REGULAR MEETING – 5:30PM:

I. ROLL CALL

II. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

III. APPROVAL OF MINUTES
   • 22-02-08 Special Meeting (Draft)
   • 22-02-17 Regular Meeting (Draft)

IV. CITIZEN’S COMMENTS

V. COMMUNICATIONS
   • 22-02-21 Letter to Mayor from Quintillion – Port Expansion Communications
   • 22-02-25 USCG to PON – Part 154 Applicability Letter
   • 22-03-07 U.S. Cites Graphite One as Largest Deposit in Nation – Digital Journal
   • 22-03-10 Travel industry figures bullish on return for 2022 Alaska season – KRBD

VI. COMMISSIONER UPDATES

VII. HARBORMASTER REPORT
   • 2022 Maintenance, Repairs & Planning
     ▪ High Mast Lights; Condition, Removal and Reinstall
     ▪ 2022 Cruise Ship Schedule (Updated)
     ▪ Arctic Eagle 2022 95th and 81st - PON Training and Coordination

VIII. PORT DIRECTOR REPORT/PROJECTS UPDATE
   • 22-03-14 Port Director/Projects Status Report
     ▪ Alaska Legislature House Finance Committee Hearing
       ▪ Video Clip & Presentation Review

IX. OLD BUSINESS
   • Port Expansion Road Surfacing – Asphalt

X. NEW BUSINESS
   • USDOT RAISE Grant Applications
     o Port Expansion Planning Grant
     o Remaining Thornbush Development

XI. CITIZEN’S COMMENTS

XII. COMMISSIONER COMMENTS

XIII. NEXT REGULAR MEETING
   • April 21, 2022 – 5:30pm

XIV. ADJOURNMENT
NOME PORT COMISSION
MINUTES
SPECIAL MEETING
FEBRUARY 8, 2022 @ 6:30 PM
COUNCIL CHAMBERS CITY HALL

The Special Meeting of the Nome Port Commission was called to order at 7:06 pm (delayed) by Chairman West at the City Hall Council Chambers.

ROLL CALL
Members Present: Smithhisler; Lean (phone); West; McCann; Rowe; Sheffield (phone); McLarty

Also Present: Joy Baker, Port Director (phone); Glenn Steckman, City Manager; Lucas Stotts, Harbormaster;

In the audience: Scot Henderson

APPROVAL OF AGENDA
Chairman West asked for a motion to approve the agenda:

Motion to approve made by McLarty, seconded by Smithhisler.

At the Roll Call:
Ayes: Lean; West; McCann; Rowe; Sheffield; McLarty; Smithhisler
Nays: Abstain:

The motion CARRIED.

CITIZENS’ COMMENTS
None

OLD BUSINESS
- Revisions to Port of Nome Tariff No. 16.1
- Annual CPI Adjustment Graduated scale for Rock/Sand/Gravel Wharfage Rates

Chairman West asked for a motion:

Motion: Moved by McCann, seconded by McLarty;

Approval of revisions and rates as presented in Port Tariff No. 16.1, as amended, and recommending Nome Common Council adopt these revisions, replacing all existing tariffs.
**Discussion:**

Discussion continued from the earlier work session on an alternate rate structure posed by staff that would limit the largest volume to a rate equal to 60% of the base rate as opposed to 50% in last work session. Further discussion ensued on the balance of maximizing revenue streams versus attracting more gravel export business. The group eventually reached a consensus, and were prepared to vote.

Staff made an inquiry to the Chair about the presence of a potential conflict of interest, and whether the Chair should recuse. A member mentioned that Commissioner Smithhisler may also have a conflict.

Discussion was held on the handling of conflicts, chairman rulings and challenges, based on input from the City attorney during previous work session.

Chairman West disagreed he had a conflict, but disclosed that his business does sell/haul/load rock products that are exported at the Port of Nome. Chairman West passed meeting control to Vice-Chair Lean for a ruling on the presence of a conflict in West voting on revised gravel rates.

Vice-chair Lean stated he understands Commissioners were selected and appointed by the Mayor because of our varied and diverse experience and interests. He added, this came up last summer, but at that time, West had already been awarded a specific project, which is why the decision was put off until the next annual tariff revision, which we are doing now.

Lean added that unlike that time, this is a general item of discussion as we are not talking about any specific project, so the ruling is that Chairman West does not have a conflict of interest in voting on gravel rates in this tariff revision.

Prior to the vote; Commissioner Sheffield stated a challenge to the ruling by the Vice-Chair, indicating she disagreed with the process underway and felt the Chair should not vote on the scaled gravel rates, due to the perceived conflicts with his gravel business by the public.

The motion (challenge) **FAILED** due to no second.

**Motion:**

The following motion was made by Commissioner Lean and seconded by Commissioner Rowe:

Recommend amending the proposed gravel rate scale presented in salmon color block, eliminating the last category of 400,001 tons and over, leaving the last category as 300,001 tons and over at 55% discount of the new base rate.

Discussion:

- Commissioner McLarty stated that we had discussed this at the last PC meeting and he felt we were already in agreement on the salmon color block rates and suggests that we leave those rates with all rate sections and not removed the 400,001 and over rate @ a 50% discount.
- Commissioner Rowe commented that rates laid out at the previous meeting were not agreed upon by all and that some commissioners felt a 45% discount was too steep and should be revisited, which we are doing now. Rowe feels that Lean’s motion may be a happy medium for all as it provides a higher discount for the larger gravel volume per project, but also caps the discount at 55%.
- Commissioner McLarty agreed that a 50% discount was a good break but feels, the 400,001 and over rate @ a 50% discount would attract larger loads in the future.
- Commissioner Lean commented that the revenue required to manage and maintain the port and look at the development we currently are is substantial and that gravel wharfage charges are a large portion of the Ports annual revenue. Lean added that gravel companies are still getting a significant break @ 55% but above all else, we need to maintain our Port. Stated that we have several items coming up in the future that the Port is going to have to pay for and we need to keep rates at the front of our mind as we move forward.
Commissioner McCann stated that he was crunching numbers and @ 55% for 800,000 tons, there is a max of $88k in funds difference between that and the 50% rates. The differences are minimal, but would support either option.

