms cyclists are having their cake and eating it too. Cyclists have more freedom than any other class of road user. Once the motor lemmings* figure this out, there could be trouble, so ssshhhh. The best way for cyclists to conserve their already outstanding privileges is not to lobby for new bike paths, not to complain and blow up over every little lane conflict, but to continue riding the streets in a style that is smooth, quiet, and cooperative.

Streets, bike lanes, bike paths—even side paths—are all tools for the cyclist to use. The more tools the better. Just because a tool may be somewhat dangerous, like a bike path, does not mean it won’t be a useful tool. If you went through the garage and threw out all the tools that could cause injury when misused, you wouldn’t have much left over, except for maybe some tape. Let’s say the most dangerous tool in the garage is the radial saw. Would you let your precocious three-year-old use the radial saw? Probably shouldn’t let anyone clumsy or careless around sharp objects, no matter how old, fire up the saw. But the radial saw is still one of the handiest tools in the entire garage. You don’t trash it just because it’s dangerous. You reach for it every time you need to build a shed.

* motor lemmings: Not to be confused with Lemmy of Motorhead.
you and them. In this regard, bike paths are troubling, because there is not much available space to escape into. Adjust for the lack of space by slowing way down around pedestrians and other path traffic. Commitment to slow riding around others requires patience. Patience is easy to come by on the path if riders can remember all the red lights they don’t have to stop at. There will still be sections of path where discreet cyclists can stretch out and crank it up a bit.

When passing slower cyclists on a bike path, wait until there is plenty of space, and nobody coming the opposite direction, then pass on the left. Say, “On your left,” without a hint of alarm, as you begin the pass. This lets slower riders know you’re coming, so presumably they won’t swerve left into you. It is also polite, and traditional among cyclists. In-line skaters, who take up a great deal of lateral space when they think nobody else is around, should get the same treatment. It may be useful, at times, to verbally warn pedestrians, but usually it is best if the cyclist can pass quietly, leaving a reasonable amount of space at a reasonable speed. Some cyclists use bells to good effect on the bike path; they warn pedestrians well ahead of time and don’t have to slow down as much. “On your left” is a bike thing. Saying “on your left” to pedestrians is impractical, first of all, because they are moving too slow and the cyclist is past them before they can process the words, and also because it causes about half of them to freak out and walk to their left, exactly the opposite of what you want.

Perhaps the scariest hazard on the bike path is the rider coming at you from the opposite direction. He’s got his head down, he’s pumping those pedals. He’s drifting just a bit across the path. Bike paths are relatively skinny (10 feet wide for a full-size path, 6 feet wide for a thin one) so a little drift goes a long way. Prevent extremely violent, dangerous head-on collisions with other cyclists—literal head-on collisions—by hauling enough awareness for yourself and everybody else. And try not to ride on a bike path at night without a light, even though the surface, if it is the typical white concrete, will be easy to follow in the dark. The light isn’t there for you to see where you’re going, but so others can see you coming.

Like streets, the bike paths themselves can sometimes be dangerous, even when they’re empty. Many paths are lined with soft grass on both sides, which is a nice inadvertent safety feature. Not so for Denver’s Cherry Creek bike path, a fully separated concrete ribbon that is bordered for long stretches by fields of large, sharp rocks. Riders who wander off paths like this are sanctioned with serious injuries and broken bicycles. The obvious way to prevent these and other bike-path disasters is to keep the head up and eyes forward.

On the fully separated path, the increased danger of minor collisions could very well be offset by the elimination of car-bike interactions. Removing cars from the picture decreases stress along with the likelihood of deadly accidents. No cars . . . We really must stand back and admire these words for a moment.

While somewhat dangerous for inexperienced users, the fully separated path is the newest, coolest tool in the cyclist’s toolbox. No cars, no stops. Seekers after the Holy Grail of Momentum need seek no further.

Sidewalks and the Law

Observe any downtown area in any major city in America, and you will see bicyclists riding on the sidewalk. Most of these riders will be riding illegally, and they will do so even though they have some vague idea of the illegality of their actions. The pedestrians there will be occasionally perturbed, and occasionally terrorized by the sidewalk riders, but generally accepting of the situation. Sidewalk cycling, like rolling through stop signs, has gained some measure of legitimacy in American society that does not match the letter of the law.

The typical sidewalk law of a large American city bans bicycles outright from sidewalks in the Central Business District (CBD). Many municipal codes allow only children younger than age twelve or thirteen to ride on sidewalks outside the CBD, but many cities also allow adults to ride sidewalks outside the CBD—where the sidewalks are usually only 5 or 6 feet wide. The rider is always required to yield right-of-way to pedestrians.

