

**ANCHORAGE METROPOLITAN AREA TRANSPORTATION SOLUTIONS  
POLICY COMMITTEE MEETING**

**City Hall  
Mayor's Conference Room  
632 West 6<sup>th</sup> Avenue  
Anchorage, Alaska**

**April 28, 2011  
1:00 p.m.**

Policy Committee members present:

Name	Representing
Robert Campbell	Alaska Dept. of Transportation & Public Facilities (ADOT), Central Region, Planning
Alice Edwards	Alaska Dept. of Environmental Conservation (ADEC)
Mayor Sullivan	Municipality Of Anchorage
Patrick Flynn	Anchorage Municipal Assembly

Also in attendance

---

Name	Representing
Craig Lyon	MOA/Community Development Department (CDD)
Teresa Brewer	MOA/CDD
Vivian Underwood	MOA/CDD
John Tolley	MOA/Highway to Highway
Jerry Hansen*	MOA/PW/PM&E
Emily Cotter	MOA/Port of Anchorage
Linda Kovac**	Chugiak Community Council
Steve Capp	Rabbit Creek Community Council
Anne Brooks	Brooks and Associates
Aves Thompson**	Alaska Trucking Association
John Madden**	State of Alaska
Bart Rudolph	Alaska Dept. of Transportation & Public Facilities (ADOT)
Jed Smith**	Alaska Center for the Environment
Cindy Heil*	ADEC
Mike Vanderhoof	Federal Highway Administration (FHWA)
Kris Riesenberg	FHWA
David Barton**	Access Alaska
Bruce Carr*	Alaska Railroad Corporation
Loran Frazier**	Knik Arm Bridge and Toll Authority (KABATA)
John McPherson	HDR, INC
Laurie Cummings	HDR, INC
Andrew Ooms	Kittelson and Associates
Chuck Kopp	Office of Senator Dyson

Jamie Kenworthy  
Walt Parker  
Bob French  
Ken Morton

- \* AMATS Technical Advisory Committee members
- \*\* AMATS Technical Advisory Committee + members

**1. CALL TO ORDER**

CHAIR CAMPBELL called the meeting to order at 1:04 p.m. All Policy Committee members were present with the exception of Chris Birch who was absent. A quorum was established.

**2. PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT ANNOUNCEMENT**

MR. LYON encouraged public involvement in this meeting of the AMATS Technical Advisory Committee. He explained staff would first make their presentation, followed by any comments from Committee members, and the floor would then be open to public comment.

**3. APPROVAL OF AGENDA**

MR. FLYNN moved to approve the agenda. MS. EDWARDS seconded. *Hearing no objections, the agenda was approved unanimously.*

**4. APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES**

**April 22, 2010**

MAYOR SULLIVAN motioned. MR. FLYNN seconded. *Hearing no objection the April 22, 2010 minutes were approved unanimously.*

**May 27, 2010**

MAYOR SULLIVAN motioned. MR. FLYNN seconded. *Hearing no objection the May 27, 2010 minutes were approved unanimously.*

**June 24, 2010**

MAYOR SULLIVAN motioned. MS. EDWARDS seconded. *Hearing no objection the June 24, 2010 minutes were approved unanimously.*

**July 22, 2010**

MAYOR SULLIVAN motioned. MR. FLYNN seconded. *Hearing no objection the July 22, 2010 minutes were approved unanimously.*

**December 16, 2010**

MAYOR SULLIVAN motioned. MR. FLYNN seconded. *Hearing no objection the December 16, 2010 minutes were approved unanimously.*

**5. BUSINESS ITEMS**

**a. ANCHORAGE CO MAINTENANCE PLAN – TECHNICAL REVISIONS**

MR. MORRIS discussed why we are calling these technical revisions because we are not making any substantive changes to the strategies and plans for example the IM program, which was slated for discontinuation. These revisions are precipitated solely by a new modeling requirement mandated by EPA to replace an old model called Mobile6 with the new model called MOVES. They are requiring any conformity determination made after March 2, 2012 to use MOVES in the conformity determination. This causes a problem for us because the MOVES estimates on the Carbon Monoxide emissions are much higher than Mobile6 and Mobile6 was used in the current air quality plan. We have an emission budget that we know if we tested with MOVES we'd bust the budget. It's not for any real reason other than comparing apples to oranges.