McLarty stated that at 50% we are still above Seward’s current gravel rate of $1.00/ton.

At the Roll Call:
Ayes: Lean; West; McCann; Rowe
Nays: Sheffield; McLarty
Abstain: Smithhisler

The motion CARRIED.

Back to Commissioner McCann’s original motion, with second by McLarty;

Motion:
Approval of revisions and rates presented in Port of Nome Tariff No. 16.1, as amended, recommending the Nome Common Council adopt all revisions, replacing all previously existing tariffs.

At the Roll Call:
Ayes: McCann; Rowe; Sheffield; McLarty; Smithhisler; Lean; West
Nays:
Abstain:

The motion CARRIED.

ADJOURNMENT
Motion was made by McLarty, seconded by Smithhisler for adjournment at 7:34pm.

APPROVED and SIGNED this 17th day of February 2022.

_______________________________
Jim West, Chairman

ATTEST:

Joy Baker, Port Director
The Regular Meeting of the Nome Port Commission was called to order at 6:30 pm by Chairman West at the City Hall Council Chambers.

ROLL CALL
Members Present: Smithhisler; Lean; West; McCann; Sheffield; McLarty (Zoom)

Absent: Rowe

Also Present: Joy Baker, Port Director (Zoom); Glenn Steckman, City Manager

In the audience:

APPROVAL OF AGENDA
Chairman West asked for a motion to approve the agenda:

Motion to approve made by Lean, seconded by Sheffield.

At the Roll Call:
Ayes: Lean; West; McCann; Sheffield; McLarty; Smithhisler
Nays:
Abstain:

The motion CARRIED.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES
Jan 20th, 2022 Regular Meeting

Motion made by Lean, seconded by Sheffield to approve minutes;

At the Roll Call
Ayes: West; McCann; Rowe; Sheffield; McLarty; Smithhisler; Lean
Nays:
Abstain:

The motion CARRIED.
APPROVAL OF MINUTES
Feb 8th, 2022  Motion made by Lean, seconded by McLarty to approve minutes;
Regular Meeting

Discussion:
Commissioner Sheffield commented that she felt there were inaccuracies during the Feb 8th meeting vote on setting the scaled gravel rates, and in the minutes reflecting that meeting. She believed she should have been allowed to abstain from voting and not have to choose either yes or no, and that Commissioner Smithhisler should have recused himself and not abstained.

PD Baker advised that the City Clerk had shared the City Code which states, all members are required to vote, and only those with a conflict of interest can abstain. Baker added that she had been told the City Code supersedes Robert’s Rules of Order rules.

CM Steckman advised that he would talk with the attorney for some clarification.

The motion Failed. Minutes were tabled until next meeting.

CITIZENS’ COMMENTS
• None

COMMUNICATIONS
• 22-01-17 U.S. Needs More Icebreakers for Arctic - Naval News
• 22-01-19 Seismic and Permafrost Thaw Impacts Study
• 22-02-05 PON Letter of Support – NSF Proposal
• 22-02-10 Scientists Improve Predictions for Sea Ice Coverage - The Arctic Sounder

Discussion:
HM Stotts commented on the 22-01-19 Seismic and Permafrost Thaw Impacts Study. The intent is to install sensors in multiple locations around the Causeway and Industrial Pad to monitor seismic activity for assisting in informing how those events affect infrastructure and their subsurface materials.

COMMISSIONER UPDATES
• None

HARBORMASTER REPORT
• HM FY22 2nd QTR Report
• Operations and Maintenance
  • HML test light location and installation plan
• Alaska Commercial Passenger Vessel (CPV) – Expending $2,345 by 30 June 2022

HM Stotts updated the members on the failures of multiple high mast light fixtures, and the plan to test a new type of fixture as provided at no charge by a lighting company, as recommended by CRW Engineering (NJUS contract firm and port expansion utilities designers). If test fixture works well, all will be replaced.

Discussion:
Brief discussion was held on what could be achieved with the CPV funds – after exchanging ideas, it was determined that more signage would be the most economical, signs that welcomed visitors to Nome (staff will investigate options and pricing).
PORT DIRECTOR REPORT/PROJECTS UPDATE

- 22-02-17 PD/Project’s Report
  - America’s Marine Highway System – MARAD Route Designation
  - ADDP Cost-Share Funding Options
  - Collaboration on Thornbush Property Drainage

PD Baker highlighted ADOT will be putting the Port Rd Reconstruction Project out to bid in Aug 2022, with construction scheduled for the 2023 summer season.

Additional information on the proposed M5 Route Extension Designation under MARAD was outlined, with an update that the issue is currently being considered by ADOT Commissioner’s office for serving as the route sponsor or co-sponsor.

PD Baker advised on the cost-share funding options available to the City, and that it was a fluid document that is updated as often as necessary. Further updates will be shared with the group.

There was a brief highlight of the need to collaborate with BFI on their Thornbush property infill project, in order to ensure drainage was established in a way that was mutually acceptable to both parties. John Blees, City Engineer, is working with Umiaq, BFI engineers, to coordinate a smooth design integration.

Discussion:

OLD BUSINESS
- None

NEW BUSINESS
- Port Expansion – Elements of Deep Water Dock Design
  - Drainage
  - Surfacing

Discussion:
Tabled, pending additional information from design firm.

ADJOURNMENT
Motion was made by for adjournment at 7:35pm.

APPROVED and SIGNED this 17th day of March 2022.

