

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

**Mayor's Conference Room, 8th Floor
632 West 6th Avenue
Anchorage, Alaska**

**December 15, 2011
1:00 p.m.**

Policy Committee members Present:

Name	Representing
Robert Campbell	Alaska Dept. of Transportation & Public Facilities, Regional Director (DOT&PF)
Alice Edwards	Alaska Dept. of Environmental Conservation (ADEC), Air Quality
Dan Sullivan	Municipal Mayor
Patrick Flynn	MOA/Municipal Assembly

Also in attendance

Name	Representing
Craig Lyon	MOA/Community Development/Transportation Planning (CDD)
Jon Spring	TPD
Jamie Acton	MOA/Public Transportation Department
Walter Parker	ACC
Jennifer Witt *	DOT&PF
Bart Rudolph	DOT&PF
Gary Katsion	Kittelson & Associates
Joann Mitchell	Brooks & Associates

*AMATS Technical Advisory Committee members

1. CALL TO ORDER

CHAIR CAMPBELL called the meeting to order at 1:02 p.m. Mayor Sullivan arrived at 1:13 p.m., and Chris Birch was absent. A quorum was established.

2. PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT ANNOUNCEMENT

MR. LYON encouraged public involvement in this meeting of the AMATS Policy 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

Hearing no objections, the agenda was approved.

Mayor Sullivan arrived at 1:13 p.m.

4. APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES

August 25, 2011, September 22, 2011, September 29, 2011, November 17, 2011

MS. EDWARDS moved to approve the minutes of August 25, 2011. MR. FLYNN seconded.
Hearing no objections, the motion passed unanimously.

MR. FLYNN moved to approve the minutes of September 22, 2011. MS. EDWARDS seconded.
Hearing no objections, the motion passed unanimously.

MR. FLYNN moved to approve the minutes of September 29, 2011. MS. EDWARDS seconded.
Hearing no objections, the motion passed unanimously.

CHAIR CAMPBELL moved to approve the minutes of November 17, 2011. MS. EDWARDS seconded.
Hearing no objections, the motion passed unanimously.

5. BUSINESS ITEMS

a. 2035 Metropolitan Transportation Plan Update & Release of Public Hearing Draft

GARY KATSION with Kittelson & Associates provided a presentation on the 2035 Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP). He explained that throughout the past year the draft 2035 MTP has been under development and is a blueprint for blended roads, public transportation and non-motorized components. He noted the plan has been put together under a financially constrained group of projects, policies, and action items outlining how AMATS will responsibly invest over \$2.4 billion over the next 24 years. He stated the MTP includes almost another \$1 billion for the Knik Arm Crossing (KAC).

MR. KATSION noted all of the MTP discussions have been vetted through the public over the last 12 months; the first stage from January to August was plan development. The second stage was the Public Review Draft, which came out in September and has been vetted throughout the last two months. He stated the vetting of the public review draft is what is to be discussed by the Policy Committee at this meeting. He noted this includes the public involvement activities that occurred during the last two months, reviewing more than 80 pages of comments, AMATS Technical Advisory Committee's (TAC) recommendations, and answering questions followed by discussion of the Public Hearing Draft process and schedule.

MR. KATSION stated the MTP Public Review Draft was released October 1, 2011 with a variety of public involvement activities during the comment period. This included public announcements and newspaper inserts with over 70,000 copies distributed in four different languages, meeting with the Environmental Agency Coordination group, providing briefings to a variety of community councils and stakeholders, a Planning & Zoning Commission (PZC) work session in October, and 3 public open houses (one in downtown Anchorage that helped get people arriving by public transit with notices of the open house on buses, one in the U-MED District area, and one in Eagle River).

He noted comments were received from agencies, community councils, a variety of community groups, and from individuals with over 250 individual comments provided. The comments were compiled by the project team, responses to the comments prepared, and all of those comments were included in the AMATS' packet.

He explained that comments 1 through 87 were individual comments actually responded to with action taken by the TAC, comments identified by code number 88 were comments with no additional action taken, and those identified by code number 99 were comments that were opinions, which did not require a response. All these comments were presented to the TAC for deliberation and recommendations with over 8 hours of TAC meetings in the last couple of weeks.