That’s the typical law, but there are some noticeable exceptions around the nation. Seattle has a very bike friendly code: “Every person operating a
bicycle upon any sidewalk or public path shall operate the same in a care-
ful and prudent manner and at a rate of speed no greater than is reason-
able and proper under the conditions existing at the point of operation,
taking into account the amount and character of pedestrian traffic, grade
and width of sidewalk or public path, and conditions of surface, and shall
obey all traffic control devices.” Sidewalk surfers are required to yield
right-of-way to pedestrians, and to give an audible signal when passing,
but otherwise, if you want to ride your bike carefully on the sidewalks of
Seattle, go for it.

The cities of Portland, Oregon, and Madison, Wisconsin, great bike
cities that they are, have some of the most enlightened and reasonable
sidewalk laws in the nation. In Portland, the rider may hop onto a side-
walk in the business district if he or she is “avoiding a traffic hazard in the
immediate area.” We can live with that. In Madison, “bicycle riding on
sidewalks is permitted,” except “where a building abuts the sidewalk.”
These laws are the product of some careful, logical thought, rather than
arbitrary antibike sentiment or the conventional dogma that classifies
bikes as vehicles and leaves it at that.

Regardless of what the law in your city dictates, you will likely find
yourself rolling on the sidewalk at some point. Realistically, unless you are
a strict vehicular cyclist who shudders at the thought of riding anywhere
but a street, any trip into the downtown area will put you on the sidewalk,
perhaps just for a short while as you negotiate one-way streets or make
your way to a destination at midblock.

It’s conceivable that limited, selective sidewalk riding could be accom-
plished in a safe and courteous manner, but it always requires a good deal
of special care. It must be accepted, first of all, that sidewalks always
belong to the walkers. You are just visiting in their realm. On a sidewalk,
slow to a near-walking pace. This is not enough, but it’s a start. It’s also
easier said than done. Riding a bicycle under control at 3 mph or less is
beyond the abilities of many bike riders. They can’t come close to riding a
straight line unless they are rolling quickly. Wild weaving, overcorrecting,
on the verge of toppling over—please do not inflict your drunken clown
circus act on the good citizens of your city. It is strongly recommended
that those in the balance-challenged set spend a good deal of time practic-
ing and honing skills in a neutral location before dicing it up in traffic or

inviting disaster on the sidewalks. These riders will simply need to step off
their bikes and walk ’em if they have to use a sidewalk.

It’s not good enough to simply avoid peds while riding on a side-
walk—ride in such a way that you do not alter or disturb their intended
path. Allow them to walk the same direction, at the same speed, and in the
same way they would if you weren’t around. This is achieved by passing
behind pedestrians whenever possible, and otherwise leaving a somewhat
melodramatically wide berth in front of any walkers, large enough that
their inner alarms stay silent and they don’t even consider slowing down
or changing course. This is an example of Leave No Trace urban cycling.
If everybody rode sidewalks like this, there would be no bans on riding
sidewalks. Not only is this a very courteous way to move, it also greatly
reduces the chances of collision. Obviously, this tactic could be ruined by a
moderately busy sidewalk or pedestrians executing sudden flip turns,
which they all do at some point—I think I’ll go to that open-air drug market
on 15th before I go to the meeting on 18th.

Municipal codes quite often require the cyclist to let loose an audible
signal when passing pedestrians on a sidewalk or path. Some experienced
riders harbor cynical feelings about the whole audible-signal thing.
Voicing a warning or ringing a bell is sometimes quite useful, especially
on bike paths where the rider is allowed to hold a bit of speed. On side-
walks an audible warning will often just gum up the works, especially
when the rider is practicing a Leave No Trace style and can slip by a rea-
sonable distance away from, and at a speed only slightly faster than, the
walker. The audible signal may just confuse the ped, which defeats the
purpose of this riding style. Audible signals have a way of startling small
groups into stopping, turning, and roaming in random directions across
the sidewalk. Best to just roll past gently, if possible. Do not disturb. If
you’re riding on a sidewalk, and a spread-out group blocks your passage,
refrain from whistling, clicking your brake levers, or even saying “scuse
me.” You will just have to wait. It’s their world.

