Regular City Council Meeting  
August 3, 2022 @ 7:00 pm  
Cordova Center Comm Rooms  
Agenda

A. Call to order

B. Invocation, pledge of allegiance
I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the republic for which it stands, one Nation under God, indivisible with liberty and justice for all.

C. Roll call
Mayor David Allison, Council members Tom Bailer, Cathy Sherman, Jeff Guard, Melina Meyer, Anne Schaefer, Kristin Carpenter, and Ken Jones

D. Approval of Regular Agenda…………………………… (voice vote)

E. Disclosures of Conflicts of Interest and Ex Parte Communications
- conflicts as defined in Cordova Municipal Code 3.10.010 should be declared, then Mayor rules on whether member should be recused, Council can appeal the Mayor’s ruling
- ex parte should be declared here, the content of the ex parte should be explained when the item comes before Council, ex parte does not recuse a member, it is required that ex parte is declared and explained

F. Communications by and Petitions from Visitors
1. Guest Speakers – AK Dept of Transportation report on Whitshed Road………………………. (page 1) and Pedestrian Improvements Project
2. Audience comments regarding agenda items…………………………………………………... (3 minutes per speaker)
3. Chairpersons and Representatives of Boards and Commissions (CCMCA BoD, School Board Rep)

G. Approval of Consent Calendar
4. Minutes of the July 6, 2022 Council Public Hearing………………………………………………. (page 16)
5. Minutes of the July 6, 2022 Regular Council Meeting………………………………………………. (page 17)
6. Resolution 08-22-21…………………………………………………………………………………… (page 21)
   A resolution of the Council of the City of Cordova, Alaska, acknowledging the June 2022 surplus vehicle and equipment sale and approving the bid results
7. Resolution 08-22-22…………………………………………………………………………………… (page 27)
   A resolution of the Council of the City of Cordova, Alaska, supporting the alaska DOT&PF Whitshed Road and Pedestrian Improvements Project which provides pedestrian accommodations and stormwater system upgrades along Whitshed from Copper River Highway to Orca Inlet Drive
8. Per Charter Section 2-8 and Cordova Municipal Code 3.12.022, recordation of unexcused absence of Council member Kristin Carpenter from the July 6, 2022 Regular Meeting

H. Approval of Minutes - in consent calendar

I. Consideration of Bids/Proposals/Contracts
10. Award of bid for $86,710 to AK Elec & Control dba Jewell Equipment………………………… (voice vote)(page 71) of Wasilla for a Wacker G70 generator and power transfer switch
Executive Sessions per Cordova Municipal Code 3.14.030

- subjects which may be considered are: (1) matters the immediate knowledge of which would clearly have an adverse effect upon the finances of the government; (2) subjects that tend to prejudice the reputation and character of any person; provided that the person may request a public discussion; (3) matters which by law, municipal charter or code are required to be confidential; (4) matters involving consideration of governmental records that by law are not subject to public disclosure.

- subjects may not be considered in the executive session except those mentioned in the motion calling for the executive session, unless they are auxiliary to the main question

- action may not be taken in an executive session except to give direction to an attorney or labor negotiator regarding the handling of a specific legal matter or pending labor negotiations

If you have a disability that makes it difficult to attend city-sponsored functions, you may contact 424-6200 for assistance.

Full City Council agendas and packets available online at www.cityofcordova.net
Whitshed Road and Pedestrian Improvements

Scope: Provide pedestrian accommodations along Whitshed Road between the Copper River Highway and Orca Inlet Drive intersections

Purpose: Improve safety by providing accommodations for non-motorized traffic along the 0.8 mile corridor

Need: The project is needed because Point Whitshed Road is narrow and has no dedicated shoulders. The lack of shoulders causes non-motorized users to share the 11-foot vehicle lanes or trek off the paved roadway.
Project Corridor
Background Information

How was this project created?

The City of Cordova and Native Village of Eyak sponsored and submitted a nomination packet to the State supporting design and construction of this project.
Existing Whitshed Road Corridor

• The only road in and out of the area
• Narrow Right-of-Way
• High seasonal bicycle and pedestrian use
• Multiple utilities exist beneath the road surface
• Drainage improvements are needed:
  ▪ Ditches need to be establish and/or regrade ditches
  ▪ Culverts are undersized and some are failing

Looking west on Whitshed Road away from Cordova city center. Narrow roadway lanes, no shoulders or pedestrian facilities, steep mountain face on the left, steep drop to the ocean on the right.
I heard this was a CMGC project. What does that mean? A “Construction Manager General Contractor” (CMGC) project is where you hire a construction contractor (Granite Construction Company) during development of the design.

How much is the project going to cost? The project’s construction budget/limit is set at $9 million
Project Challenges

- The narrow right-of-way combined with the exceptionally steep rock topography just beyond the paved road surface limits the physical room to fit new pedestrian accommodations.

- No alternate access routes to detour traffic during construction activities.

- How to construct the final design.
Proposed Project Improvements

• Pedestrian/Bicycle Path
• Clear Zone
• Rock slope stability
• Drainage
TYPICAL SECTION 1
Utility Relocations

• Utility relocations:
  ▪ Cordova Electric
  ▪ Cordova Telephone
  ▪ GCI

• No sewer or water relocations
• Services will be maintained
• After-hours cut-overs
• Advance notice of outage
Utility Relocations

Changes will be:

- New mainline conduit under the sidewalk
- New vaults/pedestals behind the sidewalk
- New road crossings to provide secondary services
Right-of-Way

• History of Existing Right-of-Way

• Project Right-of-Way needs:
  ▪ ROW Acquisitions
  ▪ TCEs
  ▪ TCPs

• Right-of-Way process
Current Schedule

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Milestones</th>
<th>2022</th>
<th></th>
<th>2023</th>
<th></th>
<th>2024</th>
<th></th>
<th>2025</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Q1</td>
<td>Q2</td>
<td>Q3</td>
<td>Q4</td>
<td>Q1</td>
<td>Q2</td>
<td>Q3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preliminary Design</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final Design</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right-of-Way</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Questions?
A. Call to order

Mayor David Allison called the Council public hearing to order at 6:45 pm on July 6, 2022, in the Cordova Center Community Rooms.

B. Roll call

Present for roll call were Mayor David Allison and Council members Jeff Guard, Melina Meyer, and Anne Schaefer. Council members Tom Bailer, Cathy Sherman were present via teleconference. Council members Kristin Carpenter and Ken Jones were absent. Also present were City Manager Helen Howarth and City Clerk Susan Bourgeois.

C. Public hearing

1. Substitute Ordinance 1200 An ordinance of the Council of the City of Cordova, Alaska amending Section 11.08.020 of the Cordova Municipal code to increase the number of Harbor Commission members from five to seven

2. Ordinance 1201 An ordinance of the Council of the City of Cordova, Alaska repealing Cordova Municipal Code Title 16 “Building Codes” and enacting Title 16 “Buildings and Construction” to adopt the building codes adopted by the State of Alaska and local amendments to those building codes tailored to Cordova; amend CMC 1.28.085 to update the fine schedule to reflect changes in Title 16; amend CMC 1.04.025, 18.08.010, 18.17.100, 18.18.010, 18.26.040, 18.32.055, 18.33.010, 18.33.030, 18.33.050, 18.33.060, 18.33.080, 18.33.100; 18.33.110, 18.33.130, 18.34.070, 18.34.080, 18.34.100, 18.38.050-18.38.100, 18.39.100, 18.39.130, 18.44.010-18.44.030, 18.46.030 to reflect revisions to Title 16; repealing and reenacting CMC Chapter 18.42 “Site Plan Review” to streamline the site plan review process and provide a hearing and review process for suspended or revoked site plan approval; repealing 18.33.070 “Lot Coverage,” 18.76.070 “Building Permit”, and 18.80.020 “Building Permit-Scope and Validity.”

Mayor Allison opened the hearing up for public testimony on the two ordinances. Hearing no testimony, he recessed the public hearing at 6:49 pm. The public hearing was brought back into session at 6:55 pm and there still was no public testimony.

D. Adjournment

Hearing no objection Mayor Allison adjourned the public hearing at 6:56 pm.

Approved: August 6, 2022

Attest: _______________________________

Susan Bourgeois, CMC, City Clerk
Regular City Council Meeting  
July 6, 2022 @ 7:00 pm  
Cordova Center Community Rooms A & B  
Minutes

A. Call to order – Mayor David Allison called the Regular City Council Meeting to order at 7:00 pm on July 6, 2022, in the Cordova Center Community Rooms.

B. Invocation and pledge of allegiance – Mayor Allison led the audience in the Pledge of Allegiance.

C. Roll call - Present for roll call were Mayor David Allison and Council members Jeff Guard, Melina Meyer, and Anne Schaefer. Council members Tom Bailer and Cathy Sherman were present via teleconference. Council members Kristin Carpenter and Ken Jones were absent. Also present were City Manager Helen Howarth and City Clerk Susan Bourgeois.

D. Approval of Regular Agenda – M/Guard S/Schaefer to approve the agenda.
Vote on the motion: 5 yeas, 0 nays, 2 absent (Carpenter, Jones). Motion was approved.

E. Disclosures of Conflicts of Interest and ex parte communications
Council member Meyer declared a conflict on item 15 because that is her parent’s business transferring a liquor license. Mayor Allison agreed with the conflict.

F. Communications by and Petitions from Visitors
Westing was not yet in attendance, Council moved on with the meeting and would come back to this item when she arrived.
2. Audience comments regarding agenda items:
Clay Koplin spoke to item 16 – specifically the Council calendar – he mentioned that Representative Louise Stutes would be in Cordova – a meet and greet at the Reluctant on Thursday July 14 from 4-6pm.
3. Chairpersons and Representatives of Boards and Commissions – no School Board or CCMC Authority Board reports.

G. Approval of Consent Calendar
4. Minutes of the June 15, 2022 Regular Council Meeting
5. Per Charter Section 2-8 and Cordova Municipal Code 3.12.022, recordation of unexcused absence of Council member Anne Schaefer from the June 15, 2022 Regular Meeting
Vote on the Consent Calendar: 5 yeas, 0 nays, 2 absent. Sherman-yes; Guard-yes; Jones-absent; Schaefer-absent; Carpenter-absent; Bailer-yes and Meyer-yes. Consent Calendar was approved.