_____________________________
Jim West, Chairman

ATTEST:

_____________________________
Joy Baker, Port Director
February 21, 2022

Mayor John Handeland & Nome City Council
PO Box
Nome, AK 99762

RE: Port of Nome Broadband Support

Dear Mayor Handeland and City Council,

My name is Cheri McConnell and with great interest, I have paid attention to the developments of the port here in Nome. I see this as a step forward in the mission and vision of our city, and beneficial to the success of such a pivotal project, that would provide a huge economic opportunity for our community, would be to seek out opportunities for strategic partnerships.

As a Nome citizen and an employee of Quintillion, I would like to speak to you today about how we could open conversations in participating in the broadband and technology planning/development of the project. How we would make our services available at or below cost during the early stages in order to help, initiate the project and we aspire to making the port a technology showcase in terms:

- Ship to shore and shore to ship communications
- Area wide 5G and Wi-Fi
- Monitoring and Security
- Integrated ground stations for satellites operations
- Provide cargo owners, shipping lines, terminal operations, and every other wharf-side player, a way (with broadband technology) to manage and plan their interactions with the port.
- Make broadband as available, flexible and affordable as other commonplace utilities
- Provide direct connectivity to the major internet exchange and cloud service providers

The next steps would be a respectful level of involvement, and understand the requirements of the potential users. Explore how Quintillion might be involved in developing the technology plan for the Port and taking direction from the Nome City Council on how to best support them.

Quintillion’s is a leading integrated digital infrastructure provider of broadband connectivity, satellite ground station operations, and big data/cloud services. The company contracts to sell
capacity on its network on a wholesale basis. We operate the broadband cable landing station in Nome and deliver broadband services through TelAlaska, GCI, ACS, and DRS. We have built, operate, and maintain a state of the art submarine and terrestrial high-speed fiber optic system serving residential, commercial, and government clients with the first and only fiber network serving the Alaskan Arctic. We are located in Anchorage and are committed to our mission to expand broadband services and capabilities throughout Alaska with a specific emphasis on Nome and the Seward Peninsula. Our senior executive staff is available to support the Port of Nome mission in whatever manner is required. On behalf of Quintillion’s executive staff, I appreciate your time and consideration.

Sincerely,

Cheri McConnell
Quintillion Liaison for the City of Nome
Dear Mr. Stotts:

After reviewing the Port of Nome’s USCG facility file and considering the jurisdictional ownership of the marine transfer area, I hereby rescind the letter waiving the facilities requirements under Title 33 CFR 154 and 156 issued to the Port of Nome dated May 15th, 1998 from Marine Safety Office Anchorage. Pursuant to the regulations, you will be required to submit a Letter of Intent (LOI) and a valid Operations Manual within 90 days of receipt of this letter. The manual must be in accordance with 33 CFR 154.310 and outline your current marine transfer related activities starting from the marine header up to the product transfer valves owned by the other USCG regulated facilities that utilize the Port of Nome’s marine transfer system. It has been determined that the Port of Nome is not subject to 33 CFR 154 subpart F, based on the capacity of the facilities pipelines and the absence of a storage tank farm. If you have any questions or concerns regarding this determination, please contact MST1 Christopher Houvener at (907) 428-4130.

Sincerely,

L. M. LUSK
Captain, U.S. Coast Guard
Captain of the Port, Western Alaska

Copy: Sector Anchorage
U.S. Government Cites Graphite One’s Graphite Creek as the Largest Graphite Deposit in the United States

VANCOUVER, BC / ACCESSWIRE / March 7, 2022 / Graphite One Inc. (TSX-V:GPH; OTCQX:GPHOF) (“Graphite One” or the “Company”) is pleased to announce that its Graphite Creek resource in Alaska has been cited as the largest known graphite deposit in the United States by the U.S. Geological Survey (“USGS”) in its updated U.S. Mineral Deposit Database (“USMIN”).¹
“Graphite has not been produced in the United States since the 1950s,” said Jeff Mauk, USGS lead scientist for USMIN. “This release provides an update on the Nation’s graphite resources and past production.”

“We are pleased to see the U.S. Government’s leading agency for geologic science and natural resource data identify Graphite Creek as the largest known graphite deposit in the U.S.,” said Anthony Huston, President and CEO of Graphite One.

The USGS report confirms Alaska Governor Mike Dunleavy’s statement in support of Graphite One’s designation as a U.S. Government High-Priority
Infrastructure Project: “Graphite Creek is the largest deposit of graphite in the nation and would be a superior domestic supply of this critical mineral.”

With the U.S. currently 100% import-dependent for natural graphite, Graphite One is developing a complete U.S.-based, advanced graphite supply chain solution anchored by the Graphite Creek resource near Nome, Alaska. The Graphite One Project plan includes an advanced graphite material and battery anode manufacturing plant to be sited in the continental U.S. with the development of the Graphite Creek resource.

The updated USMIN data includes 10 sites with historical graphite production or undeveloped graphite resources and consists of sites with more than 1,000 metric tonnes of contained graphite resources and/or past graphite production. The sites are located across the country in Alaska, Alabama, Colorado, Montana, New York, Pennsylvania, and Texas. Of those 10 sites, Graphite Creek is the only one that contains more than 8 million metric tonnes of graphite.

Graphite One updated its graphite resources in March 2019 to:

Measured and Indicated 10.95 Mt Grading 7.8% Cg at 5% Cg Cut-Off Grade
Inferred 91.89 Mt Grading 8.0% Cg at 5% Cg Cut-Off Grade

The Company expects that it will update the resource model and provide updated technical data in the Preliminary Feasibility Study anticipated to be released in April which will include results of the 2021 drill program.


2Graphite One Press Release, 15-10-2019: Alaska Governor Nominates Graphite One Project as High Priority Infrastructure Project

32019 NI 43-101 Mineral Resource Update for Graphite Creek, Seward Peninsula, Alaska, USA dated May 2, 2019

About the U.S. Mineral Deposit Database

USMIN is a national-scale geospatial database that is the authoritative source for the locations of the most important current and historical mines, mineral deposits and mineral districts of the U.S.