There is one way to continue practicing reasonable Leave No Trace
cycling even on a fairly crowded sidewalk, and that is to ride the strip
between the curb’s edge and the parking meters and newspaper boxes.
People rarely walk there. In fact, peds strolling down the sidewalk pretty
much forget about this space entirely, although they infiltrate it when
jaywalking, when entering and exiting vehicles parked on the curb, or when staring in a daze at the parking meter. This strip is usually between 1½ and 3 feet wide. It can be negotiated only at small speeds, and even this will require a somewhat advanced command of low-speed balance and straight-line riding. Riding here is much more difficult, technically speaking, than riding on the sidewalk itself. There is often a nasty longitudinal crack between the sidewalk slabs and the curb proper, and there are always hardened obstacles brushing the cyclist's shoulder and occasional car doors opening from the street side. Riding the strip remains useful, polite, and, like sidewalk riding in general, quite illegal almost everywhere.

Cyclists run into more trouble when riding on the other side of the sidewalk, next to the buildings. When a building directly abuts a sidewalk, people will be stepping directly out of the building onto the sidewalk. It also means, quite often, that the corners of the building will obscure the view of alleys or sidewalks lining intersecting streets. With respect to alleys, sidewalk riding necessarily reduces the buffer zone between the cyclist and alley intersections. Expect cars and trucks to roll out of the alleys, and expect pedestrians (and other cyclists) to come bolting out from the hidden sidewalks. Always expect the worst from an alley or a blind corner. Roll slowly at the far side of the sidewalk, away from the building, to avoid these hazards.

One of the strongest among many good reasons not to ride a bicycle on city sidewalks is the problematic interface between sidewalk riders and street traffic. Motorists who cross sidewalks or crosswalks will often swivel their heads in only one direction to check for traffic, the direction from which they expect traffic to come. So if you're on the sidewalk and rolling against traffic, don't expect these drivers to look your way, or to see you even if they do. Definitely don't roll in front of their vehicles. Roll behind them, or, if the sidewalk is completely blocked, put a foot down and wait.

Many cyclists are run down, perhaps deservedly so, as they roll off the sidewalk and into the street at the end of the block. This is pure kid stuff: failure to look, failure to appreciate common dangers or to stay minimally alert, general failure to pull the head from the arse. These are the types of riders for whom the vehicular-cycling principle would do a lot of good. They aren't ready to handle the available freedoms of cycling, especially sidewalk riding.

It should be noted that, in addition to legions of resentful pedestrians, a large contingent of serious urban cyclists are staunchly in favor of the side-walk bans. Some of these are strict legalists with good intentions, and others are vehicular cyclists who claim they would like to see every last off-street bike path rolled up and crushed into gravel but are turned into hypocrites every time they have to go downtown. Lots of idealists in this group.

Riding at Night

Night riding is an important component of the urban-cycling experience. This is especially true in North America, where the winter months bring early darkness for commuters.

Discussion of night-riding techniques can often be quite interesting, as it can reveal the underpinnings of one's whole urban-cycling philosophy, and perhaps other personality traits as well. Some will say, for instance, that a cyclist need only gear up with the proper lights and reflectors, and stick to classic traffic-law principles, to be able to ride safely on the busiest streets on the darkest nights. Others will insist that no amount of lights and reflectors will completely solve the problem of cyclists' being overlooked on the roadways. This is just an extension of the ongoing debate about proper technique for riding in daylight. As with the larger debate, the truth is somewhere between these two extremes.

Night cycling looks very dangerous on paper. In 2001 about half of cyclist traffic fatalities occurred between 6:00 P.M. and 6:00 A.M.? This amazing stat is even more impressive when you consider that relatively few cyclists ride at night. Many of these riders were run down from behind by drunks or sleepers on high-speed roads and never stood a chance. Some of these victims, however, as with their daylight counterparts, were riding irresponsibly and erratically, without proper equipment, and had only themselves to blame. At night the garden-variety bonehead mistakes of cyclists are compounded massively.

It stands to reason that some of these cyclists-turned-statistics would not have been hit at all if they had been using proper lights and flashers. Ideally, a night rider will have a helmet light as well as a handlebar-mounted light,
and at least one bright red flashing reflector to clip on the back somewhere. In most jurisdictions, this equipment is legally required for night cycling (although the law is rarely enforced). But will the lights and flashers be enough? Echoing the helmet debate, it must be said that attitude, style, and experience are more useful and important for cyclists than safety equipment. Undoubtedly some of these victims could have saved themselves by drastically altering their route and technique to make up for their lack of lighting.