H. Approval of Minutes - in consent calendar
I. Consideration of Bids - none
J. Reports of Officers
6. Mayor’s Report – Mayor Allison reported: 1) about 100 emails, 20% of those need a response or need to be forwarded; 2) baseball season just ended and he thanked all of those that volunteer to keep that great program going – and thanked all volunteers in Cordova for all the great youth programs; 3) he gave opening remarks to the community July 4th celebration – was well-attended, he figured 300+ people; 4) he attended the last state and fishing industry meeting – last week, they finished up with those meetings
7. Manager’s Report – City Manager Helen Howarth reported: 1) written updates in packet – both manager report and south harbor report – no verbal updates until process moves a little further along; 2) audit begins next week – audit staff will be here for the week – new firm on board, hoping to have a completed audit this time before we start budget process in fall.
   a. South Harbor Rebuild update
8. City Clerk’s Report - none

K. Correspondence
8a. 05-26-22 Email from T. McGann regarding Harbor Commission
9. 06-15-22 Email from L. Stavig regarding Copper River Highway
10. 06-15-22 ADoT CRH Master Plan Mailer
11. Public Notice: Community Health Needs Assessment Survey

L. Ordinances and Resolutions
12. Substitute Ordinance 1200 An ordinance of the Council of the City of Cordova, Alaska amending Section 11.08.020 of the Cordova Municipal code to increase the number of Harbor Commission members from five to seven – 2nd reading

M/Schaefer S/Guard to adopt Substitute Ordinance 1200 An ordinance of the Council of the City of Cordova, Alaska amending Section 11.08.020 of the Cordova Municipal code to increase the number of Harbor Commission members from five to seven

Schaefer said she is in favor – no further comments other than what Council has discussed before. Guard said he is also in favor – Meyer, Bailer, Sherman said the same.

Vote on the motion: 5 yeas, 0 nays, 2 absent. Meyer-yes; Carper-ter-absent; Bailer-yes; Guard-yes; Sherman-yes; Jones-absent and Schaefer-yes. Motion was approved.

13. Ordinance 1201 An ordinance of the Council of the City of Cordova, Alaska repealing Cordova Municipal Code Title 16 “Building Codes” and enacting Title 16 “Buildings and Construction” to adopt the building codes adopted by the State of Alaska and local amendments to those building codes tailored to Cordova; amend CMC 1.28.085 to update the fine schedule to reflect changes in Title 16; amend CMC 1.04.025, 18.08.010, 18.17.100, 18.18.010, 18.26.040, 18.32.055, 18.33.010, 18.33.030, 18.33.050, 18.33.060, 18.33.080, 18.33.100, 18.33.110, 18.33.130, 18.34.070, 18.34.080, 18.34.100, 18.38.050-18.38.100, 18.39.100, 18.39.130, 18.44.010-18.44.030, 18.46.030 to reflect revisions to Title 16; repealing and reenacting CMC Chapter 18.42 “Site Plan Review” to streamline the site plan review process and provide a hearing and review process for suspended or revoked site plan approval; repealing 18.33.070 “Lot Coverage,” 18.76.070 “Building Permit”, and 18.80.020 “Building Permit-Scope and Validity.” – 2nd reading

M/Schaefer S/Guard to adopt ordinance 1201 an ordinance of the Council of the City of Cordova, Alaska repealing Cordova Municipal Code Title 16 “Building Codes” and enacting Title 16 “Buildings and Construction” to adopt the building codes adopted by the State of Alaska and local amendments to those building codes tailored to Cordova; amend CMC 1.28.085 to update the fine schedule to reflect changes in Title 16; amend CMC 1.04.025, 18.08.010, 18.17.100, 18.18.010, 18.26.040, 18.32.055, 18.33.010, 18.33.030, 18.33.050, 18.33.060, 18.33.080, 18.33.100, 18.33.110, 18.33.130, 18.34.070, 18.34.080, 18.34.100, 18.38.050-18.38.100, 18.39.100, 18.39.130, 18.44.010-18.44.030, 18.46.030 to reflect revisions to Title 16; repealing and reenacting CMC Chapter 18.42 “Site Plan Review” to streamline the site plan review process and provide a hearing and review process for suspended or revoked site plan approval; repealing 18.33.070 “Lot Coverage,” 18.76.070 “Building Permit”, and 18.80.020 “Building Permit-Scope and Validity.”

Schaefer had no further comments from what was discussed at the last meeting, but she had an amendment to offer.

M/Schaefer S/Guard to amend Section 3 of the ordinance by deleting the referenced Code sections and replacing them with the corresponding sections in the proposed Title 16, which are as follows: 16.10.020 “Adoption of Cordova Building Codes” $300 16.30.010 “Building permit required” $300 16.30.060(B) “Stop Work order-Authority” $300

Mayor Allison asked the Clerk to explain what happened here. Bourgeois said upon drafting and redrafting this Title 16 a few times, this section outlining the appropriate pieces of the new Title 16 that need to be cited in the minor offense fine schedule part of code (section 1.28.085) was overlooked when the final draft was completed and these need to be changed to appropriately cite the correct
14. Resolution 07-22-20 A resolution of the Council of the City of Cordova, Alaska supporting and placing the highest priority on repairs to the Copper River Highway and urging the State of Alaska to fund such repairs

M/Schaefer S/Guard to approve Resolution 07-22-20 A resolution of the Council of the City of Cordova, Alaska supporting and placing the highest priority on repairs to the Copper River Highway and urging the State of Alaska to fund such repairs. She appreciates Council putting this on tonight, also the letter from Leif Stavig – she is in full support. Guard, Bailer, Meyer and Sherman also said they support this.

Vote on the motion: 5 yeas, 0 nays, 2 absent (Carpenter, Jones). Motion was approved.

Mayor Allison reverted to the Guest Speaker item, as the guest speaker had arrived at the meeting. Westing discussed “defense of life and property” laws – they are specific as to when it is appropriate encouraged citizens to know the rules. She suggested that citizens should do the following: 1) make their neighborhoods unattractive for bears; 2) communicate about bear concerns in a productive way – to City Police (if immediate public safety risk exists), to ADF&G (if a bear problem could be developing); 3) support law enforcement – shooting in neighborhoods is an extreme risk, leave the area so officers can secure it; 4) support City’s efforts to secure trash – use the baler – generous hours – don’t complain about heavy lids (bear-proof dumpsters), brainstorm innovative ways to make them work. She suggested Council could: support law enforcement, support refuse department, improve trash security (possible code changes to increase rules/requirements and enforcement), advise/educate the public.

M. Unfinished Business - none

N. New & Miscellaneous Business

15. Council action to protest or waive protest for the transfer of a liquor license from Cannery Row, Inc. to RF Hospitality, LLC

M/Schaefer S/Guard to waive protest of the transfer of the transfer of liquor license #954, from Cannery Row, Inc. to RF Hospitality, LLC. Schaefer said she sees no reason to protest. Guard agreed. Bailer and Sherman – no comment.

Vote on the motion: 4 yeas, 0 nays, 2 absent (Carpenter, Jones), 1 conflicted (Meyer). Motion was approved.

16. Pending Agenda, CIP List, Calendar, Elected & Appointed Officials lists

Mayor Allison said – the Clerk said she would start advertising the 2 seats on Harbor Commission. Guard said maybe we could have an annual work session or some mention of bears and how to deal with garbage seasonally – maybe approximately May 1 each year – Clerk said she’d put that on PA. Clerk and Manager said we could cancel the second July meeting, currently it looks light agenda-wise, if ok with City Council. Council was fine with that plan, so next regular meeting would be August 3 – special meetings could be called if items arise requiring timely Council action.

O. Audience Participation - none

P. Council Comments

Meyer appreciated the bear report and information – she hoped the public listened or would listen to the good ideas thrown out there. Guard also thanked for the bear presentation and a huge shout out to Planning Department and Planning Commission for getting Title 16 hashed out.
Schaefer also thanked for bear presentation and the hard work of staff – she suggested ideas for trash in the summer months – said it is difficult for a lot of people to secure trash until pick-up day if they do not have a garage.

Q. Executive Session – none
R. Adjournment
M/Guard S/Schaefer to adjourn the meeting.
Hearing no objection Mayor Allison adjourned the meeting at 8:01 pm.

Approved: August 3, 2022

Attest: ________________________________
Susan Bourgeois, CMC, City Clerk
AGENDA ITEM 6
City Council Meeting Date: 8/3/2022
CITY COUNCIL COMMUNICATION FORM

FROM: Duncan Chisholm, Director Parks & Recreation
DATE: 7/14/2022
ITEM: Disposal of Surplus City Vehicles and Equipment
NEXT STEP: Majority voice vote

Ordinance: ___, Resolution: ___x___, Motion: ___, Information: ____

I. REQUEST OR ISSUE: Approval of Resolution 08-22-21 acknowledging the disposal of surplus City owned vehicles and equipment in June 2022.

II. RECOMMENDED ACTION / NEXT STEP: Approval of Resolution Suggested motion:
I move to approve Resolution 08-22-21 a resolution of the Council of the City of Cordova, Alaska acknowledging the disposal of surplus City vehicles and equipment in June 2022.

III. FISCAL IMPACTS:
- Cost of advertising: $100
- Revenue generated: $18,459.25

Proceeds from the sale of surplus property shall be returned to the appropriate fund.

IV. BACKGROUND INFORMATION: Staff have recently completed a process as prescribed in 5.14.020 for a number of items which have been deemed by City staff as being no longer needed or useable. All the listed property in the surplus sale is obsolete, broken, unreliable, or excessively costly to continue to operate.
Chapter 5.14 SALE OF CITY PERSONAL PROPERTY

5.14.010 Disposal authority.

The council may by motion authorize the disposal of any property or equipment the estimated market value of which is one thousand dollars or less.

(Ord. 872 (part), 2000).


Sales of property, material or equipment the estimated value of which is over one thousand dollars shall be as follows:

A. By advertising for a period not less than fourteen days prior to date of sale. Advertising shall be in two consecutive issues of the local newspaper, a notice on the bulletin board in the City Hall, and in one other public place.

B. Bids shall be sealed bids and accompanied by a deposit of not less than ten percent of the amount bid.

C. No conditions of sale shall be considered except payment in full within seventy-two hours after acceptance of bid. Deposits of the three highest bidders will be held seventy-two hours or until the balance is paid on the bid of first successful bidder. If bid is not completed, sale shall be made to next highest bid or if otherwise acceptable.

D. No bid may be withdrawn subsequent to the opening of bids, and in the event a successful bidder does not complete the purchase, the deposit shall become the property of the city as liquidated damages.

(Ord. 872 (part), 2000).

5.14.030 Advertisement.

All advertisements shall contain the following information:

A. Reference to this chapter;

B. Object offered for sale;

C. Reference to sealing of bids;

D. Deadline for submission of sealed bids;

E. Amount of deposit on bid;

F. Date and place of opening.

Such shall be in substantially the following form:

Pursuant to Title 5, Chapter 5.14 of the Code of the City of Cordova, the City of Cordova offers for sale and will accept sealed bids on ____ (object) ____ until 5:____ P.M. on ____ (date) ____ at the office of the City Clerk.