If we consider MOVES the orange version, we have to have the orange version in the plan so essentially we went back and revised the plan, projections and analysis substituting MOVES from Mobile6-Alaska. It changes the number, but it really didn't change the prescription or outlook because in Anchorage we're still looking very good for our prospects of continued compliance of standards for the next decade. Our prospects for attainment are virtually unchanged and in doing this we solved our problem in looming conformity analysis. When the future MTP comes up in June 2012, we'll be required to use MOVES and if we had an emission budget based on Mobile6 we wouldn't be able to show constraint, so we're calling these technical revisions because all we've done is substitute the Mobile6 projections with MOVES and have a new emission budget. As far we can tell everything looks rosy and we won't be in trouble unless something such as explosive growth or some unforeseen scenario in Anchorage in the next decade and we shouldn't have a problem showing CO conformity. With that, we request your recommendation for approval to the Assembly. MR. MORRIS believed it's before the Assembly agenda on May 10.

MAYOR SULLIVAN asked Mr. Morris how is it a budget item using a new methodology you're say all of a sudden creates a higher budget cost. Why is that? MR. MORRIS responded by budget he doesn't mean a fiscal budget, he means a carbon monoxide emission budget. Right now for example the budget is set for 85 tons a day.

MAYOR SULLIVAN noted it's a theoretical budget in emissions business. MR. MORRIS responded it's a term we use. Right now budget is set at about 85 tons per day; so if motor vehicles are projected to emit more than 85 tons per day we would bust the budget and we couldn't show conformity and couldn't pass a plan. Now the budget is going to be about 156 tons per day and that shows you the difference between MOVES and Mobile6, huge differences in the estimates. The budget is now much higher since we have to use MOVES to meet the budget replied MR. MORRIS.

MAYOR SULLIVAN asked if this is the standard across the country using this methodology. Is it replacing similar methodologies that we've been using? MR. MORRIS responded yes, it is a uniform requirement everyone is using this new MOVES requirement; everyone is struggling, some more than others, and we have it easier here. MAYOR SULLIVAN asked what triggers the new requirement. Is there concern from EPA that the past methodology was inaccurate to the point were they couldn't rely on it for setting standards. MR. MORRIS explained MOVES is supposedly a much better model; not for CO but for the ozone issue and other areas in the country. Again the EPA has prescribed this for everyone and everyone has to use this model. MAYOR SULLIVAN noted you mentioned right at the start this won't affect the sun-setting of the IM program. It seems like all of a sudden the estimation for carbon monoxide is significantly higher – how can it not be a relationship? MR. MORRIS replied it is a little convoluted and will take longer to explain but it's like apples and oranges. For example, a doctor says he's overweight if he weighs 180 kilos but if he's 180 lbs, it's okay. It's just using a different sort of tool to estimate them and now we are using the same tool that was used in the plan and now will be using for future transportation conformity analysis.

MR. FLYNN asked if it was possible to cite 2 or 3 factors that have changed in this analysis that lead to this district. MR. MORRIS responded supposedly MOVES is based on new emissions testing done in Michigan and have compiled lots of data on emissions and other emissions motor vehicles actually estimate so they revised the algorithms in the model. One of the things that changed tremendously is the amount they are contributing to start emissions, it used to be much lower. In the new MOVES model the CO start emissions are 4 times greater than they were in Mobile6 model. It surprises me of the big differences between one model and the other. Apparently there is new data, specifically at the cold temperatures they used that they are incorporating into the algorithms. He should note, they think they found an error in the new MOVES model, it is a very new model, and he thinks some of the projections shown here may be a little pessimistic. We hope EPA will fix them as it is fairly obvious there is some flaw in some of their algorithms and it doesn't affect us here, very little at all and hopefully they will resolve it in the next year or so.

MS. EDWARDS noted when we raised the emissions it's not like we just raised the emissions in the out year. The whole plan is based and set-emissions are set, everything is coming up proportionately and it's still being compared to the air quality data so it all

connects and works together but we do need to set a new cap for our emissions to Mobile6, basically or budget for the new emissions budget so we wouldn't come up with this disconnect between our air quality and transportation plans.