Although one hopes that cyclists will keep their lights charged and blazing, they should also take a lesson from those who have learned to ride in the dark without any lights at all. Is it possible to go lightless safely, and if so, how? Riding at night without a light is not only possible, it can also be a very instructive drill. That’s not to say we should make a habit of it! But—even those who are religious light users, the true believers worshiping at the altar of Visibility, would probably benefit from at least considering the implications of this alternative, just to gain a partial understanding of it. (And, realistically, a dedicated urban cyclist will be forced into this less-than-optimal situation from time to time anyway.) The style that is required to safely pull this off is a zealous version of what has been called the “invisible style.” It is, by necessity, extreme antisocial cycling. The rider starts by choosing the quietest route within reason, to minimize interactions with cars. Then, whenever cars are encountered, the rider proceeds as if he or she is totally invisible—which is probably the case, frankly, if the rider is out at night with no light. This means slipping behind cars at intersections, adjusting speed to avoid situations where the rider is dependent on being seen by a driver, et cetera. There is an undeniable element of sneaking and creeping to this style that is very unpalatable to the vehicularists. Indeed, it is an extremely defensive, conservative, and patient style. It is a style that requires constant engagement, constant thinking ahead.

Now, let’s keep our jerky knees firmly lashed down for just a bit here as we acknowledge some of the more interesting advantages of using the invisible style at night. From one point of view, the night rider’s lightless paranoid-invisible style is extremely liberating. There is no pretense of being seen, and no dependence on it. It is all up to the cyclist to avoid the moving “obstacles,” rather than up to the drivers to see and avoid the cyclist. The rider thus seizes control of his or her own destiny, in theory. Some riders who are devoted to this style claim that their visibility to motorists is occasionally a complicating factor—a disadvantage—in car-bike interactions. Some veteran night riders have been known to switch their lights off from time to time, for precisely this reason.

A rider utilizing a reasonable vehicular style, on the other hand, well-lit and dedicated to riding in a predictable manner, will enter situation after situation that should rightly be characterized by a gnawing uncertainty: Does that driver really see me? Guesswork. The invisible cyclist is not plagued by this question. The invisible cyclist has gotten inside this question, and has beaten it from within.

OK, you can unstrap your knees now and let ‘em fly. The problems associated with the invisible style are well-known and probably outweigh the advantages. It is a style that could be criticized as selfish, and even unfair to other road users—because, even if the rider is shrouded in darkness, there will still be a few drivers here and there who will notice, and who might be confused or startled by the rider’s presence. It is true that some drivers will not notice a cyclist on the street, but it is also true that many drivers will notice. As cyclists, we must somehow respect and reconcile these two opposing facts of life, whether it be day or night. For this reason, the invisible style is not practical for use on busy streets, or with other riders in close proximity.

Riders who practice the no-lights method will likely have some serious trouble with the city surface, even if they avoid all car trouble (see The Great American Pothole, on page 43). Lights don’t reveal surface anomalies with flawless precision, but they are far superior to flying blind. A true samurai master of urban cycling, theoretically, would be so perfectly acquainted with the route that he or she would be able to pick a path around any potholes in complete darkness, with eyes closed. Good luck with that.

There are important elements of the invisible style that we should master and adopt for everyday riding. On the other hand, it is not always suitable or effective. The same could be said of the Vehicular-cycling Principle. Enlightened urban cyclists achieve an artful blend of these two styles, the end result of which could be called a modified invisible style, or a modified vehicular style, depending on one’s point of view. Their method in fact shifts fluidly along this continuum between the vehicular style and the invisible style, as they adapt to a multitude of variables. It is no different for night riding.

Due to the presence of potholes, and the practical unavoidability of at
least occasional encounters with motor vehicles—not to mention other cyclists—the author must insist in no uncertain terms that night-riding cyclists use proper lighting whenever possible. This means using at least one bright, illuminating headlight (a light that not only makes the cyclist more visible to other road users but also illuminates the road ahead) and at least one flashing red blinker for the rear. Lights are effective, necessary equipment (and ungodly expensive). But they are not enough. The night rider must artfully adopt the cynical mind-set, vigilance, and flexibility of the invisible cyclist, even while flashing like a UFO.
NEW BUSINESS