1Cross reference(s)—For charter provisions on sales of city property, see Charter §§ 5-16 and 5.17.
All bids must be accompanied by a deposit of at least 10% of the total amount bid. Bids shall be publicly opened and read at ___ P.M. on ___ (date) ___ in City Hall. Final acceptance of the successful bid shall be at such time as the Council shall determine on the above date or later.

(Signed)

City Manager or City Clerk

(Ord. 872 (part), 2000).

5.14.040 One bid per bidder.

No bidder may submit more than one bid on any object to be sold.

(Ord. 872 (part), 2000).

5.14.050 Basis on which property is sold.

All property, material, or equipment are sold on an "as is-where is" basis, and no guarantee of any sort, express or implied, by a city official or employee of the city shall be binding upon the city. Bidder shall inspect the offered object in his own manner, and the submitting of the bid shall be conclusive that he has satisfied himself as to the condition and location of the object bid on.

(Ord. 872 (part), 2000).

5.14.060 Acceptance or rejection of bids.

The city reserves the right to reject any and all bids and to accept the bid which in its opinion is most advantageous to the city even though such bid is not among the three highest. The council shall at the time of bid award determine those bids which are acceptable and on which deposits will be held seventy-two hours and authorize the return of deposits to the other bidders.

(Ord. 872 (part), 2000).

5.14.070 Sale when no bid received.

Any material, equipment or property that has been put up for bid in the manner set forth in this chapter at least twice and which has received no bid acceptable to the council, may be sold thereafter by the city manager with approval of the city council.

(Ord. 872 (part), 2000).

5.14.080 Reference to chapter—Familiarity with provisions required.

All advertisements and sales agreements shall refer to this chapter, and it shall be the obligation of the bidder to familiarize himself with the provisions of the rules set forth in this chapter.

(Ord. 872 (part), 2000).
CITY OF CORDOVA, ALASKA
RESOLUTION 08-22-21

A RESOLUTION OF THE COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF CORDOVA, ALASKA,
ACKNOWLEDGING THE JUNE 2022 SURPLUS VEHICLE AND EQUIPMENT SALE
AND APPROVING THE BID RESULTS

WHEREAS, a surplus vehicle and equipment sale was conducted in accordance with the City
of Cordova City Code Chapter 5.14 Sale of City Property; and

WHEREAS, the June 2022 Surplus Vehicles and Equipment Sale Invitation to Bid was
advertised in the Cordova Times, on May 27 and June 3, 2022, sent to two plans rooms in the State
and posted on the City of Cordova website and in a number of locations around the City; and

WHEREAS, there were 14 items included on the list and sealed bids were due by 5:00 p.m.
on Friday June 17, 2022 in the City Clerk’s Office; and

WHEREAS, there were 10 bidders who submitted a total of 25 bids on 11 items available for
sale; and

WHEREAS, The City Manager shall reevaluate the value of those items not bid upon and if
found to meet the criteria of Cordova City Code 5.14.070, the City Manager may authorize the
disposal of those items through non-competitive methods.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Council of the City of Cordova, Alaska,
hereby acknowledges the surplus vehicles and equipment bid results attached as Exhibit A for the
June 2022 Surplus Vehicle & Equipment Sale.

PASSED AND APPROVED THIS 3rd DAY OF AUGUST 2022

______________________________
David Allison, Mayor

ATTEST:

______________________________
Susan Bourgeois, CMC, City Clerk
# EXHIBIT A: City of Cordova Surplus Vehicles & Equipment Bid List June 2022

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item #</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Bid Name</th>
<th>Bid Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1990 Blue Bird School Bus. TC2000</td>
<td>Charity Schandel</td>
<td>$1,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1995 GMC G3500 1 ton Van 8 Cylinders</td>
<td>NONE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2000 Ford F250 Super Duty P/U 4WD 8 Cylinders</td>
<td>NONE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2001 Genie Z45/25 boom lift</td>
<td>Donald Sjostedt</td>
<td>$3,650.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>XXXXX</td>
<td>$1,625.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>XXXXX</td>
<td>$1,856.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>XXXXX</td>
<td>$2,250.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2003 Ford F550 Super Duty P/U 2WD 10 Cylinders</td>
<td>NONE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1997 Mack MR MR600S 6 Cylinders Dumpster Truck</td>
<td>Sheridan Joyce</td>
<td>$2,826.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>1999 Bobcat 763 Skid Steer Loader.</td>
<td>XXXXX</td>
<td>$556.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>XXXXX</td>
<td>$1,126.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Jason Davis</td>
<td>$3,501.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>2005 Chevrolet Silverado 2500HD 4WD 8 Cylinders</td>
<td>Diana Riedel</td>
<td>$575.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>XXXXX</td>
<td>$200.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Seller</td>
<td>Amount</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>2007 Peterbilt Dumpster Truck 320</td>
<td>Sheridan Joyce</td>
<td>$578.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Rhino PD-140 Heavy Duty Pneumatic Post Driver</td>
<td>XXXXX</td>
<td>$101.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>XXXXX</td>
<td>$250.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bill Howard</td>
<td>$353.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Unknown Year &amp; Model Vehicle Tow Dolly.</td>
<td>XXXXX</td>
<td>$33.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bill Howard</td>
<td>$551.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Ramsey 20 Ton Hydraulic Winch</td>
<td>Sheridan Joyce</td>
<td>$25.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>1997 Ford CF8000 Elgin Eagle Street Sweeper</td>
<td>XXXXX</td>
<td>$501.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mitchell McGraw</td>
<td>$1,200.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>2006 RamVac. CM3600 Trailer Mounted Vacuum</td>
<td>Mitchell McGraw</td>
<td>$4,200.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>XXXXX</td>
<td>$930.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>XXXXX</td>
<td>$255.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A RESOLUTION OF THE COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF CORDOVA, ALASKA
SUPPORTING THE ALASKA DOT&PF WHITSHED ROAD AND PEDESTRIAN
IMPROVEMENTS PROJECT WHICH PROVIDES PEDESTRIAN ACCOMMODATIONS
AND STORMWATER SYSTEM UPGRADES ALONG WHITSHED FROM COPPER RIVER
HIGHWAY TO ORCA INLET DRIVE

WHEREAS, the project is needed because Whitshed Road is narrow and provides no dedicated
and improved shoulders which requires non-motorized users to share the paved roadway with vehicular
traffic; and

WHEREAS, Whitshed Road is the only road in and out of the area; and

WHEREAS, existing drainage is inadequate and undersized causing failures in some area; and

WHEREAS, the project will create a safe six-foot-wide to eight-foot-wide dedicated pedestrian
and bike path linking an existing sidewalk along Copper River Highway to the Odiak Camper Park, and
the baseball/softball field and multi-use field that makeup the Orca Inlet Recreation Area; and

WHEREAS, the project will reduce the occurrence of stormwater sheet flowing across the road
surface thus improving driver safety.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the Council of the City of Cordova, Alaska,
continues to support the Whitshed Road and Pedestrian Improvements Project and supports the design
study report as submitted.

PASSED AND APPROVED THIS 3rd DAY OF AUGUST 2022

Mayor, David Allison

Attest:

City Clerk, Susan Bourgeois
DESIGN APPROVAL

WHITESHED ROAD AND PEDESTRIAN IMPROVEMENTS

PROJECT NO. NFHWY00129 / 0837004

Requested by: ____________________________________________________________
Russell Johnson, P.E.
Engineering Manager
Northern Region

Design Approval Granted: ______________________________________________________
Sarah E. Schacher, P.E.
Preconstruction Engineer
Northern Region

Distribution: NR Design Directive 20-01 Distribution
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INTRODUCTION/HISTORY

The Alaska Department of Transportation & Public Facilities (Department) in cooperation with the Alaska Division of the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) is reconstructing Point Whitshed Road to add pedestrian accommodations from the intersection with the Copper River Highway to the intersection with Orca Inlet Drive (approximately 0.8 miles). See the following Figure 3 for project location.

Point Whitshed Road is a curvy, narrow, paved, two-lane, two-way, undivided, rural major collector. The road generally leads southwest away from the Copper River Highway along the south side of Orca Inlet and ends at Hartney Bay (approximately 6.8 miles in length). It passes through mountainous terrain as it winds along the coast. Several driveways along the project corridor consist of steep uphill and downhill grades. Numerous residential and commercial properties rely on Point Whitshed Road as their only route to the City of Cordova. No alternate routes exist.

The paved top width on Point Whitshed Road within the project limits is 22-feet which allows for two 11-foot vehicular travel lanes with no shoulders between existing steep topographic features on both sides of the roadway.

Figure 1: Example mountainous road pavement width with steep topographic features on both sides of the roadway. (source: DOT&PF file photo, Point Whitshed Road MP ~0.4, 2019)
Figure 2: Miniature rock slide (right) as an example of ditch infill.
(source: DOT&PF file photo, Point Whitshed Road MP ~0.6, 2019)

Point Whitshed Road was last resurfaced over its full length in 2004-2005. In 2015 the road was resurfaced between the Copper River Highway and Milepost 3. Neither of those projects addressed existing drainage deficiencies such as failing or undersized culverts.

Longitudinal roadside drainage facilities, where present, consist of minimal depth vee-ditches on the uphill (mountain) side of the road. Ditch depth is limited in some places due to shallow bedrock. In some areas ditches accumulate loose, sloughing soil and aggregate detritus from adjacent backslopes, requiring them to be cleaned/excavated a few times a year to re-establish drainage. See Figure 2.

Failing and undersized drainage culverts and infilled ditches causes surface water to sheet flow across the roadway surface in some areas, creating potential vehicular hydroplaning and roadway sheet icing hazards.

The narrow road Right-of-Way combined with the exceptionally steep rock topography beyond the paved road surface limits the physical room to fit new pedestrian accommodations and accommodate construction activities. Construction expertise is needed to develop constructible design. The Department has chosen to utilize the Construction Manager General Contractor (CMGC) project delivery method. The CMGC will assist the Department with identifying impact areas, estimating preliminary costs, provide constructability consultation, construction phasing and traffic control in support the development of the project’s environmental document and final design.
PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The purpose of the project is to improve safety by providing accommodations for non-motorized traffic along the corridor. The project is needed because Point Whitshed Road is narrow with no dedicated shoulders. The lack of shoulders combined with the steep topography causes non-motorized users to share the existing 11-ft vehicle lanes or forces them to trek off the paved roadway.