About Graphite One Inc.

GRAPHITE ONE INC. (GPH: TSX-V; GPHOF: OTCQB) continues to develop its Graphite One Project (the “Project”), whereby the Company could potentially become an American producer of high-
grade anode materials that is integrated with a domestic graphite resource. The Project is proposed as a vertically integrated enterprise to mine, process and manufacture high grade anode materials primarily for the lithium-ion electric vehicle battery market. As set forth in the Company’s Preliminary Economic Assessment, potential graphite mineralization mined from the Company’s Graphite Creek Property, is expected to be processed into concentrate at a graphite processing plant. The proposed processing plant would be located on the Graphite Creek Property situated on the Seward Peninsula about 60 kilometers north of Nome, Alaska. Graphite anodes and other value-added graphite products would be manufactured from the concentrate and other materials at the Company’s proposed advanced graphite materials manufacturing facility, the location of which is the subject of further study and analysis. The Company intends to make a production decision on the Project once a feasibility study is completed.

On Behalf of the Board of Directors

“Anthony Huston” (signed)

For more information on Graphite One Inc., please visit the Company’s website, www.GraphiteOneInc.com or contact:
Neither the TSX Venture Exchange nor its Regulation Services Provider (as that term is defined in the policies of the TSX Venture Exchange) accepts responsibility for the adequacy or accuracy of this release.

All statements in this release, other than statements of historical facts, including those related to the timing and completion of the anticipated Preliminary Feasibility Study, future production, establishment of a processing plant and a graphite manufacturing plant, and events or developments that the Company intends, expects, plans, or proposes are forward-looking statements. Generally, forward-looking information can be identified by the use of forward-looking terminology such as “proposes”, “expects”, or “is expected”, “scheduled”, “estimates”, “projects”, “intends”, “assumes”, “believes”, “indicates” or variations of such words and phrases that state that certain actions, events or results “may”, “could”, “would”, “might” or “will be taken”, “occur” or “be achieved”.
The Company cautions that there is no certainty that tests of the Company's material will be successful or that such tests will result in the development of successful products. Although the Company believes the expectations expressed in such forward-looking statements are based on reasonable assumptions, such statements are not guarantees of future performance and actual results or developments may differ materially from those in the forward-looking statements. Factors that could cause actual results to differ materially from those in forward-looking statements include market prices, exploitation and exploration successes, continuity of mineralization, uncertainties related to the ability to obtain necessary permits, licenses and title and delays due to third party opposition, changes in government policies regarding mining and natural resource exploration and exploitation, and continued availability of capital and financing, and general economic, market or business conditions. Readers are cautioned not to place undue reliance on this forward-looking information, which is given as of the date it is expressed in this press release, and the Company undertakes no obligation to update publicly or revise any forward-looking information, except as required by applicable securities laws. For more information on the Company, investors should review the
Company’s continuous disclosure filings that are available at www.sedar.com.

**SOURCE:** Graphite One Inc.
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News network reaching more than 1,500 media outlets in 98 countries. The newest, fastest-growing and most disruptive newswire available today.

You may also like:
Travel industry figures are bullish on a return to almost-normal for the 2022 Alaska cruise season

Posted by Eric Stone | Mar 10, 2022

Alaska’s visitor industry representatives are bullish about the 2022 cruise season. But at the same time, there are questions over how many visitors will actually arrive on the ships this summer.

After two years of little to no cruise traffic, Travel Juneau President and CEO Liz Perry says she’s excited to get back to something resembling a normal summer.

“I think all of our operators are really optimistic that they’re going to see better returns the season for 2022 than they have seen in a long time,” Perry said in a phone interview Thursday.
There were essentially no cruise ship tourists in 2020, save for a single small ship. And though independent tourists buoyed the visitor industry in 2021, cruise ships delivered only about a tenth of their typical passenger load with just one or two large vessels tied up each day.

But this summer, cruise ship schedules are packed — on some days, Ketchikan and Juneau are expecting as many as seven ships in port at a time.

“The big question for us is how full the ships are actually going to be when they arrive,” Perry said.

If all of the ships on the schedule this year were full, it would be a record year: an emailed statement from Cruise Lines International Association Alaska says the ships planning to visit this summer have a rough capacity of 1.5 million passengers — upwards of 2019 levels.

“I know that worldwide, cruising has been operating at about 60-70% capacity. What that means for the Alaska cruise season, we’re just not sure,” she said.

The city of Ketchikan’s port and harbors department is expecting ships to be about 70% full. That’d be just shy of a million passengers. Skagway Mayor Andrew Cremata, for his part, says he expects ships to fill up as the season progresses.

“We’re cautiously optimistic. I think after the last couple of years, it’s a good approach. However, what I’m hearing from the cruise ship companies is that it may be a little bit of a slower start than everybody had hoped,” Cremata said by phone Thursday.

For a couple of reasons: First, Cremata says the omicron variant put a damper on cruise bookings, though lately he says they’ve bounced back.

“There's always the threat that the PVSA (Passenger Vessel Services Act) moratorium expiring could have an effect on some of the ships, but mostly what we're hearing from Canada is positive as well," he said.
The Canadian government announced updated COVID-19 rules for cruise ships this month: passengers must be vaccinated, with limited exceptions for kids under 12 and a few other exemptions. Passengers have to be tested before boarding, and cruise lines must have plans in place for outbreaks aboard. Masks will often be optional.

Cruise Lines International Association Alaska, the largest regional cruise industry group, welcomed the news.

“We’re encouraged by the recent announcement as it provides a level of certainty for a full Alaska season,” Renée Limoge Reeve of Cruise Lines International Association Alaska wrote in an email to KRBD.

In a statement, Holland America compared the Canadian protocols to the U.S. government’s COVID-19 policies, which were made voluntary earlier this year.