Discussion on FNSB Department of Community Planning Fee Schedule
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community Planning</th>
<th>Fees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Zoning Service</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rezone (Reduced Fee ††)</td>
<td>$1,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conditional Use Permit</td>
<td>800.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conditional Use Permit with Supplementary Regulations in FNSBC 18.96</td>
<td>1,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telecommunications Tower CUP</td>
<td>2,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expert Review Telecomm - CUP</td>
<td><strong>Actual Cost ($2,000.00 Deposit)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telecommunication Collocation/Modification Permit</td>
<td>900.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Section 8409(a) and Substantial Modification)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expert Review Collocation/Modification</td>
<td><strong>Actual Cost</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variance/Highway Variance (fee waived †††)</td>
<td>1,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admin Variance</td>
<td>300.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verification of Sensitive Uses within buffers</td>
<td>250.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second attempt at verification of sensitive uses, and every time after</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Re-Notice Fee*</td>
<td>200.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appeals</td>
<td>400.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal Non-Conforming (Grandfather Rights†††) without Hearing</td>
<td>50.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal Non-Conforming (Grandfather Rights†††) with Hearing</td>
<td>50.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amnesty Relief without Hearing</td>
<td>50.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amnesty Relief with Hearing</td>
<td>200.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobile Home Park Permits</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobile Home Park Permit-New</td>
<td>600.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobile Home Park Permit-Annual Renewal (3-49 spaces)</td>
<td>200.00/yr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobile Home Park Permit-Annual Renewal (50-68 spaces)</td>
<td>300.00/yr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobile Home Park Permit-Annual Renewal (100+ spaces)</td>
<td>400.00/yr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zoning Permits</td>
<td>No Charge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flood Zone Permits</td>
<td>No Charge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flood Determination Letter</td>
<td>$50.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Platting Service</strong></td>
<td>$850.00 plus $100.00/per lot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preliminary Plat and Replat (exceptions to per lot fee)</td>
<td>$750.00 plus $75.00/per lot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waiver (exceptions to per lot fee)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Row Vacation Plat (<strong>reduced fee</strong></td>
<td>500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Utility Easement (P.U.E.) Vacation (for each vacation)</td>
<td>75.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preliminary Plat Variance (for each variance)</td>
<td>400.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Road Construction Exemption (FNSBC 17.66.080)</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final Plat (*exceptions to per lot fee)</td>
<td>$400.00 plus $100.00/per lot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final Plat Review on third attempt and every time after</td>
<td>250.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final Plat Subdivision Improvement Inspection on third attempt and every time after (2 hr minimum Public Works Engineer)</td>
<td>240.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quick Plat (*exception to per lot fee)</td>
<td>$400.00 plus $100.00/per lot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modifications of Approved Plats (<strong>reduced fee</strong></td>
<td>400.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extensions of time on Approved Plats</td>
<td>200.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Re-Notice Fee*</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appeals</td>
<td>400.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street Renaming</td>
<td>200.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street Renaming for the purpose of Health and Safety</td>
<td>No Charge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History of Subdivision Regulations CD</td>
<td>15.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Admin Fees</th>
<th>Non-Profit/Journalistic</th>
<th>Public Agencies</th>
<th>All Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Title 15 - Floodplain Management Ordinance</td>
<td>$10.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title 17 - Subdivision Ordinance</td>
<td>$10.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title 18 - Zoning Ordinance</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bench Mark List</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recorded Plats List (Alpha, Chrono, Inst.##)</td>
<td>25.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GIS Data Download/DVD</td>
<td>$75.00</td>
<td>No Charge</td>
<td>150.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imagery Jump Drive - 2017</td>
<td>125.00</td>
<td>No Charge</td>
<td>250.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imagery Jump Drive - Pre 2012</td>
<td>125.00</td>
<td>No Charge</td>
<td>250.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imagery Jump Drive - 2012</td>
<td>125.00</td>
<td>No Charge</td>
<td>250.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lidar Jump Drive - 2017</td>
<td>125.00</td>
<td>No Charge</td>
<td>250.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lidar Jump Drive - 2010</td>
<td>125.00</td>
<td>No Charge</td>
<td>250.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electronic Recording Fees (plats and other documents)</td>
<td>Actual Cost</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Other Fees - Community Planning</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community Research Quarterly</td>
<td>$10.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Xerox Engineer Copier-plat/map copies 24&quot; x 36&quot;</td>
<td>6.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Xerox Engineer Copier-plat/map copies 18&quot; x 24&quot;</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11&quot;x17&quot; Color Copies (plats/maps)</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8½&quot;x14&quot; Color Copies (plats/maps)</td>
<td>0.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8½&quot;x11&quot; Color Copies (plats/maps)</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Notice Signs: Security Deposit</td>
<td>200.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Other Fees - Borough-Wide Fees</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Audio USB/CD of Public Meetings</td>
<td>$15.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CD (other-records request)</td>
<td>15.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Copying/scanning fee (letter or legal)</td>
<td>0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Copying/scanning fee (11&quot;x17&quot;)</td>
<td>0.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Color copying/scanning fee (letter or legal)</td>
<td>0.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Color copying/scanning fee (11&quot;x17&quot;)</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Microfilm/Microfiche Copies</td>
<td>First copy 1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Each additional copy 0.25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A fee for copying/scanning, responding to a public records request that is less than $5 (monthly cumulative amount) will be waived because the fee is less than the cost to the Borough to arrange for payment.