Project work includes the following items:
- Acquiring right-of-way and resolving existing encroachments in the right-of-way
- Adjusting the road’s horizontal and vertical alignments to minimize impacts to surrounding properties
- Re-grading and paving the roadway
- Relocating and/or re-grading driveways and paving approaches
- Relocating utilities
- Replacing AVC sensors
- Improving drainage
- Constructing a shared use path for non-motorized traffic
- Updating signage and applying painted traffic markings
DESIGN STANDARDS

The project will be designed according to the following standards:

- State of Alaska, DOT&PF *Highway Preconstruction Manual* (HPCM)

The proposed project design speed is 30 MPH for the first 700 lineal feet (to station 8+00), and then 40 mph thereafter. Terrain within the project limits is generally mountainous even though the beginning and end of the project contain locally rolling terrain.

See Appendix A for design criteria and design designation.

DESIGN EXCEPTIONS AND DESIGN WAIVERS

There are no design exceptions or design waivers.

DESIGN ALTERNATIVES

To reduce project construction costs, the following design elements have been dismissed:

1. **Separated Path.** Constructing a 4-foot wide concrete valley gutter between the road shoulder and shared use path has been eliminated. This reduces the roadway width, which reduces concrete and embankment fill volumes.

2. **Soldier Pile and MSE retaining walls.** Instead of using Soldier Pile and MSE retaining walls, the project proposes to construct steepened (1.5H:1V) “shot rock” embankment fill slopes.

3. **Continuous Illumination.** Constructing continuous street illumination along the project corridor is not required and has been eliminated. The project will retain the existing Copper River Highway and Orca Inlet Road intersection lighting.

PREFERRED DESIGN ALTERNATIVE

Refer to Typical Section for the preferred design alternative.

3R ANALYSIS

This section is not applicable; this is not a 3R project requiring 3R analysis.
TRAFFIC ANALYSIS

The project design designation found in Appendix A indicates the average annual daily traffic (AADT) in 2015 was 1260 vehicles per day, and the projected traffic count for 2045 is estimated to be 1700 vehicles per day. Analysis of crash data shows no apparent accident clusters or crash patterns.

HORIZONTAL/VERTICAL ALIGNMENT

The existing horizontal road alignment is curvy and the existing vertical alignment is relatively flat. The project will generally follow the existing vertical alignment. To minimize impacts to adjacent properties, the project will make adjustments to the horizontal alignment while generally following the existing vertical alignment.

Road centerline grades and horizontal and vertical curves will meet current design standards for a 30 MPH design speed the first 700 lineal feet of the project, and 40 MPH thereafter.

TYPICAL SECTION(S)

The Whitshed Road typical section is a 2 lane paved roadway having 11-foot wide vehicle lanes with 1-foot shoulders. The right (ocean) side of the road will have a 6’ to 8’ wide pedestrian/bicycle shared use path separated from the road shoulder by concrete curb & gutter. The path width will be 6-feet wide in areas where handrails are required for safety.

Embankment fore-slopes and ditch back-slopes:

a. Project left (mountain side) fore-slopes will nominally be 4H:1V and tie into a 4-foot wide flat bottom ditch. Ditch back-slopes will vary between 0.75H:1V and 3H:1V. Besides the ditch providing drainage, it’s also designed to catch rock-falls to minimize the risk of rocks from encroaching into vehicle travel lanes. Where warranted, wire rope netting will be placed on steep ditch back-slopes to mitigate rock-fall risks/hazards.

b. Project right (ocean side) fore-slopes will vary between 1.5H:1V to 4H:1V. In areas constrained by steep topography and/or Right-of-Way limits, the project will construct steepened 1.5H:1V embankment fill slopes using “shot rock” material.

Figure 4: Typical Section
PAVEMENT DESIGN

The pavement design is presented in Appendix C. Two pavement structures for the road and shared use path have been developed and approved by the Regional Materials Engineer:

1. Pulverizing the existing asphalt pavement to create a Crushed Asphalt Base Course in areas where the proposed horizontal and vertical road alignment generally matches existing
2. Using Aggregate Base Course where the road alignment and proposed separated shared use path are outside the existing paved roadway limits

The most cost effective pavement structure will be determined and chosen by the CMGC team.

PRELIMINARY BRIDGE LAYOUT

There are no bridges within the proposed project limits.

RIGHT-OF-WAY REQUIREMENTS

During 1935, the Federal Agency, US Bureau of Public Roads received the original Whitshed Road Right-of-Way (ROW) interest from the Copper River & Northwestern Railway Company. In 1959, the ROW was conveyed to the Department through the 1959 Alaska Omnibus Act. Over time since its original construction, the Whitshed Road alignment has moved and is not centered or contained entirely inside the existing road ROW limits. In a few areas, portions of the road extends outside the ROW limits.

Recent survey and property title research has revealed mistakes have been made in the past. These mistakes have created situations where existing subdivision lots overlap the Whitshed Road ROW, creating ROW encroachments. All ROW encroachments within the project limits will be resolved and/or permitted prior to construction.

ROW acquisition will be required and is anticipated to be a mix of fee simple and easement interest depending on underlying land status. Strip acquisitions are the primary acquisition type, no full acquisitions are anticipated. Temporary Construction Easements and Permits will be acquired, as necessary, to provide room for construction activities and to transition existing driveways to match/tie into Whitshed Road. See Appendix E for the Preliminary Right-of-Way Map.

MAINTENANCE CONSIDERATIONS

The City of Cordova and Department have entered into an approved maintenance agreement for the project. In summary:

1. The Department owns and will continue to maintain Point Whitshed Road
2. The City of Cordova will have maintenance responsibilities for the new pedestrian accommodation. This includes maintaining the:
   a. Path and its surface, including snow removal
   b. Path’s concrete curbs and pedestrian handrails
Department maintenance requirements will decrease due to widening and deepening ditches along with replacing failing and undersized culverts to provide more drainage capacity and storage of sediment. In addition the proposed rock-fall mitigation will reduce/eliminate the need to periodically remove rocks and derbies off the driving surface. There is an increase in maintenance requirements related to adding drainage catch basins and manholes. There is also a slight increase in lane-miles maintenance responsibility. The Department currently maintains 1.38 lane-miles inside the project corridor. The project will add 1-foot shoulders to each side of Point Whitshed Road which equals and adds 0.13 lane miles of maintenance responsibility to the Department for a total of 1.51 lane-miles.

Constructing the new path will add 0.50 lane-miles of maintenance responsibility to the City of Cordova.

MATERIAL SOURCES

A substantial volume of excavated material is anticipated to be generated from new cut slopes during roadway realignment near the end of the project. This material will be incorporated as fill for constructing and widening the roadway.

All other material sources will be contractor furnished. Commercial and/or private material sources are available in the project vicinity.

UTILITY RELOCATION & COORDINATION

Underground utilities are present in the project area:
- City of Cordova (CCC); water and sewer
- Cordova Electric Cooperative (CEC); electric
- Cordova Telephone Cooperative (CTC); communications
- GCI Communication Corporation (GCI); cable

Extensive underground electric, communication and cable TV conflicts are expected along the project corridor due to proposed drainage ditch widening and grading. A new duct bank will be constructed under the new shared use path for relocated electric, communication, and cable television utilities. The duct bank will be constructed while existing utilities remain in service to avoid the need for temporary utilities during construction. It also minimizes outage disruptions by limiting the time required to cut over new utilities to existing services.

The intent of the current design is to avoid major water and sewer line conflicts and limit them to minor water line valve box and sewer manhole lid elevation adjustments.

ACCESS CONTROL FEATURES

The Copper River Highway and Point Whitshed Road are not access controlled facilities. No changes to access control are proposed with this project.

Common access to adjacent property along the Copper River Highway and Point Whitshed Road is controlled by the driveway permit process.
PEDESTRIAN/BICYCLE (ADA) PROVISIONS

Existing pedestrian facilities on Point Whitshed Road in the project area consist of a 4-foot wide sidewalk with curb & gutter located on the north corner of the Copper River Highway/Whitshed Road intersection. The sidewalk terminates within the intersection’s radius return and the existing curb and gutter terminate 16 feet further along/down Whitshed Road. No ADA curb ramps exist at this intersection.

The project proposes to construct a 6’ to 8’ wide ADA compliant paved shared use path along the right (ocean) side of Whitshed Road within the project corridor. The path will be adjacent to Whitshed Road, separated by a 1-foot wide paved shoulder and a 2-foot wide concrete curb and gutter. The curb and gutter will provide visual delineation and tactile separation between the roadway and path in addition to accommodating surface drainage. Safety railing will be constructed along the outer edge of the path in areas where embankment steepness and heights warrant its use. The path width will be reduced to 6-feet where there is safety railing. See Typical Section Figure 4.

SAFETY IMPROVEMENTS

Safety improvements include the following:
- Addition of an 8-ft wide, shared use path to accommodate non-motorized users so they no longer have to share vehicle travel lanes with vehicles
- Minor horizontal road centerline realignment near end of project to provide better sight stopping distance
- Rock-fall ditch and netting on project left to mitigate rocks falling onto the road
- Providing clear zones and constructing traversable and/or recoverable embankment slopes
- Removing existing irregularly-spaced roadway illumination along the project corridor eliminates the visual hazard of mixing light and dark areas along the road corridor

INTELLIGENT TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM FEATURES

The project will replace sensors in the roadway for the traffic count and classification system that currently exists near the Meals Water Treatment Plant on the south side of the roadway at approximate MP 0.31. By definition in the HPCM, this is a non-significant ITS project and a Systems Engineering Analysis (SEA) is not required.

DRAINAGE

Cordova is within a maritime climate with moderate temperatures and abundant precipitation. The average annual temperature is 42.5⁰F with an annual low of 37.5⁰F and annual high of 47.6⁰F. The average annual precipitation is 148.4 inches. Groundwater is relatively shallow recorded between 4.5 and 12 feet below the ground surface that flows generally through fractured rock.

Significant runoff occurs during heavy rains from the higher elevation rock slopes on the north (mountain) side of the road. Numerous steep outfall channels, discharge large flows and sediment that occasionally overwhelm existing ditch and culvert capacities. The amount of
sediment accumulated in ditches necessitates M&O to excavate ‘Bell Holes’ or sumps to capture the sediment and facilitate ditch drainage through cross culverts. The project will increase ditch and culvert capacities along with stabilizing rock faces to reduce the amount of loose debris (sediment) transported towards culvert inlets.

Numerous existing culverts are failing and/or undersized. The culverts are primarily made of galvanized steel and none of them are identified as fish passage. All culverts will be removed and replaced. Their locations and sizes will be designed to accommodate changes in roadway geometry and driveway approaches. New catch basins and concrete curb & gutter will be designed and constructed mitigate excess volumes of storm water runoff and to delineate the new pedestrian walkway.

The City of Cordova participates in the National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP) and the project lies within a regulated floodplain in Zone X, Area of Minimal Flood Hazards. The project is anticipated to not involve significant encroachments and should not support incompatible floodplain development.