MR. KATSION noted some of the key comments received were on the goals and objectives, Chugiak-Eagle River issues, project revenue assumptions for the fiscal constraint analysis, public transportation and non-motorized projects, and specific projects were also singled out.

MR. KATSION briefly reviewed the 3 objectives added to Goal 3 by the TAC in response to a comment about making a stronger tie between transportation and social health objectives. The objectives added to address the social justice issues were: to improve opportunities for active transportation (non-motorized) as part of daily system use; and balance the benefit of transportation impacts to neighborhoods with populations traditionally underserved by transportation. The objective to "preserve and improve air quality to maintain the health and welfare of the citizens" was added to address the social justice issue.

In terms of the Eagle-River topics, MR. KATSION noted there was concern about equity between the Anchorage Bowl and Chugiak-Eagle River funding. He indicated there was a suggestion to add into the Plan what those differences were in terms of funding proportions, which was discussed at length by the TAC. The projects are in the MTP based on need, not because of specific areas, and although it was okay to find out the equity, it was not one of the goals. He noted the goal is to make sure the system is working, and as such, the TAC decided not to recommend adding these pie charts or tables into the actual report. However, for this Committee's information, he showed the pie charts reflecting the numbers if that was done. He noted one of the concerns with singling out Chugiak-Eagle River was then what about Hillside,

Midtown and other areas. Although the charts have not been added to the MTP, MR. KATSION noted the information was put out in presentations. He stated the Chugiak-Eagle River percentage of improvement projects for the life of the MTP is just under 16%, and the population in that area is about 12%. He indicated that the project team felt this was an equitable funding distribution.

MR. KATSION discussed the other issue in the Chugiak-Eagle River areas, which are large tracts of undeveloped land that really need a collector or circulation plan prior to development. He noted they were also seeing this somewhat in the Hillside area as well. Based on the recommendation coming from the Official Streets and Highway Plan (OS&HP), he noted some studies were added as part of both the short-term and the long-term plan to study larger tract areas prior to development so the street system for that area can be laid out, and then developers coming in could use that as guidelines as they are developing their land and subdivision plats.

In response to the issue of Chugiak-Eagle River being poorly served by public transportation, MR. KATSION noted an additional action item was added to the Plan to investigate alternatives for methods of public transportation in low density areas. In addition, the service between Eagle River, Chugiak and Anchorage is being recommended to bring back to a solid level of service based on the 5-year transit blueprint plan. He indicated there was also discussion of adding the Mat-Su area-Anchorage Express with potential park-n-rides that stop in Chugiak-Eagle River to help the daily commute to the Glenn Highway area.

In terms of the revenue assumptions for fiscal constraint analysis, MR. KATSION noted that in October they met with two of the committees from the State Legislature because this Plan has a major shift from federal funding to state funding. The difference between the current LRTP and the proposed MTP is approximately 71% to 40% for federal, and the state shift from 18% to 56%. He indicated the legislative committees did not make any specific recommendations on the reasonableness of the Plan. MR. KATSION stated that the TAC decided not to make any changes to the assumptions as they felt the analysis was strong and represented reasonable trends.

MR. KATSION noted there were a variety of comments received about public transportation and non-motorized projects. He stated there was a lot of discussion that the percent share for non-motorized projects seemed low compared to roadway projects. He noted the TAC discussed this, but recommended not changing it from its current AMATS funding percentage within the 10 to 15% range. He indicated the TAC felt the percentage was sufficient at this point because there are a lot of roadway projects that include non-motorized components; and almost every roadway project include at least some component of sidewalks, bike facilities or separate trails. As such, he noted the TAC felt the non-motorized system is well handled.

MR. KATSION discussed the need for steady and sufficient public transportation operating funds for maintaining the desired level of service. He explained federal allocations can be used to buy buses, but then there is the need for drivers, as well and funds for operation and

maintenance of the buses. He stated the TAC recommended no change to the policy for implementation of public transportation service recognizing the State had allocated some funds in its last legislative session to help with operation, and they are continuing to lobby to keep receiving those funds.

MR. KATSION noted the last key topic with regard to the public transportation/non-motorized project area was the need to create a regional transit authority. He indicated there was a lot of discussion about the ability to move people through the Glenn Highway corridor and looking at all the options available. He stated the TAC recommended a policy to support regional planning activities for public transportation, and supports the creation of a regional transit authority.