†Refunds or withdrawn within one (1) business day of the application submittal.
†† No fee if rezoning a split zone parcel or rezoning a GU property to an appropriate residential zone if the zone encompases at least thirteen (13) acres or five (5) or more contiguous lots.
††† No fee for Highway Project Variance requested by private property owners, if AKDOT & PF did not fulfill their statutory responsibility of obtaining a variance.
*** No fee for Grandfather Rights Affirmation within one year of a rezone or code changes to setbacks or use.
**Plats that do not create additional lots are waived from the per lot fee.
**$250 if Vacation is part of a preliminary plat, replat or waiver.
***50% Fee reduction for Quick Plats.
**If postponed at the request of the applicant after the original notice was issued or if the applicant makes a substantial change to the application materials that necessitate renegotiating.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Conditional Use</th>
<th>Variance</th>
<th>Grandfather Rights</th>
<th>Amnesty</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FNSB</td>
<td>$800/ $1000***</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>$50.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mat-Su</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>$200.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenai*</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anchorage**</td>
<td>Range: $1,688 to 15,750 based on acreage/type</td>
<td>$675 to $3,780 based on acreage/type</td>
<td>$130/hr w/ 1 hr min.</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juneau</td>
<td>Range: $350-$1,600 based on type</td>
<td>$120 Admin / $400 Variance</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* The cities in Kenai charge additional fees beyond borough fees
** The Municipality of Anchorage charges an additional $130/hour for all staff work plus any other costs incurred on a project
*** CUP w/ supplemental regs
† With Hearing
†† Without Hearing
## Conditional Use Permits and Variances

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TASK</th>
<th>STAFF</th>
<th>HOURS</th>
<th>FYE 2019 Rate w/ benefits</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prepare for Pre-App Conference</td>
<td>Planner</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$52</td>
<td>$52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-App Conference</td>
<td>Planner</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$52</td>
<td>$104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contact with Applicant</td>
<td>Planner</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$52</td>
<td>$104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Application Intake</td>
<td>Planner</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$52</td>
<td>$52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>File Set-up</td>
<td>Admin</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$41</td>
<td>$82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Application Review</td>
<td>Planner</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$52</td>
<td>$104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applicant Contacts</td>
<td>Planner</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$52</td>
<td>$104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completeness Letter</td>
<td>Planner</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$52</td>
<td>$104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DPO's determined and letter created</td>
<td>Planner</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$52</td>
<td>$104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DPO's printed and mailed</td>
<td>Admin</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$41</td>
<td>$123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agency Comment requests prepared and sent</td>
<td>Planner</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$52</td>
<td>$104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site visit and photos</td>
<td>Planner</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$52</td>
<td>$104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project and site research</td>
<td>Planner</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$52</td>
<td>$104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff Report, including consult with other borough staff</td>
<td>Planner</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>$52</td>
<td>$780</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maps and other documentation prepared</td>
<td>Planner</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$52</td>
<td>$104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal notice and agenda prepared and published</td>
<td>Admin</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$41</td>
<td>$123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review and edit of legal, agenda and packet materials</td>
<td>Director</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>$92</td>
<td>$460</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Packet Preparation/print/post to web/mail</td>
<td>Admin</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$41</td>
<td>$123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applicant notification (dear applicant letters)</td>
<td>Admin</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$41</td>
<td>$41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prepare PC presentation</td>
<td>Planner</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$52</td>
<td>$156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Commission meeting</td>
<td>Planner</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$52</td>
<td>$104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Commission meeting</td>
<td>Admin</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$41</td>
<td>$82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Commission meeting</td>
<td>Director</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$92</td>
<td>$92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Findings of Fact to Clerk</td>
<td>Admin</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$41</td>
<td>$41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notice of decision/ PC action letters</td>
<td>Admin</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$41</td>
<td>$41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minutes</td>
<td>Admin</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$41</td>
<td>$164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Update, complete and close out of file</td>
<td>Admin</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$41</td>
<td>$82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Records Retention and Destruction</td>
<td>Admin</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$41</td>
<td>$82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTALS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>72</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$3,720</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th># of CUPs</th>
<th># of Vari</th>
<th>Total Apps</th>
<th>Fee</th>
<th>Revenue</th>
<th>Expenditure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Projected FYE 2019</td>
<td></td>
<td>19</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>$800/$1000/$2,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Estimated Actual Cost