SOIL CONDITIONS

A foundation geology investigation was performed in November of 2020 by the Alaska DOT&PF Northern Region Materials Section. The investigation included test holes drilled at existing embankment and potential retaining wall locations, rockfall analysis and outcrop mapping, and a capacitively-couple resistivity (CCR) survey. General surface conditions in the embankment fill section of Whitshed Road at the project location were characterized as fills between 1 to 5 foot thickness consisting of gravel with silt, sand, cobbles and boulders. General subsurface conditions were characterized as unfrozen glacial till: cobbles and boulders with a dense matrix of gravel, sand, and silt. Groundwater was encountered between 4.5 and 12 feet below the ground surface in all test holes. Permafrost and seasonally frozen ground was not observed in any test holes, but seasonal frost may be expected during winter months. 4 separate typical soil profiles were generated from the test hole data and can be found in the draft foundation geology report.

EROSION AND SEDIMENT CONTROL

The proposed project will include an Erosion and Sediment Control Plan (ESCP). This plan will describe Best Management Practices (BMPs) that may be used during construction and serve as a guide for Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) development.

The primary potential for erosion will occur in excavated areas where vegetation cover is disrupted due to construction of roadway embankments and ditches. Slopes will be seeded, covered with durable matting or rolled erosion control product (RECP), or covered with rock blankets to provide temporary and permanent erosion protection.

Perimeter control, inlet/outlet control at culverts, soil stabilization, construction scheduling, and other measures as described in the ESCP will be used as appropriate to control storm water discharge.
ENVIRONMENTAL COMMITMENTS

For this proposed project, only one environmental commitment has been made:

- Mechanized vegetation clearing will be avoided during the recommended migratory bird nesting window for the project area (May 1 – July 15) unless a mitigative BMP is submitted by the contractor and approved by DOT&PF.

No specific mitigation measures have been committed to. A copy of the environmental document signature approval page may be found in Appendix B.

WORK ZONE TRAFFIC CONTROL

During construction and before disrupting traffic, the construction contractor will be required to develop an approved temporary traffic control plan for each work zone. The plan(s) will be developed to provide safety for motorists, bicyclists, pedestrians, workers, and emergency vehicles as they pass through the work zone. Each plan will identify and provide adequate warning, delineation, and channelization to assist in guiding road users through the work zone.

This project is not considered significant for traffic control in accordance with HPCM Section 1400.2.

VALUE ENGINEERING

Value engineering was considered but will not be conducted for this project. Collaboration with the CMGC contractor will obtain all desired outcomes from the Value Engineering (VE) process. In accordance with DOT&PF Policy and Procedure 05.01.030, this project does not meet requirement criteria for a VE analysis.

COST ESTIMATE

The estimated costs for this project are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Design</td>
<td>$2,225,740.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilities</td>
<td>$1,500,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right of Way</td>
<td>$1,000,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>$9,000,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Cost of Project</strong></td>
<td><strong>$13,725,740.00</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX A

DESIGN CRITERIA AND DESIGN DESIGNATION
### Project Design Criteria

**Project Name:** Whitshed Road and Pedestrian Improvements  
**Stations:** 1+00 to 8+00  
**New Construction/Reconstruction:** Yes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Functional Classification:</th>
<th>Rural Major Collector</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Design Year:</td>
<td>2045</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design Year ADT:</td>
<td>1700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DHV (year):</td>
<td>235 (2045)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent Trucks:</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pavement Design Year:</td>
<td>2035</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terrain:</td>
<td>Mountainous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design Speed:</td>
<td>30 mph</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lane Width:</td>
<td>11 ft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shoulder Width:</td>
<td>Outside: 1 ft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cross Slope:</td>
<td>2.5% (single plane - no crown)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superelevation:</td>
<td>6% max</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Min. Radius of Horizontal Curvature:</td>
<td>Using Method 2 (AASHTO Green Book) where $e_{\text{max}} = 6%$ and $f_{\text{max}} = 0.20$, then $R_{\text{min}} = 231$ ft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum Allowable Grade:</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stopping Sight Distance:</td>
<td>200 ft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vertical Clearance:</td>
<td>20'-6&quot; (min) to new or relocated overhead utilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design Loading Structural Capacity:</td>
<td>HL-93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridge Width:</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Min. Allowable Grade:</td>
<td>0.3% along Curb &amp; Gutter; 0.78% at Level Cross-Slope</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Min. K-Value for Vert. Curves:</td>
<td>Sag: 37, Crest: 19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passing Sight Distance:</td>
<td>500 ft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surface Treatment:</td>
<td>T/W: HMA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Side Slope Ratios:</td>
<td>Foreslopes: 2:1 (H:V) or flatter Backslopes: per Geologic/Geotech. rec.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree of Access Control:</td>
<td>Driveway Permit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median Treatment:</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illumination:</td>
<td>Intersections of Copper River Hwy &amp; Orca Inlet Rd. Continuous street lighting if construction budget allows.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lateral Offset to Obstruction:</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curb Usage and Type:</td>
<td>Standard curb and gutter with transition to 4-ft wide v-gutter between shoulder and separated path</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bicycle Provisions:</td>
<td>8-ft side path</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrian Provisions:</td>
<td>8-ft side path</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Misc. Criteria:</td>
<td>Clear Zone: fill slopes 6:1 (H:V) or flatter - 12-14 ft; fill slopes from 4:1 up to 6:1 (H:V) - 14-16 ft</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Shaded criteria are commonly referred to as FHWA controlling criteria for NHS high-speed roadways (design speed >= to 50 mph). For NHS low-speed roadways (design speed < 50 mph), the only two FHWA controlling criteria which apply are design speed and design loading structural capacity. For NHS routes only, controlling criteria must meet the minimums established in the Green Book, unless a design exception is approved. For all other routes, all criteria must meet the minimums established in the Alaska Highway Preconstruction Manual, unless a Design Waiver is approved.**

---

**Design Criteria marked with a "#" do not meet minimums and must have a Design Exception(s) and/or Design Waiver(s) approved. See the Design Study Report for Design Exception/Design Waiver approval(s) and approved design criteria values.**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Name:</th>
<th>Whitshed Road and Pedestrian Improvements</th>
<th>Stations 8+00 to 42+00</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☐ New Construction/Reconstruction</td>
<td>☐ 3R</td>
<td>☐ PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Other:</td>
<td>NFHWY00129 / 0837004</td>
<td>NHS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Functional Classification:</td>
<td>Rural Major Collector</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design Year:</td>
<td>2045</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design Year ADT:</td>
<td>1700</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid Design Period ADT (year):</td>
<td>1465 (2030)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DHV (year):</td>
<td>235 (2045)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Directional Split:</td>
<td>55/45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent Trucks:</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equivalent Axle Loading:</td>
<td>156,220</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pavement Design Year:</td>
<td>2035</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design Vehicle:</td>
<td>WB-40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terrain:</td>
<td>Mountainous</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Roadways:</td>
<td>One, two-way undivided</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design Speed:</td>
<td>40 mph</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lane Width:</td>
<td>11 ft</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shoulder Width:</td>
<td>Outside: 1 ft</td>
<td>Inside: n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cross Slope:</td>
<td>2.5% (single plane - no crown)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superelevation:</td>
<td>6% max</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Min. Radius of Horizontal Curvature:</td>
<td>Using Method 2 (AASHTO Green Book) where $e_{max} = 6%$ and $f_{max} = 0.16$, then $R_{min} = 485$ ft</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum Allowable Grade:</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stopping Sight Distance:</td>
<td>305 ft</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vertical Clearance:</td>
<td>20'-6&quot; (min) to new or relocated overhead utilities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design Loading Structural Capacity:</td>
<td>HL-93</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridge Width:</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Min. Allowable Grade:</td>
<td>0.3% along Curb &amp; Gutter; 0.78% at Level Cross-Slope</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passing Sight Distance:</td>
<td>600 ft</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surface Treatment:</td>
<td>T/W: HMA</td>
<td>Shoulders: HMA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Side Slope Ratios:</td>
<td>Foreslopes: 2:1 (H:V) or flatter</td>
<td>Backslopes: per Geologic/Geotech. rec.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree of Access Control:</td>
<td>Driveway Permit</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median Treatment:</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illumination:</td>
<td>Intersections of Copper River Hwy &amp; Orca Inlet Rd. Continuous street lighting if construction budget allows</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lateral Offset to Obstruction:</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curb Usage and Type:</td>
<td>4-ft wide v-gutter between shoulder and separated path with transition to Standard curb and gutter</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bicycle Provisions:</td>
<td>8-ft side path</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrian Provisions:</td>
<td>8-ft side path</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Misc. Criteria:</td>
<td>Clear Zone: fill slopes 6.1 (H:V) or flatter - 12-14 ft; fill slopes from 4:1 up to 6:1 (H:V) - 14-16 ft</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Proposed - Designer/Consultant:** Jacob Rahlf's  
Date: 4/30/2020

**Endorsed - Engineering Manager:** Russell Johnson, P.E.  
Date: 4/30/2020

**Approved - Preconstruction Engineer:** Sarah E. Schacher, P.E.  
Date: 5/11/2020

Shaded criteria are commonly referred to as FHWA controlling criteria for NHS high-speed roadways (design speed >= to 50 mph). For NHS low-speed roadways (design speed < 50 mph), the only two FHWA controlling criteria which apply are design speed and design loading structural capacity. For NHS routes only, controlling criteria must meet the minimums established in the Green Book, unless a design exception is approved. For all other routes, all criteria must meet the minimums established in the Alaska Highway Preconstruction Manual, unless a Design Waiver is approved.

*Design Criteria marked with a "#" do not meet minimums and must have a Design Exception(s) and/or Design Waiver(s) approved. See the Design Study Report for Design Exception/Design Waiver approval(s) and approved design criteria values.*
APPENDIX B

ENVIRONMENTAL DOCUMENT

(SIGNATURE PAGE ONLY)
V. Environmental Commitments and Mitigation Measures

window for the project area (May 1 - July 15) unless a mitigative BMP is submitted by the contractor and approved by DOT&PF.

VI. Environmental Documentation Approval

1. Do any unusual circumstances exist, as described in 23 CFR 771.117(b)? If yes, attach consultation with the NEPA Program Manager demonstrating that a CE is appropriate.

   □* □ □

2. The project meets the criteria of one of the following DOT&PF Programmatic Approvals authorized in the Nov. 13, 2017 “Chief Engineer Directive – Programmatic Categorical Exclusions”.

   • If yes, select the appropriate Programmatic Approval below, and the CE documentation form may be approved by the Regional Environmental Manager.