In terms of the overall projects, MR. KATSION stated this draft MTP has not changed much from the draft the Policy Committee had seen the last time they met. He noted there are 56 road projects at \$2.1 billion throughout the term of the Plan; the KAC is just under \$1 billion, bike and pedestrian trails with 110 projects at almost \$100 million, and 24 public transportation projects.

With regard to specific projects, MR. KATSION noted there were a lot of comments regarding the KAC, but not all were bad. He indicated there were a number of people who wanted the KAC built now while others debated and questioned the KAC financing plan. He further noted there was a lot of discussion at the TAC about this topic with a lot of data back and forth. The TAC recommended some changes to the text and figures to reflect the latest Knik Arm Crossing Bridge and Toll Authority's (KABATA) pro forma and schedule of developer selection process.

He explained a comment came up about the difficulty of finding the topics related to the KAC in the current draft plan, and this is where the TAC made a recommendation to create a new chapter for the KAC in the final MTP. He indicated the KAC information has been integrated into the plan and is not a separate part, but the TAC recommendation was to create a new chapter.

However, he noted at the time of the TAC deliberation information was not available on whether creating this new chapter would cost AMATS more money or result in lost time to the MTP schedule. As such, the TAC did pass a recommendation on to the Policy Committee to make that decision. The consensus of the Committee was for MR. KATSION to complete his presentation, and then the Committee will come back to this issue.

MR. KATSION noted the second most discussed project was the Seward Highway to Glenn Highway connection. He indicated a lot of it had to do with information to be shared, which they did do as part of the hearings and briefings held. In discussions with the TAC, the TAC recommended no changes to the three phases currently documented in the Plan. Project 104, 36th Avenue-Seward Highway Interchange, and Project 114, Section from the 36th Avenue Interchange area down to Chester Creek were to remain in the short-term. Project 201 from Chester Creek to the Glenn Highway Connection was to remain in the long-term, although he noted based on its criteria it was one of the higher rated projects in the long-term. Another thing

about Project 201 is that it also works in conjunction with the KAC and the Ingra-Gambell Connection of the KAC. He indicated it would all have to be coordinated to make sure that Project 201 was in place prior to the Ingra-Gambell Connection because that makes a complete “Y” system for the major highways coming into the area. The TAC recognized the importance of completing that entire project, but had to break it into parts primarily because of financial constraint analysis, and the high levels of congestion in the Midtown area. The TAC also recommended adding a Fairview Pedestrian Safety Study, Project 578, to the short-term under non-motorized projects to address non-motorized issues during project development.

MR. KATSION noted the U-MED District North Access, Roadway Project 125 received a lot of interest since one of the open houses was held in their backyard. There were questions about the need for the project from certain members of the groups, and there were other people who felt the project was needed as there is limited access from the north and northeast areas to get directly into the U-MED area. MR. KATSION stated the TAC recommended no changes to the project, and it is to remain in the short-term. He indicated the TAC recognized the findings in the Reconnaissance Study for the need for a connection. He further noted the cost estimate for that project was adjusted from \$15 million to almost \$19 million based on the cost estimates from the Reconnaissance Study.

With regard to the Rabbit Creek Road Upgrade, MR. KATSION noted there was an immediate need for that project in the south Hillside area. He noted they looked at the criteria, which was right on the edge between short and long-term. He indicated because it is a relatively inexpensive project compared to other projects, and there was still some cap room under the short-term funding, the TAC recommended moving that project from the long-term to the short-term.

In the Hillside area, MR. KATSION noted there was opposition to a couple illustrative road connections that were shown, Projects 318 and 319. Those projects were already on the illustrative list, and were not part of the Plan. The TAC recommended removing those projects from the illustrative list, and adding them into the Collector Circulation Studies of Project 135, which is short-term, and Project 216, which is long-term. This corresponded to some of the recommendations that came out of the Hillside District Plan as well. These were some connections that due to topography and environmental concerns that at this time needed to be looked at in a more holistic manner.

Also in the Hillside area, the TAC recommended moving Transit Project 805 to the short-term, which would basically provide regular daily transit service on the Hillside.