Canada’s rules matter because this year, unlike last year, all cruise ships have to stop in Canada because of a 19th-century federal law. The Passenger Vessel Services Act was waived for Alaska cruises last year after a push by Alaska’s congressional delegation. But that waiver expires at the end of March. A proposal to extend the waiver is pending on Capitol Hill but likely won’t pass in time for the beginning of the season.

Skagway’s Mayor Cremata spends his summers on the cruise docks selling tours. And he says he’s ready for the hustle and bustle again.

“I like the tourists. I like it when it’s busy,” he said. “And that might sound a bit crazy to people who avoid those types of scenarios, but it is part of what makes our community unique.”

The first Alaska port call of the season is set for April 25, when the nearly 4,000-passenger Norwegian Bliss is scheduled to tie up in Juneau as part of its cruise of Southeast Alaska.
Nome, Alaska:

Who: 95th CBRN Company, ICW 81st CST (North Dakota), the Port of Nome, and JTF-Alaska.

What: Executed joint dismounted CBRN reconnaissance training operations.

When: 1-6 MAR 2022

Where: IVO Nome, Alaska

Why: In order to execute and assess CBRN recon capabilities in cold weather environments.

Amplifying Information: From 1-6 MAR, the company worked with the 81st CST (North Dakota) to execute dismounted CBRN reconnaissance operations IVO the Port of Nome and its surrounding areas. The Port of Nome Harbormaster acted as the “Incident Commander”, enabling both 95th and 81st to conduct realistic hazard response missions in support of DSCA operations. The company also rehearsed moving over terrain in “Arctic conditions” by executing a 3.6 mile hike to the White Alice Towers, a Cold War-era defense communication system.
Memo

To: Glenn Steckman – City Manager
From: Joy L. Baker – Port Director
CC: Mayor Handeland & Common Council; Port Commission
Date: March 14, 2022
Re: Monthly PD Report/Capital Projects Update – March 2022

Administrative:

Staff continue working budgetary planning and tracking, supplies and resale items inventory, compliance reporting, maintenance/repair needs, along with purchasing, training and vessel scheduling for 2022.

The Port Commission will have a Regular Meeting at 5:30pm on Thursday, 17 March 2022 to discuss a USCG issue, a motion selecting asphalt surfacing on the Causeway extension, grant applications support, and a presentation given to the House Finance Committee on 11 March (see details in project section below).

Causeway:

Arctic Deep Draft Port – Nome Modifications Pre-Construction Engineering & Design (PED):
The PED phase continues to move forward with bi-monthly calls between project managers, to discuss current and long range schedules and funding needs to ensure both parties are in tune, with no surprises. Efforts continue to identify and clarify the City’s cost-share match, with a few of the federal grant applications now open for application.

The City was asked to provide an in-person presentation to the Alaska State Legislature House Finance Committee at a 1:30pm Hearing on 11 March 2022. The request was on very short notice, so Mayor Handeland and I coordinated to meet in Juneau on the 10th to do a combined presentation (attached) on the City’s behalf – in support of a $175M funding request. The attached presentation is an outline, but can be seen in full on the City’s website, along with a short video clip we were lucky enough to have generated by a media firm in Juneau that has been inquiring on the project.

(The video clip and PowerPoint can also be presented in full during a work session or meeting at the Council’s request.)

Local Service Facilities (LSF) Design Integration:

Bi-weekly meetings continue with the Corps and City design teams for integrating elements of merging the local design portion with the Corps features on an aggressive schedule. Design criteria continue to be discussed and updated by each team. A meeting was held in late February to review comments on the 35% design by all teams.

- Anyone with questions on this project can call 907-304-1905 or email jlbaker@nomealaska.org
  further info on the project study is located on the Port of Nome page at www.nomealaska.org.

Sediment at Causeway Bridge and Bridge Repairs:
The Corps is still working to determine a program and contracting mechanism to conduct sediment
removal west and under the bridge. In the meantime, there are repairs needed to the west and underside of the bridge due to erosion caused by wave impact. District personnel are coordinating the work and schedule with Bristol Engineers for the 2022 ice-free season.

**Harbor:**
**Inner Harbor CAP 107 Study (Deepen/Widen the Inner Basin):**
After evaluating the decisions by the Army Corps Pacific Ocean Division (POD) to require the south and east harbor docks and their berthing areas to be de-authorized in order for the project to move forward, documents are being compiled for submission to the Congressional Delegation offices for review and consideration of a policy waiver. De-authorization requires congressional action which takes time, and moreover, converts federal maintenance into local responsibility.

**Launch Ramp Replacement Project:**
The launch ramp project is now lying dormant for winter at 97% completion, with the remaining work scheduled for late spring/early summer of 2022.

**Snake River Moorage & Vessel Haulout Facility:**
City personnel continue to search for an applicable funding vehicle to develop this project.

**Port Industrial Pad:**
**West Nome Tank Farm (Property Conveyance):**
The City continues to work with JBER and HQ USAF personnel to understand the remaining steps required to complete the property conveyance to the City. At this time, it is anticipated the final documents could be signed sometime around Oct/Nov 2021. In the meantime, the City and NJUS continue collaborating on development of the site for relocating the NJUS tank farm, and defining vessel lay down closer to the ramp.

**Port Rd. Improvements (ADOT Project cost-shared with City/Port):**
ADOT advised the project solicitation will be released in Aug 2022, with construction in summer of 2023.