   • If no, the CE documentation form must be approved by a NEPA Program Manager.

   a. Programmatic Approval 1
   □

   b. Programmatic Approval 2
   □

   c. Programmatic Approval 3
   □

VII. Environmental Documentation Approval Signatures

Prepared by: ____________________________ Date: __________

[Signature] Environmental Impact Analyst

______________________________
Jill Baxter-McIntosh

[Print Name] Environmental Impact Analyst

Reviewed by: ____________________________ Date: __________

[Signature] Engineering Manager

______________________________
Russell Johnson

[Print Name] Engineering Manager

Programmatic CE

Approved by: ____________________________ Date: __________

[Signature] Regional Environmental Manager

______________________________
[Print Name] Regional Environmental Manager
VII. Environmental Documentation Approval Signatures

Non-Programmatic CE

Approval
Recommended by: ____________________________ Date: 12-30-19

[Signature] Regional Environmental Manager

Brett Nelson

[Print Name] Regional Environmental Manager

Approved by: ____________________________ Date: 1.2.20

[Signature] NEPA Program Manager

Jill Taylor

Digitally signed by Jill Taylor
Date: 2020.01.02 14:39:31 -09'00'

[Print Name] NEPA Program Manager
APPENDIX C

PAVEMENT DESIGN
Hi Travis. Thanks for getting this to me so quickly.

Interesting that 2” HMA won’t work over D-1. We’ve built a lot of well performing highways with 2”/6”, and even 1.5”/4”. I played around with your design, and I couldn’t make 2” HMA/6” D-1 work either. The new program must be more conservative than I thought.

I have approved both designs, but I did notice that **2.5” HMA over 6” D-1 does work-that would save a little.**

A thought: If you are considering using both typicals, and Contractor paves all at the same time, switching thickness is doable but not ideal. But this is all stuff that can be worked out in CMGC discussions. I think your approved designs get you across the finish line.

JC

---

Thank you Jeff for the help yesterday and all the great information in this response.

I have taken in all of your recommendations and come up with 2 pavement designs for proposed project for your review and approval.

I have also attached the EASL calculation from AKFPD software as well as the design designation for your reference in the review of these two designs.

**AKFPD#1 – 2” HMA with 4” CABC**

This design looks suitable for areas of the project where we are not changing the profile much. Sections of the project could be designated that meet this case and would be a reclaim, spread, regrade, compact, and pave situation without disturbing anything below the top 6 inches of the existing road. I didn’t include a Subbase F layer in this design for this reason. The Sub F for leveling would be added back in for widened sections. I did ad a 12” layer of Select A <10% Fines on top of the infinite layer per your recommendation.

**AKFPD#2 – 3” HMA with 6” Aggregate Base Course Grading D-1**

I could not get this design to work without failing with only 2” of HMA. It required adding an additional inch of pavement. I used a 4” as an average for the layer of Subbase F because we show 0-8” Subbase F for leveling. This design is more viable for project sections that require changes to the profile and where we are widening and wouldn’t have enough CABC to spread.

**General Comments**
After our discussion yesterday, I am not sure that it is worth the cost of mobilizing a reclaimer to the project if the amount of project that can be constructed cost effectively with CABC is not that large. We do not want the added cost of double handling the CABC (Milling it, moving it, storing it, do grade work, bring it back, etc. That being said, I also don’t like to see this material just wasted. I’d much rather see it used in the road structure as we have most likely already paid for this material once, then just hauled off project.

Having the 2 pavement designs gives us some options to discuss with CMGC partners and determine what could be the most cost effective alternative, and this may be just deciding to chunk out the pavement, and go with AKFPD#2, or maybe some combination of both depending on what section of the project we are in.

If we decide on AKFPD#2, CABC would be a more than adequate substitute for the D-1 so I agree with Jeff that we should make that optional for the Contractor.

Regarding the typ. Section cross slope (2.5% shed roof) I will let Jacob and Russ hash this out. I am told that original designer Dwayne meticulously developed this strategy for the project.

Travis

---

From: Currey, Jeff L (DOT) <jeff.currey@alaska.gov>
Sent: Wednesday, May 26, 2021 3:06 PM
To: Donovan, Travis A (DOT) <travis.donovan@alaska.gov>
Cc: Johnson, Russell M (DOT) <russell.johnson@alaska.gov>; Rahlf, Jacob L (DOT) <jacob.ralef@alaska.gov>; Berggren, Michael J (DOT) <michael.berggren@alaska.gov>; Billings, Matthew E G (DOT) <matt.billings@alaska.gov>
Subject: RE: MechDesignA.pdf

Hi Travis-as we discussed on phone, this is just a few FYIs and considerations:

First-Per new manual and AKFPD policy, a pavement design isn’t mandatory unless road is an arterial or higher class. But it doesn’t hurt to do one anyway.

Your design and analysis meets requirements, and I will approve just as it is, if you like. But I have a couple suggestions below.

Normally when I approve a pavement design, I ask for the design designation, ESAL calculations, etc. But in this case, the ESALs sound pretty reasonable (actually more than I would have guessed for 15 years), and you’re still fine on the damage numbers.

I assume the seasonal breakdown is from the default/drop-down menu for Valdez airport, which is a reasonable proxy for Cordova. I don’t have a great sense of the percentages for Cordova, but those seem reasonable. Could be that Winter is high-Winter is intended to represent the material properties when the upper embankment is well frozen, and I’m not sure how long (or even if) the upper embankment on Whitshed Road (right on the coast) freezes. And if default Winter is high, then Spring may also be high-Spring represents Break-up properties when the frozen embankment is thawing (that’s where you see maximum damage). But again, I am OK with the numbers, and if there are errors, they will tend to cancel out. And I’m not sure I have any better suggestions, without doing a bunch of legwork. I will say, at some places in NR, the default/drop-down is not very accurate and if your design is marginal, and refining those percentages can sometimes help. I’m not crazy about the algorithm used to calculate the winter & spring breakdowns.

Looking at your typical section-I’m pretty sure the Precon Manual says to use a 2% cross slope with HMA (and 3% for chipseal, high float & crushed agg surface course). The reason for this is safety-limiting the maximum slope change when top-heavy trucks cross centerline. Personally, I’d like to have the option to increase the cross-slope, for drainage reasons, on some projects, but Traffic & Safety used to say “no”. I had this debate with Steve Powers several times (and since he has retired, maybe T&S will lighten up a little?).
Your 6” CABC on top of Subbase F may not be ideal—CABC is a great choice when you can do it in place and just spread it a little, but you lose a lot of the efficiency and cost-effectiveness if you have to pick it up, haul it off then bring it back to do grade work underneath. You might specify D-1 instead, and include a note that CABC is an acceptable alternative to D-1. That would give Contractor maximum flexibility.

In your AKFPD analysis, there should probably be something better than Subgrade P200>30% underneath the Subbase F. The existing road has to be built out of something, and I’d give 10 to 1 it’s better than silt. Probably some combination of bedrock and shot rock, maybe alluvial gravel. I suggest moving your infinite Subgrade layer to the fifth row of input, and putting, say, 18” of Select A between it and Subbase F. That should reduce damage in subgrade substantially, and will help make D-1 work instead of CABC.

Your HMA layer is selected as “unmodified”—that is the correct choice for Cordova, Valdez, and other relatively warm winter locations, especially with low traffic. I don’t recall where we switch to using modified oil—maybe north of Thompson Pass, or maybe further north than that—I’ll have to check. Take-away, unless it gets colder than -15F or so, PG 52-28 (neat oil), is probably fine. At -20F, especially for prolonged time, we are typically spec’ing PG 52-40 asphalt binder, which uses the “modified” material properties (higher moduli).

Have a good one,

Jeff L. Currey, P.E.
NR Materials Engineer, DOT&PF
907-451-2040
Cell 907-750-5989

From: Donovan, Travis A (DOT) <travis.donovan@alaska.gov>
Sent: Wednesday, May 12, 2021 9:01 AM
To: Currey, Jeff L (DOT) <jeff.currey@alaska.gov>
Cc: Johnson, Russell M (DOT) <russell.johnson@alaska.gov>; Rahlfs, Jacob L (DOT) <jacob.rahlfs@alaska.gov>
Subject: MechDesignA.pdf

Greetings Mr. Currey,

Please see attached for your review my very 1st go at a pavement design for the Point Whitshed Rehab project.

Thank you,

Travis Donovan, P.E.
Engineer I
Northern Region Design
Office: 907-451-2652
travis.donovan@alaska.gov
### Whitshed Road and Pedestrian Improvements

#### Project Location: VALDEZ WSO

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Design AADT:</th>
<th>1,260</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

#### Tire Load (lbs) 4500

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Load Description:</th>
<th>Tire Press. (psi)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>X: 0</td>
<td>13.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y: 0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Load Description: ESAL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Eval Loc (in)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>X: 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y: 0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Design Loadings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Season</th>
<th>Loadings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spring</td>
<td>39,429</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer</td>
<td>39,429</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall</td>
<td>39,429</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winter</td>
<td>39,429</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>157,717</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Design Tire Press. (psi)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tire Press. (psi)</th>
<th>X: 0</th>
<th>13.5</th>
<th>Y: 0</th>
<th>0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

#### Season

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Season</th>
<th>Spring</th>
<th>Summer</th>
<th>Fall</th>
<th>Winter</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>X: 0</td>
<td>39,429</td>
<td>39,429</td>
<td>39,429</td>
<td>39,429</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y: 0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pressure (psi)</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>1200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Micro Strain</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>0.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stress (psi)</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total%</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>429</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Damage</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Layer Properties

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Layer</th>
<th>Critical Z Properties</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Air%</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thickness (in): 2</td>
<td>1.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name:</td>
<td>asphalt Concrete (Unmodified Asphalt)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use TAI:</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Asphalt Properties

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Season</th>
<th>Modulus (Ksi)</th>
<th>Poisson's Ratio</th>
<th>Tensile Micro Strain</th>
<th>Compressive Stress (psi)</th>
<th>Million Cycles to Failure</th>
<th>Past Damage (%)</th>
<th>Future Damage (%)</th>
<th>Total Damage (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spring</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>2.57</td>
<td>157,717</td>
<td>1.54</td>
<td>1.54</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>6.89</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>6.89</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winter</td>
<td>1200</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>4.26</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Total Damage

- **Total Damage:** 3.61
- **Spring:** 1.54
- **Summer:** 0.57
- **Fall:** 0.57
- **Winter:** 0.93

#### Crushed Asph. Base Course

| Thickness (in): 4 | 2.01 |
| Use TAI: | Yes |
| Name: | Crushed Asph. Base Course |