MR. KATSION indicated there was a lot of discussion about moving the Eagle River Greenbelt and Coastal Trails into either short-term or long-term projects, and actually getting those projects on the funded list. Discussion included the possibility of breaking the projects into smaller segments. After a lot of deliberation, the TAC recommended keeping the Eagle River Trail in the illustrative list, and adding two projects for the southern extension of the Coastal Trail to the

illustrative list to recognize that those projects were desired, or at least mentioned by a number of people.

There were no comments from the public.

MR. FLYNN noted comments were included about dividing out Project 201 (Seward Hwy/Glenn Hwy Connection-Phase III), but it was not addressed in terms of response. He noted they had the meeting with the TAC, and there had been a lot of agreement around the table that the project should be split up. He asked for a status on this issue. MR. KATSION noted this was discussed in a long meeting with DOT. In response, MR. FLYNN stated he knows what the DOT response is, which is we have not done an EIS, so we cannot do anything. He indicated it does not mean AMATS cannot have a different project list in the MTP. He asked if DOT had said not to do this. MR. KATSION stated “no,” but it was brought to the TAC, and the TAC decided not to break it up into any more pieces than that.

MR. FLYNN moved that Project 201, which is in the proposed MTP project list, connecting from Chester Creek to Airport Heights be split into 3 sections with the first being from Chester Creek to the 5th and 6th Avenue Corridor, the second from along the 5th and 6th Avenue Corridor from Hyder Street to Airport Heights, and the third would be a grade separated crossing at Airport Heights. MAYOR SULLIVAN seconded.

MR. FLYNN stated Project 201 is described on Page 3 of 7 in the Chapter 7 comments.

There were no public comments on the proposed motion.

CHAIR CAMPBELL asked MR. FLYNN to explain the reasons behind his motion.

In response, MR. FLYNN expressed his concern about the way the MTP is current structured, which is there are two relatively discrete projects on the south end of the former Highway-to-Highway Project, and then one mega project for the northern portion. He indicated it could not possibly be constructed in its current form the way it is described as Project 201. He thinks the proposed funding of about \$600 million is untenable. He would like to break this project down, and then, if AMATS decides it has some extra money, we could do the Hyder Street project and then address his Fairview concerns, or start on that Airport Heights Interchange and advance the flow of the Glenn traffic a little further into town before they have to go into stop light/arterial territory. Project 201 is currently estimated at \$605 million in the table. Project 117, the Seward Highway grade separation is listed at \$60 million. Project 114, Benson from 33rd Avenue to Chester Creek is listed at \$178 million.

MAYOR SULLIVAN did not think there was any harm in splitting the project up. He asked if segmenting it could cause any complications.

MR. SPRING did not see any problem either. He noted a lot of these big projects end up being broken up anyway such as the Old Minnesota Drive project, which was designed at one time back in the 70's, but was not built all at once. He noted the last interchange at International and Minnesota was built a couple years ago. He indicated it is probable that Project 201 would also be broken up like that. In his opinion, although he noted he is not an environmental specialist, Project 201 will have to be looked in its entirety as an EIS project in order to get federal money, and then once the EIS is done, it can be broken up into different segments. MR. SPRING noted all the projects fit together and indicated project staff discussed building Airport Heights Interchange separately. However, he further noted, the problem with building it in isolation without an overall EIS finished product is not knowing whether it should go below the existing interchange, above the existing interchange, or right where it is currently without knowing what the connections are going to be to the rest of the project, which is why it is necessary to know what the entire design will be more or less over the entire alignment before you start that phase.

CHAIR CAMPBELL added there is a further subtlety to the Minnesota Drive Project Mr. Spring discussed, and indicated as part of that document there is a grade separation up at the Old and New Seward Highways as well, and when you drive under the railroad tracks and look at the huge expanse of unused space to the north that is accommodation for future lanes through there. As such, he noted that project really has been a multi-generational environmental document that served the last 30 years in this town in development of the project.