MR. FLYNN expressed his concern that we are doubling our CO output for layman to look at this. He doesn't like what's happening here. Philosophically, people can use that as a tool to make their point in transportation and it concerns him. He doesn't know if there is a bigger picture or not. It is of concern to him that we are going to have almost twice the CO in this town after today. Not sure that in this stage that many people have had success fighting with EPA either. How are we getting pinched in any way in this new MOVES thing? He doesn't know what the exact numbers are but he is assuming in Mobile6 that we had a certain amount of head room from where we are at to the ceiling. Is that reducing in terms of absolute numbers or percentage allowed?

MR. MORRIS stated the percent margin currently has a little less breathing room than we did under Mobile6. That is mainly due to the flaw in the model, he mentioned, that they will fix. What this flaw does is overestimates start emissions in the future. It's pretty apparent to DEC and CR Research that there is some kind of flaw in their algorithm that they will fix. EPA has half way acknowledged it even though they haven't looked into this and when they fix that flaw, he imagines the buffer we have under MOVES will be very close to what we have under Mobile6. MR. FLYNN stated he is more concerned about the percentage. MR. MORRIS responded the percentage is right in the absolute, but there may be an "if" and he doesn't know what the numbers are if there is a 25% under Mobile6 and once this flaw gets fixed it might be 25% under MOVES.

MR. FLYNN moved to recommend to the Assembly approval on the adoption of the Technical Revisions to the Anchorage CO Maintenance Plan. MS. EDWARDS seconded. *Hearing no objection the Anchorage CO Maintenance Plan with Technical Revisions was approved unanimously.*

## **6. INFORMATION ITEMS**

### **a. OBLIGATION REPORT**

MR. RUDOLH explained that the committee is familiar with this report, but just to remind everyone projects in the first column are in our TIP, the purple column is what the dollar amount was approved in the last amendment, the green column is what has been obligated to-date and the blue column is what we anticipate yet to obligate. This is a snapshot in time at the end of the 2<sup>nd</sup> quarter. This is a tool we use to compare what is in the TIP and what we have left to obligate. A quick note on what the TAC approved at their last meeting; the first project was Victor Rd, they approved an additional \$213,000 for increased design costs. The second project was an additional \$150,000 for the Eagle River Rd Rehab. The third project was the Old Glenn Highway Rehab, a little over \$2.4m

increase due to a construction overrun; those construction overruns are unforeseen and do not require committee approval. We are just making you aware that we are putting a little extra under that project.

Other things to note, further down the list, Dowling Rd Extension West, remains a large part of our program; \$21m is anticipated to obligate in August and that still looks good. Spenard Rd has some money in the TIP this year and it doesn't look like we'll be obligating that so we are anticipating zeroing that out and possibility pushing that money back for a future year.

On the 2<sup>nd</sup> page, the 2<sup>nd</sup> project down, Muldoon Rd Landscaping we originally identified a little over \$5.5m to AC from next year into this year. It looks like we will be able to use all that money this year and not AC any money from next year. It'll free up some money in next year's TIP due to some of the decreased costs with projects like Huffman and the de-obligations that were listed on the first page. On the 3<sup>rd</sup> page if you look at the very bottom, at this point we are required to be within a 10% difference of what's in the approved TIP and what we anticipate to obligate and we're at 6.1%. We have a little over \$2.5m gap right now, which it's still early in the year with overruns and other things yet to obligate-not anything to worry about we'll continue to keep an eye on it and we'll have a little better idea in the 3<sup>rd</sup> quarter.

MAYOR SULLIVAN asked when you add money in for cost overruns or for additional design where do you take the money from. MR. RUDOLPH replied typically from the de-obligations on the bottom of the first page. Those were projects that were obligated in previous TIPs and other years and that money helps balance out and this year. In particular the 2<sup>nd</sup> project, Huffman may not obligate \$2.3m because the estimates came in low for that project we won't need that money. We can use that money to offset some of the cost overruns. MAYOR SULLIVAN noted you don't show that as de-obligated yet. Not yet, that has to be done through a TIP amendment because it's allocated in the TIP right now replied MR. RUDOLPH.