Total Annual Cost to General Fund **$60,440**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TASK</th>
<th>STAFF</th>
<th>HOURS</th>
<th>FYE 2019 rate w/ benefits</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prepare for and hold Pre-App Conference</td>
<td>Planner</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$52</td>
<td>$104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Application Intake</td>
<td>Planner</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$52</td>
<td>$52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>File Set-up</td>
<td>Admin</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$41</td>
<td>$82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Application Review</td>
<td>Planner</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$52</td>
<td>$104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applicant Contacts</td>
<td>Planner</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$52</td>
<td>$104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DPO's determined and letter created</td>
<td>Planner</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$52</td>
<td>$104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DPO's printed and mailed</td>
<td>Admin</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$41</td>
<td>$123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agency Comment requests prepared and sent</td>
<td>Planner</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$52</td>
<td>$104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site visit and photos</td>
<td>Planner</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$52</td>
<td>$104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project and site research</td>
<td>Planner</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$52</td>
<td>$104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff Report, including consult with other borough staff</td>
<td>Planner</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>$52</td>
<td>$780</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maps and other documentation prepared</td>
<td>Planner</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$52</td>
<td>$104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal notice and agenda prepared and published</td>
<td>Admin</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$41</td>
<td>$123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review and edit of legal, agenda and packet materials</td>
<td>Director</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>$92</td>
<td>$460</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Packet Preparation/print/post to web/mail</td>
<td>Admin</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$41</td>
<td>$123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applicant notification (dear applicant letters)</td>
<td>Admin</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$41</td>
<td>$41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prepare PC presentation</td>
<td>Planner</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$52</td>
<td>$156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Commission meeting</td>
<td>Planner</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$52</td>
<td>$104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Commission meeting</td>
<td>Admin</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$41</td>
<td>$82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Commission meeting</td>
<td>Director</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$92</td>
<td>$92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minutes</td>
<td>Admin</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$41</td>
<td>$164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Write Urge Memo to Assembly</td>
<td>Director</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$92</td>
<td>$92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urge Memo and Packet to Clerk</td>
<td>Admin</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$41</td>
<td>$82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prepare COW Presentation</td>
<td>Director</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$92</td>
<td>$184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Committee of the Whole Meeting</td>
<td>Director</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$92</td>
<td>$92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prepare Assembly PH presentation</td>
<td>Director</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$92</td>
<td>$92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assembly Public Hearing</td>
<td>Director</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$92</td>
<td>$92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assembly Action Letter</td>
<td>Admin</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$41</td>
<td>$41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Update, complete and close out of file</td>
<td>Admin</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$41</td>
<td>$82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Records Retention and Destruction</td>
<td>Admin</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$41</td>
<td>$82</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTALS**  
74  
$4,053  