CHAIR CAMPBELL concurred with Mr. Spring that some of these things do need an overview. He indicated how the construction money is split up is secondary to him, but that you do need to have a concept of the entire corridor route before you start building pieces of it. In addition, he noted by building pieces you lose some efficiency, but in some of these big projects it is really not an option because it is unlikely AMATS would get a \$600 million project. He thinks realistically AMATS is going to have to look at ways to segment the construction. He is not sure how to view this, but suggested if AMATS wants to do something like this that we accommodate some kind of overview for the entire corridor in the first phase so that when the planning and environmental level activities start we accomplish the whole corridor assessment, and then maybe just identify the construction in different segments. He did not think the project could be done in two pieces all the way through.

MR. FLYNN stated he would not have any objection to having Projects 201a, b, c and d, and "a" could be the environmental piece. He indicated it might be a better way of writing it just so the planning and environmental piece could be done, and put that on the short-term list so that could be done.

MR. FLYNN indicated he would accept as a friendly amendment that (a) be the environmental and the other sections would be (b), (c) and (d). There was no objection. *This was accepted as a friendly amendment.*

CHAIR CAMPBELL asked the two TAC representatives present, Ms. Heil and Ms. Witt, the TAC Vice Chair, their thoughts about the discussion to segment Project 201 into three or four difference pieces as long as AMATS puts the entire segment in the front end piece for analysis for the entire corridor prior to constructing it in segments as described by Mr. Flynn.

In response, MS. WITT stated in terms of the long-range plan that as long as it recognized that there is no specific alignment chosen, but for planning purposes we show a line on the map, it is to be acknowledged that by breaking the project out it is not predetermining that it is absolutely going to be Hyder because there is also the possibilities through the environmental process to look at Debarr to 5th Avenue as another alternative to some of the connections. She does not see a problem specifying it as a, b, c and d as long as the intent is to have the part of the corridor that has many alternatives being 20th and Airport Heights, and as long as it is recognized that the whole corridor needs to be addressed as one, and then broken into pieces. She indicated her concern is that by specifying those locations there may be a public expectation that they are actually going to be cut out and developed as discrete projects.

CHAIR CAMPBELL noted formatting could be worked on, but he is concerned with the bigger picture. He wants to rebut that it seems like in the previous LRTP AMATS did have a line on a map that did pretty much go down a certain location, and it did not include lines that went off to the east or the west, and it was acceptable at that point in time to have that in the document. He understands and agrees with Ms. Witt about the idea that if we are going to use federal money we are going to have a standalone purpose and need, and it may swing the corridor back and forth, and may change the segments once construction phase is reached.

MS. EDWARDS thinks the solution of having the EIS in the front makes a lot of sense, but to be able to show the segments makes a lot of sense too. She noted she sat at the work session with Mr. Flynn, it is a big project, and it is clear that it is going to get segmented at some point.

MR. SPRING indicated his only concern was not creating expectations, and whether it would be necessary to put qualifying language in that the b, c and d portions are not the final corridor.

MAYOR SULLIVAN did not have a problem with the segmentation as long as there is that qualifier that basically says it does not preclude other options.

MR. FLYNN thinks the way he wrote it here is relatively open as to where it would go noting it just says “from Seward Highway, Chester Creek to 5th Avenue along the Gambell-Ingra Corridor.” As such, he indicated it could be Hyder or just Ingra.

CHAIR CAMPBELL assumed what AMATS is doing is asking the TAC to implement this, and the TAC will come forward with their proposed language based on the Policy Committee’s discussion at this meeting and Mr. Flynn’s motion, as well as the intent, and the TAC will be allowed to actually do that work.

The Committee members concurred. MS. EDWARDS indicated the TAC might want to add something with regard to the timing of this.

In response, MS. HEIL noted the schedule is to release the public hearing draft, and it could come back to the TAC to come up with language that would then come back to the Policy Committee to be released.

CHAIR CAMPBELL indicated what he thinks the TAC is asking the Policy Committee to do is that once the public hearing draft comes back to incorporate that change into what the Committee approves. MS. HEIL confirmed this. The Policy Committee is asking that what they also get from the TAC is this change so it can be incorporated when the public hearing draft is reviewed.

CHAIR CAMPBELL noted the real material issue here is that by this change whether the Policy Committee feels that we are going to have to start some public involvement clock over again. He believes the material is already here for the public to review, and the Committee is just talking about refining which ways the project is described in the Plan for construction and environmental work. CHAIR CAMPBELL'S proposal would be that AMATS move forward with those refinements during the public review process to the extent, and he believes they can, that it does not require AMATS to restart the public review process because of these formatting changes to the project.