---

*Italics reflects no change in project information from previous report.*

Additional details available upon request.
ALASKA’S ARCTIC DEEP-DRAFT PORT AT NOME

DRIVING REGIONAL EMPLOYMENT
EXPANDING ALASKA’S ECONOMY
SUPPORTING NATIONAL SECURITY

Finance Committee
Alaska State House of Representatives
March 2022

REGIONAL TRANSSHIPMENT HUB

- Serving over 60 communities (Platinum to Barrow)
  - Maritime Hub Services
    - Community resupply (fuel, vehicles, equipment, buildings, appliances, groceries)
    - Commercial & Subsistence fisheries
    - Construction project equipment/materials
    - Environmental/Oil Spill Response
    - Resource Development
    - Search and Rescue
    - Scientific research
    - Industrial support
    - Tourism

COMMODITY MOVEMENT

SHIP RESUPPLY/CREW CHANGE

On-water Transfers
Deliveries to Shore
BERING STRAIT VESSEL TRAFFIC

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Northbound</th>
<th>Southbound</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>262</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>239</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>316</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>344</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>452</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>358</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>241</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>477</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2021</td>
<td>278</td>
<td>277</td>
<td>555</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

GENERAL NAVIGATION FEATURES (GNF) COST-SHARED WITH CORPS

PHASE 1
- Stub BW removal
- Causeway extension
- Dock construction

PHASE 2
- Deep water basin dredging
- Outer basin expansion

PHASE 3
- East BW demo
- Outer basin expansion
- East causeway construction

ARCTIC DEEP DRAFT PORT MODIFICATIONS

PROJECT PURPOSE AND OBJECTIVES
- Only deep-water port in the U.S. Arctic.
- Serves as critical link for regional communities to rest of Alaska.
- Existing port facilities in the region are overcrowded, with insufficient draft to accommodate larger, deep-draft vessel traffic.
- Purpose of this project is to provide safe, reliable, and efficient maritime transportation for movement of commerce, national security, and tourism at the Port of Nome.
- Proposed project objectives:
  - Search and Rescue, Oil Spill Response, Resource Exploration
  - Reducing draft limitations for more efficient vessels.
  - Increasing dock space for safety & to avoid delays.
  - Widen navigable space for more efficient vessel maneuvering.
TARGETED BENEFITS OF ARCTIC DEEP-DRAFT PORT AT NOME

National Security & Life Safety
- Strengthen U.S. presence in Arctic
- Critical refuel/resupply support for SAR

Environmental Safety
- Regional staging for oil spill response assets
- Reducing need for offshore fuel transfers

Economic/Cultural Sustainability
- Lowering regional transportation costs
- Bringing economic opportunity to the region

Research & Resource Development
- Enhanced mission support through hub services

Tourism & Recreation
- Support increased ship calls (23 ships scheduled 2022) with more ice-hardened hulled vessels coming online

NATIONAL SECURITY/MARINER SAFETY

- National Security
  - Strengthen U.S. presence by expanding Arctic Ports to stage strategic assets
  - Establish year-round Arctic facilities to drive further infrastructure development

- Life Safety
  - Enable Coast Guard to operate more efficiently in Arctic with base support
  - Increase response capacity to meet nearly double the demand in activity
  - Expand on role as a port of refuge

ARCTIC PORT RECEPTION FACILITY

- Polar Code changes have escalated the need for port reception facilities in the Arctic to provide ships an alternative to discharging waste into the water.
- As the only coastal port in the region, Nome commissioned a feasibility study in 2017 to investigate serving that role.
- Increased vessel transits in the Bering Strait highlight the need to accelerate development.
- Nome is currently seeking to obtain funds to finalize design and construct an APRF.

MINING & RESOURCE DEVELOPMENT

- Development of onshore mineral deposits
  - Gold, graphite, lead, zinc, and silver
  - Supplies/equipment mobe/demobe
  - Mineral export – active & potential

- Active quarry stone mining at Cape Nome
  - Highest-grade quality basalt
  - Estimated production of .5 million tons since 1984
  - Quarry life expectancy = 100+ year estimate

- Project rock quarry at Cape Darby
- Offshore mining activity – continues to grow
ECONOMIC BENEFITS – DURING CONSTRUCTION

ACROSS 4-5 SUMMER SEASONS*

- **Regional:**
  - Jobs: 818  Income: $77.6M  + $100M secondary spending
- **Statewide (below includes regional):**
  - Jobs: 2,938  Income: $207M  + $291M secondary spending
- **National (below includes regional and statewide):**
  - Jobs: 5,515  Income: $365M  + $545M secondary spending

*Source: USACE Modifications Feasibility Study – Economics Appendix

ECONOMIC BENEFITS – POST CONSTRUCTION

LONG TERM OPERATIONS AND MAINTENANCE*

- **Regional:**
  - Jobs: 5  Income: 607K  + $802K secondary spending
- **Statewide (below includes regional):**
  - Jobs: 34  Income: 2.4M  + $3.3M secondary spending
- **National (below includes regional and statewide):**
  - Jobs: 60  Income: 4M  + $5.9M secondary spending

*Source: USACE Modifications Feasibility Study – Economics Appendix

PHASE 1 – FINAL DESIGN & CONSTRUCTION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(In Millions)</th>
<th>75%</th>
<th>25%</th>
<th>100%</th>
<th>GNF +LSF</th>
<th>+10% GNF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>COE</td>
<td>NFS</td>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>NFS Total</td>
<td>NFS Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase 1</td>
<td>$255</td>
<td>$83</td>
<td>$338</td>
<td>$81</td>
<td>$164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final Design/Bid/LSF Inspect.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase 2 - Design/Inspection</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>52.4</td>
<td>52.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NFS/CITY TOTAL</td>
<td>528</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>620</td>
<td>175</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

GNF – General Navigation Features (cost-shared)
NFS – Non-Federal Sponsor (City)
LSF – Local Sponsor Facility (100% City)

* Cost up front is 75%-25% with another 10% paid over time

PROJECT DESIGN AND CONSTRUCTION SCHEDULE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PHASE</th>
<th>DESIGN STARTS</th>
<th>100% BIDS AWARD</th>
<th>CONSTRUCTION BEGINS</th>
<th>ENDS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>July 2021</td>
<td>Jan 2023</td>
<td>March 2023</td>
<td>Sept 2023 Fall 2025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City (NFS)</td>
<td>Sign PPA*</td>
<td>Provide Funds</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Nov 2022</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>Spring 2026*</td>
<td>Fall 2026**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>Spring 2027*</td>
<td>Fall 2027**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Project Partnering Agreement  **ESTIMATES ONLY
MEMORANDUM

To: Joy Baker \ Lucas Stotts
Cc:
From: Bryan Hudson, P.E. S.E. and Doug Kenley, P.E.
Subject: Nome Arctic Deep Draft Port - Surfacing Alternatives

Date: 2/28/2022

The Nome Causeway Extension project is currently at approximately the 35% design level. At this stage the City and Port of Nome (City) has requested a concept review of alternative surfacing options that could be used on the new dock structure. This memo will outline five (5) alternatives for consideration by the City.