**Estimated Actual Cost**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th># of Apps</th>
<th>Fee</th>
<th>Revenue</th>
<th>Expenditure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Projected FYE 2019</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td>$4,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Annual Cost to General Fund**  
$12,212
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TASK</th>
<th>STAFF</th>
<th>HOURS</th>
<th>FYE 2019 Rate w/ benefits</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Application Intake Planner</td>
<td>Planner</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$52</td>
<td>$ 52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>File Set-up Admin</td>
<td>Admin</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$41</td>
<td>$ 41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Log &amp; scan application Planner</td>
<td>Planner</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$52</td>
<td>$ 52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Application Review Planner</td>
<td>Planner</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$52</td>
<td>$ 52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DPO’s determined, letter created, map created Planner</td>
<td>Planner</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$52</td>
<td>$104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DPO’s printed and mailed</td>
<td>Admin</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>$41</td>
<td>$ 62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal and agenda draft Planner</td>
<td>Planner</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$52</td>
<td>$ 52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal notice and agenda prepared and published</td>
<td>Admin</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$41</td>
<td>$ 82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review and edit of legal, agenda and packet materials Director</td>
<td>Director</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>$92</td>
<td>$ 46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property and code research, including consult with other borough staff</td>
<td>Planner</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>$52</td>
<td>$ 364</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Draft Staff Report Planner</td>
<td>Planner</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$52</td>
<td>$ 208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Packet Preparation/print/mail</td>
<td>Admin</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$41</td>
<td>$ 82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prepare report drafts Planner</td>
<td>Planner</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$52</td>
<td>$104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prepare for Administrative Hearing</td>
<td>Planner</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$52</td>
<td>$ 52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Hearing Planner</td>
<td>Planner</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$52</td>
<td>$ 52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Hearing Admin</td>
<td>Admin</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$41</td>
<td>$ 41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Hearing Director</td>
<td>Director</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>$92</td>
<td>$ 46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Draft Findings/Determination Letter/Clerk Memo Planner</td>
<td>Planner</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$52</td>
<td>$ 52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review draft Findings/Determination Letter/Clerk Memo Director</td>
<td>Director</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$92</td>
<td>$ 92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Determination Packet(s) to Owner &amp; Clerk</td>
<td>Planner</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>$52</td>
<td>$ 78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finalize File Planners</td>
<td>Planner</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$52</td>
<td>$ 52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verifications - GIS &amp; Appeals</td>
<td>Planner</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$52</td>
<td>$ 52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Close out of file Admin</td>
<td>Admin</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$41</td>
<td>$ 82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Records Retention and Destruction</td>
<td>Admin</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$41</td>
<td>$ 41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTALS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>38</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$1,941</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Estimated Actual Cost**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th># of Apps</th>
<th>Fee</th>
<th>Revenue</th>
<th>Expenditure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Projected FYE 2019</strong></td>
<td>42</td>
<td>$ 50</td>
<td>$ 2,100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Annual Cost to General Fund**

$ 79,422
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TASK</th>
<th>STAFF</th>
<th>HOURS</th>
<th>FYE 2019 Rate w/ benefits</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Application Intake</td>
<td>Planner</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$52</td>
<td>$ 52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>File Set-up</td>
<td>Admin</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>$41</td>
<td>$ 21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Log &amp; scan application</td>
<td>Planner</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>$52</td>
<td>$ 26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Application Review</td>
<td>Planner</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>$52</td>
<td>$ 26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property and code research, including consult with other borough staff</td>
<td>Planner</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>$52</td>
<td>$ 182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Draft Findings</td>
<td>Planner</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$52</td>
<td>$ 52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prepare report drafts</td>
<td>Planner</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$52</td>
<td>$ 52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Determination Letter/Clerk Memo</td>
<td>Planner</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$52</td>
<td>$ 52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review and approve findings &amp; exhibits</td>
<td>Director</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$92</td>
<td>$ 92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Determination Packet(s) to Owner &amp; Clerk</td>
<td>Planner</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$52</td>
<td>$ 52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finalize File</td>
<td>Planner</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>$52</td>
<td>$ 26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verifications - GIS &amp; Appeals</td>
<td>Planner</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>$52</td>
<td>$ 26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Close out of file</td>
<td>Admin</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$41</td>
<td>$ 41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Records Retention and Destruction</td>
<td>Admin</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$41</td>
<td>$ 41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTALS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td>$ 741</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

# of Apps          Fee     Revenue  Expenditure

| Projected FYE 2019 | 153  | $ 50   | $ 7,650 | $ 113,373 |

Total Annual Cost to General Fund $ 105,723
FMATS
TECHNICAL COMMITTEE MEETING
Wednesday, December 5, 2018
12:00 – 2:00 P.M.
City of Fairbanks, 800 Cushman Street, City Council Chambers

1. Call to Order
2. Introduction of Members and Attendees
3. Approval of the December 5, 2018 Agenda
4. Approval of the November 7, 2018 Minutes
5. Committee/Working Group Reports (including the Chair’s Report)
6. Public Comment Period (Non-Action Items)
7. Old Business
   a. FMATS Improvement Program Project Priorities (Action Item)
      • Furthering the discussion on the FFY20 Program
   b. FMATS 2045 MTP (Action Item)
      • Consideration of approval of the 2045 MTP
8. New Business
   a. Letter of Support for DEC grant application (Action Item)
      • A letter supporting DEC’s application for the EPA Airshed Grant
   b. 2019 Safety Performance Measures (Action Item)
      • Consideration of supporting State’s new FFY19 Safety Targets
9. Other Issues
10. Informational Items
    a. Transportation Alternatives Program Grant
    b. Salcha/Badger Subarea Plan update
    c. 11.21.18 Policy Board Action Items
    d. FFY18 Budget Year End Summary
    e. Obligations and Offsets
11. Technical Committee Comments
12. Adjournment

Next Scheduled Technical Committee Meeting – Wednesday, January 2, 2018, Noon,
Location to be determined