Mayor Sullivan asked if it would even be necessary to go back to the TAC, and whether Mr. Lyon could wordsmith something for the Committee. He indicated if it is not a substantive change that would require the TAC to assemble and vote. MS. HEIL indicated that would be better.

MR. FLYNN indicated he could work with Mr. Lyon on the changes.

MS. HEIL stated all efforts should be made to incorporate any changes into the public hearing draft prior to release without changing the schedule.

MR. FLYNN noted the public hearing draft is to be released based on the action at this meeting by the Policy Committee.

In response to Chair Campbell, MR. KATSION noted the plan is to print the public hearing draft next week. He noted primarily because the schedule for the Planning and Zoning Commission (PZC) is January 9th, and advertising for PZC is 21 days in advance although materials are required to be provided 7 days in advance, but they hope to have them earlier in advance of Christmas.

In response to Chair Campbell, MR. KATSION stated by code the PZC needs the draft by January 2nd.

CHAIR CAMPBELL explained there is a motion before the Committee, and he thinks right now the sense he is getting from the Committee is there is not an objection to the proposal, but there is some issue about how this would be mechanically implemented; how it gets approved either by one of the two bodies, or out for public hearing draft without being reviewed by one of the two bodies. He indicated he is not in favor of releasing the draft without the change having been reviewed.

CHAIR CAMPBELL explained the options, which would be for the Committee to come back in a week and review the work Mr. Lyon has done and approve it at that point, it can be remanded to the TAC and ask them to have a special meeting by which they can either incorporate it based on this Committee's pre-blessing, or we can come back and review their work, or the Committee can allow staff to insert this change in at their own discretion and move forward with this. He indicated he would resist that effort noting he did not think it was the responsible thing to do, and if the Committee is going to make this change, we ought to approve it before it goes out.

Although he will be leaving town the night of the December 21st, MR. FLYNN indicated he would make himself available Monday, Tuesday or Wednesday depending on other schedules.

CHAIR CAMPBELL noted this would be a continuation of this meeting.

MAYOR SULLIVAN indicated if he is not available Mr. Vakalis would attend.

MS. EDWARDS indicated MS. HEIL could fill in for her if necessary.

CHAIR CAMPBELL recapped. He noted Mr. Flynn made a motion before the Committee, which has been amended, and basically the Committee is moving to split Project 201 into 4 separate segments with the first segment to include the planning/environmental level work to identify the route by which the corridor will be constructed, three follow-on segments which will construct roughly one-third sized dollar chunks within reason of the overall \$600 million project under 201a, b, c and d. He believes the Committee has asked Mr. Lyon to work with Mr. Flynn and/or the TAC. He indicated Ms. Witt or Ms. Mormilo could assign a person to help with that because he would like the TAC to look in on it. The intent is to get something written up in the next two or three days and to continue this meeting next week.

CHAIR CAMPBELL concurred with MS. WITT'S suggestion that they could go back to the Project Oversight Committee to review this, which includes three TAC members and staff, as well as the project team.

CHAIR CAMPBELL asked if there were any objections to the motion as modified and restated several times.

Hearing no objections, the motion passed unanimously.

In response to Mr. Flynn, MR. LYON confirmed he got Mr. Flynn's email regarding the Eagle River Trail Project. MR. FLYNN stated there is apparently some concern in Eagle River about this project, but noted that although it is in the illustrative list, he remembered there being one in the actual construction list. He asked if there were two different Eagle River Trail projects. MR. LYON explained the Eagle River Trail is currently in the TIP. He indicated this project has been pushed out for such a long time because, similar to the Highway-to-Highway, it is a large project with a large dollar figure, and with \$2 million a year going to TE projects it is not possible. He indicated the suggestion has been to try and break it up, which is what came from the TAC where there was some discussion about breaking it up into separate projects.