Project Description:
The project consists of an extension of the existing Nome Causeway by approximately 3,400 feet. The existing roadway will be extended the length of the new causeway and a new 2,000-foot-long L shaped sheet pile dock will be constructed as shown below in Figure 1. The roadway and new dock surface area is approximately 592,000 ft².

[Diagram of Proposed Nome Causeway Extension and Dock]

Figure 1: Proposed Nome Causeway Extension and Dock
Design Criteria:
The new facility design criteria for surface loading is established in the current version of the project Design Criteria Rev 01 as outlined below;

D) UNIFORM LIVE LOAD (Not concurrent with VLL) 1,500 psf
E) VEHICLE LIVE LOADS (VLL)
   1) 150-Ton Crawler Crane with 70-Ton Pick.*
   2) Cat 988 Loader (136,000-lb maximum axle tipping load)
   3) Taylor TXC-975 Loaded Container Handler (GVW = 256,000 lbs), center of tires > 5’ from face of sheet pile wall.
* City may increase crane load at later stages of design. A larger crane is not likely to affect the costs or narrative outlined in this memo.

Alternatives:
This section provides a brief description of each alternative considered. A comparison of various aspects for all options is given in the table attached at the end of this memo along with Rough-Order-of-Magnitude (ROM) construction cost estimates for each.

1. Gravel Surfacing:
The gravel surfacing option would be similar to the existing Mid, City and West Gold Docks in the existing basin. Drainage would be provided by either surface draining over the face of the docks, as per existing facilities, or it could also be accommodated via surface drainage to storm drain inlet structures positioned along the alignment within the dock fill section. Surfacing would consist of a 3-inch crushed rock material.

Photo 1: Gravel Surfacing - Nome Middle Dock
2. Concrete Panels / Concrete Slab:
This option would utilize either a cast-in-place concrete slab or pre-cast concrete panels for all, or part, of the dock structure surfacing. The remaining areas not surfaced in concrete could be gravel similar to the existing docks at the Port and could utilize a gravel or paved roadway section along the causeway extension. Concrete, where provided, would need to be reinforced and approximately 8” to 10” thick to resist the required vehicle loadings outlined above.

![Photo 2: Concrete Slab – UMC Dock](image)

3. Asphalt Surfacing:
This option would utilize standard asphalt surfacing, though it would need to be 10” to 12” in thickness to handle the heavy loads such as the container handlers that are required for accessing the dock structures. Pavement in Nome is typically expensive due to high mobilization costs for paving equipment however, current AKDOT&PF projects in Nome overlapping the timeframe of this project may allow for equipment availability.

![Photo 3: Asphalt Surfacing – Kodiak Pier 3](image)
4. Concrete Pavers:
Concrete pavers, or interlocking concrete blocks, would provide a surface similar to concrete panels or slab. They can be laid down quickly with minimal equipment and small sections are relatively easy to repair should damage occur. This option could be used for the entire dock structure surfacing as well as the roadway if desired. The perimeter of the surfacing has to be terminated at a hard point. The facebeam at the dock face could serve as this hard point on one side while other areas would require placement of a concrete curb.

![Photo 4: Concrete Paver Surfacing – UMC Dock](image)

5. Gravel Admixture:
A gravel admixture such as EK35 or Envirokleen could be utilized on all, or part, of the dock structure surfacing and roadway. These types of admixtures provide a binding agent to the surface course that improves strength, reduces rutting, improves water shedding and mitigates dust on gravel surfaces. Though the binder improves gravel strength it still able to be reworked with typical gravel moving equipment such as graders and dozers over many cycles while still maintaining its beneficial properties.