#### Thickness (in): 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Season</th>
<th>Modulus (Ksi)</th>
<th>Poisson's Ratio</th>
<th>Tensile Micro Strain</th>
<th>Compressive Stress (psi)</th>
<th>Million Cycles to Failure</th>
<th>Past Damage (%)</th>
<th>Future Damage (%)</th>
<th>Total Damage (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spring</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>74.4</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>1200</td>
<td>7.87</td>
<td>7.87</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>80.0</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>6.80</td>
<td>6.80</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>80.0</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>6.80</td>
<td>6.80</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winter</td>
<td>1200</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>60.9</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Total Damage

- **Total Damage:** 22.57
- **Spring:** 7.87
- **Summer:** 6.80
- **Fall:** 6.80
- **Winter:** 1.10

#### Select A P200<10%

| Thickness (in): 12 | 6.01 |
| Use TAI: | Yes |
| Name: | Select A P200<10% |

#### Thickness (in): 12

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Season</th>
<th>Modulus (Ksi)</th>
<th>Poisson's Ratio</th>
<th>Tensile Micro Strain</th>
<th>Compressive Stress (psi)</th>
<th>Million Cycles to Failure</th>
<th>Past Damage (%)</th>
<th>Future Damage (%)</th>
<th>Total Damage (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spring</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>21.0</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>1200</td>
<td>10.98</td>
<td>10.98</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>23.6</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>4.57</td>
<td>4.57</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>23.6</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>4.57</td>
<td>4.57</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winter</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>20.4</td>
<td>7.39</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Total Damage

- **Total Damage:** 20.65
- **Spring:** 10.98
- **Summer:** 4.57
- **Fall:** 4.57
- **Winter:** 0.53

#### Subgrade P200>30%

| Thickness (in): 0 | 18.01 |
| Use TAI: | Yes |
| Name: | Subgrade P200>30% |

#### Thickness (in): 0

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Season</th>
<th>Modulus (Ksi)</th>
<th>Poisson's Ratio</th>
<th>Tensile Micro Strain</th>
<th>Compressive Stress (psi)</th>
<th>Million Cycles to Failure</th>
<th>Past Damage (%)</th>
<th>Future Damage (%)</th>
<th>Total Damage (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spring</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>9.53</td>
<td>9.53</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>6.36</td>
<td>6.36</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>6.36</td>
<td>6.36</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winter</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>2.13</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>1.85</td>
<td>1.85</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Total Damage

- **Total Damage:** 24.10
- **Spring:** 9.53
- **Summer:** 6.36
- **Fall:** 6.36
- **Winter:** 1.85

### Critical Z Asph.

| Thickness (in): 0 | 18.01 |
| Use TAI: | Yes |
| Name: | Critical Z Asph. |

#### Critical Z Asph.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Season</th>
<th>Modulus (Ksi)</th>
<th>Poisson's Ratio</th>
<th>Tensile Micro Strain</th>
<th>Compressive Stress (psi)</th>
<th>Million Cycles to Failure</th>
<th>Past Damage (%)</th>
<th>Future Damage (%)</th>
<th>Total Damage (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spring</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>9.53</td>
<td>9.53</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>6.36</td>
<td>6.36</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>6.36</td>
<td>6.36</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winter</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>2.13</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>1.85</td>
<td>1.85</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Total Damage

- **Total Damage:** 24.10
- **Spring:** 9.53
- **Summer:** 6.36
- **Fall:** 6.36
- **Winter:** 1.85

### Total Damage

- **Total Damage:** 28.52
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## Whitshed Road and Pedestrian Improvements

**Project Number:** NFWHY00129/0837004  
**Analysis Date:** 5/26/2021  
**Design Type:** New Design  
**Designer:** Travis Donovan  
**Unit:** US Customary  
**Project Status:** All layer damages less than 100%.

### Design AADT: 1,260

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Season</th>
<th>Thickness (in)</th>
<th>Layer</th>
<th>Critical Z Coordinate (in)</th>
<th>Asphalt Properties</th>
<th>Thickness (in)</th>
<th>Use TAI</th>
<th>Total Damage</th>
<th>Past Damage (%)</th>
<th>Damage (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Air%: 5</td>
<td>Spring 350 0.30 329 0.60 6.56 6.56</td>
<td>Asphalt Concrete (Unmodified Asph)</td>
<td>2.99</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14.85</td>
<td>14.85</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Air%: 5.5</td>
<td>Summer 300 0.30 291 1.03 3.84 3.84</td>
<td>Aggregate Base P200&lt;6%</td>
<td>3.01</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14.48</td>
<td>14.48</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Air%: 5</td>
<td>Fall 300 0.30 291 1.03 3.84 3.84</td>
<td>Subbase F P200&lt;6%</td>
<td>9.01</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11.07</td>
<td>11.07</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Air%: 5</td>
<td>Winter 1200 0.30 116 6.44 0.61 0.61</td>
<td>Select A P200&lt;10%</td>
<td>13.01</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Air%: 5</td>
<td>Winter 90 0.40 12.4 255.38 0.02 0.02</td>
<td>Subgrade P200&gt;30%</td>
<td>25.01</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>37.10</td>
<td>37.10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**OK-Jeff Currey, P.E.**  
NR Mat'ls Engr  5-27-21
APPENDIX D

PRELIMINARY PLAN AND PROFILE SHEETS
APPENDIX E

PRELIMINARY RIGHT-OF-WAY MAP
NOTE: REFER TO DETAIL B ON SHEET 7 FOR DETAILS ON PARCEL THREE (3).

NOTE: AS A PART OF THIS PROJECT, ALL EXISTING BUILDINGS LOCATED ON PARCEL 3 TO BE REMOVED.

PRELIMINARY
AGENDA ITEM 10
City Council Meeting Date: 8/3/2022
CITY COUNCIL COMMUNICATION FORM

FROM: Nate Taylor, Police Chief
DATE: 7/27/2022
ITEM: Award Contract for PSB Generator
NEXT STEP: Council authorizes the City Manager to negotiate this contract

___ ORDINANCE ___ RESOLUTION
_X_ MOTION ___ INFORMATION

I. REQUEST OR ISSUE: This form constitutes the memorandum required per Code per 5.12.040 setting forth the following:

A. Identity of Contractor: Alaska Electric & Control, Inc. DBA Jewell Equipment
B. Contract Price: $86,710
C. Nature & quantity of the work that the City shall receive under the contract:

To provide a new Wacker G70 trailer mounted generator and automatic power transfer switch for the Public Safety Building.

II. RECOMMENDED ACTION / NEXT STEP: Council suggested motion “to direct the City Manager to negotiate a contract with Alaska Electric & Control DBA. Jewell Equipment of Wasilla to purchase one Wacker G70 generator and automatic power transfer switch for a sum not to exceed Eighty-Six Thousand Seven Hundred ten dollars. ($86,710)”.

III. FISCAL IMPACTS: The contract will be paid from 335-420-55010 ARPA funding and was approved by council.

IV. BACKGROUND INFORMATION: This generator will replace the public safety building backup generator which was purchased in the 1970’s and found unserviceable during the last annual inspection. This generator is critical to our ability to provide emergency dispatching service during power failures. The new generator will be trailer mounted and able to be moved during a tsunami event. Additionally,
the new generator could be easily moved to a new public safety building in the future. It was decided to source a Wacker generator as a replacement since the city already has one of these generators in service and having common equipment makes preventive maintenance and repair simpler. An invitation to bid was sent out with our specifications for the generator and transfer switch to Wacker distributors in Alaska. Jewell Equipment was the lowest bidder.

V. SUMMARY AND ALTERNATIVES: Council could choose not to approve the contract.
5.12.040 - Council approval of contracts.

No contract for supplies, services or construction which obligates the city to pay more than twenty-five thousand dollars may be executed unless the council has approved a memorandum setting forth the following essential terms of the contract:

A. The identity of the contractor;
B. The contract price;
C. The nature and quantity of the performance that the city shall receive under the contract; and
D. The time for performance under the contract.


(Ord. No. 1093, § 1, 1-4-2012)

5.12.100 - Competitive sealed bidding.

Unless otherwise authorized under this chapter or another provision of law, all city contracts for supplies, services and construction shall be awarded by competitive sealed bidding.

(Ord. 809 (part), 1998).

5.12.170 - Award to responsible bidder or proposer.

A contract award under this chapter shall be made only to a responsible bidder or proposer. The city manager shall determine whether a bidder is responsible on the basis of the following criteria:

A. The skill and experience demonstrated by the bidder in performing contracts of a similar nature;
B. The bidder's record for honesty and integrity;
C. The bidder's capacity to perform in terms of facilities, equipment, personnel and financing;
D. The past and present compliance by the bidder with laws and ordinances related to its performance under the contract; and
E. The bidder's past performance under city contracts. If the bidder has failed in any material way to perform its obligations under any contract with the city, the city manager may consider the bidder to be not responsible.
F. The bidder's past performance of financial obligations to the city. If at the time of award the bidder is delinquent, overdue or in default on the payment of any money, debt or liability to the city, the city manager shall consider the bidder to be not responsible.

(Ord. 809 (part), 1998).
AGENDA ITEM 11  
City Council Meeting Date: 3/8/22  
CITY COUNCIL COMMUNICATION FORM

FROM: Duncan Chisholm, Director Parks & Recreation
DATE: 7/21/22
ITEM: Award of RFP #22-0613 Facility Condition Assessments
NEXT STEP: Council authorizes the City Manager to negotiate this contract

I. REQUEST OR ISSUE: This form constitutes the memorandum required per Code per 5.12.040 setting forth the following:

A. Identity of Contractor: Coffman Engineers Inc.
B. Contract Price: $277,920
C. Nature & quantity of the work that the City shall receive under the contract:

The engineering firm will provide expert assessment and quantification of City facilities' current condition, required repairs, and ongoing maintenance needs. The firm will provide a comprehensive inspection and analysis of each building’s systems.

For each building / structure inspected, there will be:

- An overview of general information about the building/structure, such as its age, size, and categorization of its construction type, general condition, remaining useful life and rough order of magnitude replacement cost for the structure.

- An assessment of each major building system category. For example, a roof system may include documenting the type of roof framing, insulation system, and roof covering and quantifying their condition. Where applicable, square footages, insulation values, material types, and remaining useful life are to be provided.
• A list of current deficiencies and items requiring maintenance, prioritized by the urgency for repair.

• Rough order of magnitude cost estimates for current and forecasted repair and maintenance needs.

• Routine maintenance plans and schedules for each building/structure, including providing preventative maintenance recommendations, to include minimum standards of day-to-day upkeep and their associated costs based on industry standards (including but not limited to: ongoing building maintenance, equipment replacement, janitorial needs and staffing, basic cleaning/deep cleaning, paint, flooring replacement, lighting replacement, etc.)

• Comprehensive photographs of each building and their systems.