MR. FLYNN asked where are we on the total budget for the Old Glenn Hwy. MR. RUDOLPH replied he don't know right of the top of his head. MR. FLYNN asked if Mr. Rudolph could find out and get it to him. MR. RUDOLPH responded he would get the information and make sure the Committee received it.

MAYOR SULLIVAN asked about Spenard Rd Improvements still obviously a lot of discussion. Is the committee working under Ernie Hall-do they coordinate with you? MR. RUDOLPH noted it is a Muni lead project they are doing that with GO Bond funds. The money in here was to identify or to re-evaluate some of the environmental work we had originally done when we thought we were going to do the whole thing from Minnesota all the way down to the on-ramp. As you know, we split that off into sections and that was originally what this money was identified for. MAYOR SULLIVAN commented this

also has the Fireweed to Minnesota portion too. Sunrise Bakery too, so you just split it so the downhill portion was down and the other part is Muni? MR. RUDOLPH agreed. Hillcrest to Benson is what the Muni is calling phase 2 and we still have that portion south of Benson to Minnesota, which is still up in the air.

**b. FEDERAL CERTIFICATION REVIEW UPDATE**

MIKE VANDERHOOF noted he was the statewide program's team leader in the Federal Highways Administration and he is here to thank the PC, TAC and the AMATS staff for the work they did helping FHWA and FTA with the federal certification review a few weeks ago. The USDOT is required to conduct reviews of the transportation planning process of the larger MPO's every 4 years; we did that in 2007 and we initiated the review last year with AMATS and FTA, my office in Juneau and some people from FHWA's resource center got together to conduct this review and it is a very thorough review. The process was by questionnaire going through a number of requirements to AMATS staff in advance and we came on site September 20-21.

We held onsite reviews and held a public meeting and we went through and made findings and some determinations in a draft review and supplied to AMATS and the State. We took comments on and had another meeting and issued a final report on April 8<sup>th</sup>. We issued a finding basically that FHWA and FTA certifies that the planning process conducted by AMATS meets the requirement of 23 CFR Part 450 subject to certain corrective actions and in the report there are a number of findings and recommendations and accommodations.

We did find corrective actions; these are not outrageous things, but things we identified that would bring the policies and procedures more in alignment with Federal requirements. The categories they these fell into are improvements to the Congestion Management Plan, some information included with the Fiscal constraint in the next MTP, some improvements to Title VI, and ITS. In the report and letter we've committed to working with AMATS and State DOT staff to satisfy the progress we've made and help to do what we can to respond to our request. In the letter we issued with the report we asked AMATS staff to please get with FHWA and FTA's planning staff to help identify the steps, schedule to respond to these items.

We want to thank Craig, Vivian, Teresa, Van and you and everyone on the AMATS staff with their responses and the region's response on the questionnaire on the cert review. We felt it was a positive effort and hope that the information that came out of the report was worthwhile. If you have any desire to get a more detailed discussion going we would be happy to do that.

MR. FLYNN asked in your overall assessment, what our overall package looks like. You said there were corrective actions and findings, what is it we have to do and how much time do we have, what is our overall assessment of the situation we're in.

MR. VANDERHOOF stated he thought the overall situation was good. Several of the things we asked for are going to be built into the work products, you guys are already working on. So when you update to the MTP, we asked that we got really good detail on costs of projects and where the money is coming from, so these are things we can work in to existing work processes. We asked that the next time you do a UPWP update to make sure you treat it as a work plan type document and include some scheduling and costs information, maybe little bit more than in the past. Things like that he thinks they can deal with on the fly as we do on the work product. We were happy we found something that we could contribute.

MS. EDWARDS asked how long would you be around if we wanted to talk to you about it. MR. VANDERHOOF responded today. He is flying out tonight to Juneau but if anyone wants to call he'd be happy to take them.

MR. LYON commented he should have this on the website really soon. Tana will have it posted soon. He would be happy to make copies to those who don't have a copy.

**c. OTHER INFORMATIONAL ITEMS – NONE**

**d. COMMITTEE COMMENTS - NONE**

**7. SCHEDULED AMATS MEETINGS**

Technical Advisory Committee, May 12, 2011

Policy Committee, May 26, 2011

**8. ADJOURNMENT**

The meeting adjourned at 1:31 p.m.