![Photo 5: Gravel Admixture Surfacing – Alpine Airstrip](image)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Surface Type</th>
<th>Concrete Panels \ Slab</th>
<th>Asphalt Surfacing</th>
<th>Concrete Pavers</th>
<th>Gravel Admixture</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Drainage</td>
<td>Will provide a smooth driving and walking surface for equipment and foot traffic.</td>
<td>Will provide a smooth driving and walking surface for equipment and foot traffic.</td>
<td>Could be easily washed down for passenger offload.</td>
<td>Will perform better than existing structures for driving and walking surface.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Usability</td>
<td>Could be muddy and undesirable for offload of passenger ships.</td>
<td>Could be easily washed down for passenger offload.</td>
<td>Could be easily washed down for passenger offload.</td>
<td>Will be cleaner than existing structures for passenger offload areas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herbaceous</td>
<td>Would NOT require for gravel surface. Would NOT require for gravel surface.</td>
<td>Would NOT require for gravel surface.</td>
<td>Would NOT be required for gravel surface.</td>
<td>May need some rework following crane activities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mats</td>
<td>May need some rework following crane activities.</td>
<td>Would require crane mats for crane access to prevent damage to the surfacing.</td>
<td>Would require crane mats for crane access to prevent damage to the surfacing.</td>
<td>May need some rework following crane activities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wave</td>
<td>Long term water splashing could lead to minor spalling. If only used near face of dock may require rework of gravel at interface following storms.</td>
<td>Over time water splash may erode the sand joint filler between the blocks requiring rework. A binding agent may be able to mitigate this issue at additional cost. If only used near face of dock may require rework of gravel at interface following storms.</td>
<td>Long term water splashing could lead to minor potholing. If only used near face of dock may require rework of gravel at interface following storms.</td>
<td>Performance will be superior to gravel only.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staging Pads</td>
<td>Staging containers or loaded trailers will NOT require any special pads.</td>
<td>Staging containers or loaded trailers will NOT require any special pads.</td>
<td>Staging containers or loaded trailers will NOT require any special pads.</td>
<td>Staging containers or loaded trailers will NOT require any special pads.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gravel Transport</td>
<td>Requires steepest slopes of all options to provide positive drainage.</td>
<td>Would allow for shallow slopes in coverage area for drainage.</td>
<td>Would allow for shallow slopes in coverage area for drainage.</td>
<td>Improved drainage over gravel only surfacing, but not as good as other non-gravel options.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roadway Only</td>
<td>Any amount of concrete surfacing will reduce gravel accumulation if drainage structures are used.</td>
<td>Asphalt surfacing will minimize gravel accumulation in catch basins if drainage structures are used.</td>
<td>Concrete pavers will minimize gravel accumulation in catch basins if drainage structures are used.</td>
<td>Gravel admixtures will mitigate gravel accumulation in catch basins if drainage structures are used but will be higher than other surfacing alternatives except gravel only.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dock Areas Only</td>
<td>Replacement concrete will be required to facilitate future utility installations.</td>
<td>Replacement asphalt will be required to facilitate future utility installations.</td>
<td>Small patch repairs can be made without special equipment.</td>
<td>Initial applications over several years. Re-application as required every three to five years.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drainage Structures</td>
<td>$1,795,000</td>
<td>$1,588,148</td>
<td>$1,024,000</td>
<td>$142,000 – add'l to gravel option</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20' Apron at Dock Face</td>
<td>$17,794,844</td>
<td>$4,660,970</td>
<td>$9,558,640</td>
<td>$450,000 – add'l to gravel option</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20' Apron at Dock Face</td>
<td>$1,588,148</td>
<td>$544,218</td>
<td>$1,024,000</td>
<td>$50,000 – add'l to gravel option</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$8,060,970</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
$1.5 billion multimodal, merit-based, competitive discretionary grant program for surface transportation infrastructure

Supports projects that improve safety, equity, climate and sustainability, and the creation of good-paying jobs, consistent with DOT’s strategic goals

Modal and geographic diversity requirement
What are the Characteristics of the RAISE Grant Program?

- Significant **Local or Regional** Impact
- **Public Entity** Eligibility
- **Merit-Based** Awards
- Encourages projects that address **climate change**, proactively address **racial equity**, and reduce barriers to opportunity
- Not more than **50 percent** of funds will be awarded to projects located in **urban and rural** areas, respectively
- At least **$75 million** for eligible **planning and preconstruction** activities
- At least **$15 million** to **Areas of Persistent Poverty** or **Historically Disadvantaged Communities**
# RAISE Grant Basics

## Eligible Applicants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>State Governments and the District of Columbia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any territory or possession of United States</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit of Local Government</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public agency or publicly chartered authority established by 1 or more states</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special purpose district or public authority with a transportation function, including a port authority</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federally recognized Indian Tribe or consortium of Tribes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit agency</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A multi-State or multijurisdictional group of entities that are separately eligible</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Eligible Projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Highway, bridge, or other road project</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public transportation projects</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passenger and freight rail projects</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Port infrastructure investments (including inland port infrastructure and land ports of entry)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surface transportation components of an airport project eligible for assistance under part B of subtitle VII of title 49, USC (the Airport Improvement Program-see NOFO for details)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intermodal projects</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projects to replace or rehabilitate a culvert or prevent stormwater runoff for the purpose of improving habitat for aquatic species</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation projects on Tribal land</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning and pre-construction activities for any of the above</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Include but not limited to*
RAISE Grant Basics (cont’d)

**Eligible Cost Share/Match**
- Federal cost share up to 80% in urban areas
- Federal cost share up to 100% in:
  - Rural areas
  - Areas of Persistent Poverty
  - Historically Disadvantaged Communities

**Minimum Award Size**
- $5 million for projects in urban areas
- $1 million for projects in rural areas

**Maximum Award Size**
- $25 million per project
- $225 million per State

Not more than 50% of funding will be awarded to projects located in urban and rural areas, respectively
Urban & Rural Definitions

**URBAN:**
Urbanized Area with Population Greater than 200,000

**RURAL:**
All Other Projects
- Urbanized Area with Population Less than 200,000
- Outside an Urbanized Area (including Urban Cluster)
Areas of Persistent Poverty (APP) and Historically Disadvantaged Communities (HDC)

- At least $15 million will be awarded to Areas of Persistent Poverty and Historically Disadvantaged Communities.

- The definition of Areas of Persistent Poverty is based on Census Tract or County level poverty data, and includes all US territories. The full definition is in the NOFO.

- The definition of Historically Disadvantaged Communities is based on Census Tract indicators, and includes all US territories.

- DOT lists all counties and census tracts that meet these definitions: https://www.transportation.gov/RAISEgrants/raise-app-hdc

- Additionally, DOT is providing a mapping tool to assist applicants in identifying whether a project is located in a Historically Disadvantaged Community at: https://www.transportation.gov/RAISEgrants/raise-app-hdc
Planning Grants

- What are they and what activities can they fund?
  - Pre-construction activities that do not directly lead to construction
  - Design, engineering, local or regional plans, statewide studies, etc.

- How will they be evaluated?
  - Merit Criteria Evaluation
  - Financial Completeness Review
  - No BCA
  - No Environmental Risk Analysis

- How many planning awards will be made?
  - Department will award at least $75 million in planning grants.

- Minimum award size for urban is $5 million, and for rural $1 million