MR. FLYNN asked that Mr. Lyon to follow up with Assembly Member Bill Starr, but indicated he thought what Mr. Starr told him was there was interest in the trail from the campground a short distance up the valley, but beyond there was not as much interest in the project moving forward and instead accommodating non-motorized traffic with some upgrades to the roads in the area. He asked for more definition around that, but indicated it does not have to be done as an amendment now before the public hearing, but maybe as something for the Committee to consider before final approval.

CHAIR CAMPBELL asked if Mr. Flynn's intent was to segment this project as well into some smaller piece of previous project. MR. FLYNN indicated it was or to perhaps remove part of the project more consistent with community interests. He indicated this was what Mr. Starr was representing to him, and what it sounded like to him was that they would prefer not to have the entire project.

CHAIR CAMPBELL suggested this might fit into the category of a new project, and it would probably be re-scored within the TAC at some point and identified that way. He indicated the project would either sink or swim on its merits based on the new refined scope. He did not think at the Policy level that too much action needed to be taken, but he has no objection to an informational update on that. MR. FLYNN concurred.

CHAIR CAMPBELL asked for comments on the proposed MTP public hearing draft.

MS. EDWARDS indicated the only issue she was concerned about was making clear what AMATS was doing with this new draft and the Knik Arm Crossing (KAC) with regard to the timing.

CHAIR CAMPBELL concurred, and asked Ms. Witt for a recap from the TAC'S perspective with regard to the separated chapter versus the integrated information on the KAC within the MTP document. His understanding is there is a recommendation that the Policy Committee move forward with releasing this document, and yet, at the same time, staff will be working internally perhaps to coalesce all this material into a stand-alone chapter.

MS. WITT confirmed CHAIR CAMPBELL'S assessment. She stated that the TAC, by a slight majority, voted in response to some public comments to recommend that all of the information regarding the KAC be pulled into its own chapter. She noted this was mainly for ease in finding all of the financial information and assumptions that have gone into the Plan for that specific project. At the third continuation meeting, she noted it was acknowledged that to do so now would not allow the Plan to be released in time for the public hearing draft. As such, she stated what the TAC at that time had directed staff and the project team to focus on getting all other changes approved by the TAC into the document, keep KAC dispersed throughout the document, and acknowledge that during the public hearing draft process that the information currently dispersed throughout the document would be pulled into its own chapter.

CHAIR CAMPBELL indicated his understanding is the TAC passed a recommendation asking the Policy Committee to decide if we agree with the TAC to coalesce this into one chapter.

MS. HEIL stated the TAC passed the recommendation to split KAC out. However, she clarified that as the meeting was winding down, the ramifications of that decision were discussed, and the TAC asked staff and the consultants what it would take to do this. She stated staff and the consultants came back to the third TAC meeting and said they could not get this pulled out in time for this Policy Committee meeting, nor did they have the funds within the budget to pull it out. As such, she indicated the TAC was looking at possibly having AMATS staff do the work. At that point in time, she noted the TAC did not have enough members to rescind their action, and as a result what the TAC has now is a recommendation to pull the KAC, but they do not state what the timing of when that should be. She indicated it is possible that if the public hearing draft is released with a note saying all of the KAC information is being pulled into a chapter and will be released when it gets done, and then maybe AMATS would not have to rehear any of it. She further indicated the problem is the TAC made that decision without knowing the schedule and monetary impacts, and when TAC found out they did not have the numbers to be able to rescind the decision, which would have required two-thirds of the entire body if that had been the choice. MS. HEIL noted the TAC thought it was probably a good idea, but the timing was at cross purposes.

CHAIR CAMPBELL stated what was before the Committee is a recommendation for the Committee to pull all of the KAC information out and put it in a standalone chapter, and it will take some time to do. He further stated the Committee also has a recommendation from the TAC to release the document at this meeting. CHAIR CAMPBELL feels the Committee is getting a conflicting message from the TAC.

CHAIR CAMPBELL thinks the big issue is whether the KAC should be a standalone chapter or not, and at this time the TAC has recommended it should be in a standalone chapter. He asked for discussion from the Committee.

MAYOR SULLIVAN thinks it would be nice to have a historical perspective. He noted AMATS has had any number of big projects similar in size and scope over the years, and asked

if it has been customary to create separate chapters because of the nature of the project. He indicated that certainly Highway-to-Highway could be its own chapter, and any of AMATS big projects could be, but he does not know the history of whether this is standard practice, or if this would be unusual.