Systems to be inspected will vary with each building and may include but are not limited to:

2. Interior Systems & Finishes (Interior Walls, Ceilings, Doors, Floors and Finishes).
3. HVAC & Boilers (Heating System, Cooling System, Distribution, Controls, Specialized Systems e.g., swimming pool filtration system).
5. Electrical (Array, Distribution, Lighting, Emergency Power, etc.).
7. Grounds (Sidewalks, Steps, Handrails, Parking lots, Pavement, Striping, Accessibility, Drainage, Gutters, Grading).

D. Buildings and structures included in the contract to be evaluated include:

• Bob Korn Memorial Swimming Pool – 609 Railway Ave, Cordova,
• Bidarki Recreation Center – 103 Council Ave, Cordova,
• Eyak Lake Skaters Cabin - 2210 Power Creek Road, Cordova,
• Cordova Jr/Sr High School – 100 Fisherman’s Ave, Cordova,
• Odiak Pond – Gazebo & Boardwalk – 300 Chase Avenue, Cordova,
• Odiak Camper Park – Restroom - 1401 Point Whitshed Rd, Cordova,
• Parks Maintenance Shop – 311 Orca Inlet Drive, Cordova,
• City Maintenance Shop – 311 Orca Inlet Drive, Cordova,
• Ballfield Field Restroom/Concession Stand - 100 South First Street, Cordova,
• Cordova Chamber of Commerce – 404 First Street, Cordova,
• Hollis Heinrichs Park – Restroom – 300 Chase Avenue, Cordova,
• Fleming Spit Restroom – 650 New England Cannery Road, Cordova,
• Prince William Sound Science Center- 300 Breakwater Ave, Cordova,
E. The time for performance under the contract.

It is anticipated that this contract will be completed by December 20, 2022. It is proposed that buildings are evaluated in two phases over the next few months.

II. RECOMMENDED ACTION / NEXT STEP: Council suggested motion “to direct the City Manager to negotiate a contract with Coffman Engineers Inc. to provide engineering services for facility condition assessments for a sum not to exceed Two Hundred Seventy Seven Thousand Nine Hundred Twenty Dollars ($277,920)”.

III. FISCAL IMPACTS: The contract will be paid from 335-420-52180 American Rescue Plan Act fund and from State reimbursement monies.

IV. BACKGROUND INFORMATION: City staff identified a need to understand the condition of a new of buildings and facilities within the city. This information will help the Council make informed decisions about the condition of some of the city’s parks and recreation assets, as well as the Cordova Jr/Sr High School buildings.

The City issued an RFP to conduct Facility Condition Assessments on or about June 13, 2022. Two responses from consulting firms were received by the deadline on July 1, 2022. These responses were from:

- RIM Architects
- Coffman Engineers Inc.

City staff developed a project team to review and score both proposal against the criteria established in the RFP. The proposal from Coffman Engineers Inc was scored the highest. Staff then undertook a series of negotiations with the preferred firm to refine the scope and seek cost savings.

The Coffman proposal was strongest in the areas matching the RFP and included a project team of experienced and qualified professionals in the fields of Structural, Mechanical, Civil, Electrical Engineering as well as Architectural and Cost Estimation services.

V. LEGAL ISSUES: The RFP adheres to the City Code 5.12.130 - Competitive sealed proposals and this memo reflects requirements of 5.12.040.

VI. SUMMARY AND ALTERNATIVES: Council could choose to not to award the contract.
5.12.040 - Council approval of contracts.

No contract for supplies, services or construction which obligates the city to pay more than twenty-five thousand dollars may be executed unless the council has approved a memorandum setting forth the following essential terms of the contract:

A. The identity of the contractor;
B. The contract price;
C. The nature and quantity of the performance that the city shall receive under the contract; and
D. The time for performance under the contract.


(Ord. No. 1093, § 1, 1-4-2012)

5.12.130 Competitive sealed proposals.

A. If the city manager determines in writing that use of competitive sealed bidding is not practicable, the city may procure supplies, services or construction by competitive sealed proposals under this section.

B. The city manager shall solicit competitive sealed proposals by issuing a request for proposals. The request for proposals shall state, or incorporate by reference, all specifications and contractual terms and conditions to which a proposal must respond, and shall state the factors to be considered in evaluating proposals and the relative importance of those factors. Public notice of a request for proposals shall be given in accordance with Section 5.12.110(B). A request for proposals may be modified or interpreted only in the manner provided in Section 5.12.110(C).

C. Sealed proposals shall be submitted by mail, delivery service or in person at the place and no later than the time specified in the request for proposals. Proposals not submitted at the place or within the time so specified shall not be opened or considered.

D. Proposals shall be opened so as to avoid disclosing their contents to competing proposers before notice of intent to award a contract is issued. Proposals, tabulations and evaluations thereof shall be open to public inspection only after notice of intent to award a contract is issued. To the extent the proposer designates in writing and other provisions of law permit, trade secrets and other proprietary data contained in a proposal document shall be withheld from public inspection.

E. In the manner provided in the request for proposals, the city manager may negotiate with those responsible proposers whose proposals are determined by the city manager to be reasonably responsive to the request for proposals. Negotiations shall be used to clarify and ensure full understanding of the requirements of the request for proposals. The city manager may permit proposers to revise their proposals after submission and prior to award to obtain best and final offers. Proposers deemed eligible for negotiations shall be treated equally regarding any opportunity to discuss and revise proposals. In conducting negotiations or requesting revisions, the city shall not disclose any information derived from proposals of competing proposers.

F. Award shall be made by written notice to the proposer whose final proposal is determined to be the most advantageous to the city. No criteria other than those set forth in the request for proposals, including all specifications and addenda, may be used in proposal evaluation.

(Ord. 809 (part), 1998).
AGENDA ITEM 12  
City Council Meeting Date: 8/3/2022  
CITY COUNCIL COMMUNICATION FORM

FROM:  Malvin Fajardo, Superintendent of Facilities  
DATE:  7/26/2022  
ITEM:  Award of ITB Contract to DXP/Alaska Pump & Supply, Inc.  
NEXT STEP:  Council authorizes the City Manager to negotiate this contract

____  ORDINANCE  
___  MOTION  
____  RESOLUTION  
____  INFORMATION

I. REQUEST OR ISSUE:  This form constitutes the memorandum required per Code per 5.12.040 setting forth the following:

   A. Identity of Contractor:  DXP/Alaska Pump & Supply, Inc,  
   B. Contract Price:  $50,011.00  
   C. Nature & quantity of the work that the City shall receive under the contract:

   DXP/Alaska Pump & Supply, Inc. will ship a trailer mounted Godwin 6-inch SD150M Dri-Prime to Cordova (FOB)

   D. The time for performance under the contract.

   It is anticipated that this contract will be completed no later than November 18, 2022.

II. RECOMMENDED ACTION / NEXT STEP:  Council suggested motion “to direct the City Manager to negotiate a contract with DXP/Alaska Pump & Supply, Inc, to provide & ship a trailer mounted Godwin 6 inch SD150M Dri-Prime Cordova (FOB) for a sum of not to exceed Fifty Thousand Eleven dollars ($50,011.00).

III. FISCAL IMPACTS:  The contract will be paid from 335-420-55010 ARPA $40,000.00 Grant and Water Depreciation fund 704-400-54032 $10,011.00.
IV. BACKGROUND INFORMATION: Sediment in the water causes turbidity. The sediment builds up in the bottom of the reservoir and near the intake. During storm events the heavy rain and wind causes the sediment to get stirred up and the turbidity increase in the water column. The turbidity level may increase above permitted levels. An alarm (usually at 2 AM) goes off and the plant automatically shuts down prior to the regulated limits being exceeded. This increases treatment cost and man hours for the water department. This can also be very problematic during the summer when we are relying on all our sources to supply water to the canneries and town.

In the fall after the fishing season, the PW-Water division cleans the Meals reservoir by draining it, which takes about 2 weeks depending on the weather. Once drained a 4” inch pump is used to clean & dredge the bottom of the reservoir. The dredging process may take 2-3 weeks weather dependent and with 3-4 water/sewer employees. The 4” pump works but is not efficiently removing the sediment & sludge on the bottom of the reservoir. The 6” Godwin pump will increase the efficiency of removing sediment and of the dredging process, which will allow the reservoir to fill up prior to snowfall and provide water for processing. It is estimated that the process will be decreased by 1.5 weeks.

V. LEGAL ISSUES: This adheres to the City Code 5.12.130 - Competitive sealed proposals and this memo reflects requirements of 5.12.040.

VI. SUMMARY AND ALTERNATIVES: Council could choose not to approve the contract.
5.12.040 - Council approval of contracts.

No contract for supplies, services or construction which obligates the city to pay more than twenty-five thousand dollars may be executed unless the council has approved a memorandum setting forth the following essential terms of the contract:

A. The identity of the contractor;
B. The contract price;
C. The nature and quantity of the performance that the city shall receive under the contract; and
D. The time for performance under the contract.


(Ord. No. 1093, § 1, 1-4-2012)

5.12.130 Competitive sealed proposals.

A. If the city manager determines in writing that use of competitive sealed bidding is not practicable, the city may procure supplies, services or construction by competitive sealed proposals under this section.

B. The city manager shall solicit competitive sealed proposals by issuing a request for proposals. The request for proposals shall state, or incorporate by reference, all specifications and contractual terms and conditions to which a proposal must respond, and shall state the factors to be considered in evaluating proposals and the relative importance of those factors. Public notice of a request for proposals shall be given in accordance with Section 5.12.110(B). A request for proposals may be modified or interpreted only in the manner provided in Section 5.12.110(C).

C. Sealed proposals shall be submitted by mail, delivery service or in person at the place and no later than the time specified in the request for proposals. Proposals not submitted at the place or within the time so specified shall not be opened or considered.

D. Proposals shall be opened so as to avoid disclosing their contents to competing proposers before notice of intent to award a contract is issued. Proposals, tabulations and evaluations thereof shall be open to public inspection only after notice of intent to award a contract is issued. To the extent the proposer designates in writing and other provisions of law permit, trade secrets and other proprietary data contained in a proposal document shall be withheld from public inspection.

E. In the manner provided in the request for proposals, the city manager may negotiate with those responsible proposers whose proposals are determined by the city manager to be reasonably responsive to the request for proposals. Negotiations shall be used to clarify and ensure full understanding of the requirements of the request for proposals. The city manager may permit proposers to revise their proposals after submission and prior to award to obtain best and final offers. Proposers deemed eligible for negotiations shall be treated equally regarding any opportunity to discuss and revise proposals. In conducting negotiations or requesting revisions, the city shall not disclose any information derived from proposals of competing proposers.

F. Award shall be made by written notice to the proposer whose final proposal is determined to be the most advantageous to the city. No criteria other than those set forth in the request for proposals, including all specifications and addenda, may be used in proposal evaluation.

(Ord. 809 (part), 1998).