MR. LYON stated the historical practice has been to integrate all the projects into the document together. He indicated when the KAC project was added into the LRTP in 2007 it was an amendment to add just that project in, and as such, it was added as a separate chapter. He noted this was done for ease of adding the amendment to a document that had been created and approved a long time ago. MR. LYON explained that in this version of the MTP before the Committee, the KAC project was integrated in, and staff had the time to do it from scratch. He noted the Project Oversight Committee, with the TAC'S and this Committee's blessing decided to do this all together because it reaches through all parts of the plan. He further noted the public comment came up that suggested the project should come out, and the TAC voted accordingly, but previously the only time a project had been a separate chapter is when the KAC was added in as an amendment. He indicated that otherwise it would have been integrated throughout the document.

To follow-up, MAYOR SULLIVAN asked what kind of work and time it would take to pull the KAC and consolidate it into one chapter.

In response, MR. KATSION indicated it was not so much just pulling that part out because parts of it should not be pulled out noting it is integrated and the discussion flows well with it partially integrated. He noted what they heard from the public was it was hard to find information, and he believes this was the primary reason AMATS talked about creating a separate chapter. He indicated it does not mean it would be totally pulled out. However, he indicated the problem is that it ripples through the entire document with regard to such things as the number of figures and pages, and it takes time to do this, as well as to check and recheck. He noted this document has gone through a lot of internal vetting and checking, and pulling pieces apart takes time to pull it back together. He stated one suggestion the Project Oversight Committee talked about was that if it went out at this time with it all together, they could also have a cheat sheet to show where it could be found, or it could even be set up in the table of contents to specifically callout certain things because there are segments of the chapter.

MAYOR SULLIVAN indicated it would be a reference page showing the KAC can be found on certain pages.

MR. KATSION noted the financial piece in Chapter 6 has a specific segment about the KAC, and the same with the project description, which is like Highway-to-Highway or the other projects. He indicated this could be a compromise at this time in order to keep to the time schedule.

MAYOR SULLIVAN stated he would suggest that.

MR. FLYNN stated he likes some way of calling out the KAC just because it is unique within the plan in part because at least in theory AMATS is not funding it in the traditional manner. He indicated if a specific page within the table of contents says “information about the Knik Arm Crossing can be found here, here and here, or a separate chapter all together that either option would be acceptable to him.

MS. EDWARDS stated she could see where the TAC and the issue comes from, and she also thinks it seems a much simpler and more timely solution to go with the concept of having something in the table or contents or a cheat sheet that helps if the Committee wants to get this document out for review.

CHAIR CAMPBELL agreed with that concept as well. He is concerned that AMATS has a project that is getting discriminatory treatment in his mind. He indicated it has been a lightning rod since its inception, which has led AMATS down the path to what he thinks are some bad practices in some instances. He noted it is an interesting project for a lot of reasons to a lot of people, but indicated he is also concerned, as Mayor Sullivan alluded to as well, that by treating this project separately it opens the door in the future for other projects to be similarly treated. He also expressed concern that if AMATS does pull the project out into its own chapter somebody, for example, wanting to look at the economic analysis of the MTP might have to go to two different places to look. He noted the reverse would be equally as true that if you pull the KAC project out and suddenly people are reading through lists or identification of things and it is not in there, then he thinks in a way it becomes a hidden project in that it is not identified in some of the categories that it should be shown in when it is integrated. As such, he also supports identification in the index, or wherever it is appropriate to help lead people to the relevant sections as opposed to trying to rework the document.

CHAIR CAMPBELL asked, and the Committee concurred, to have Mr. Katsion through the TAC identify a way through the index or a cheat sheet to identify the salient parts of the KAC project for the persons specifically interested in that project and leave the text essentially as it is in the existing preview of this draft.

MS. WITT suggested instead of remanding it back to the TAC that it be the Project Oversight Committee working with the project team for your continuation to release the public review draft. CHAIR CAMPBELL agreed.

CHAIR CAMPBELL stated he had some brief editorial comments. He expressed concern when AMATS takes things like Hillside connections out of our plan. He stated this is a planning document; it is not meant to be an absolute, but he thinks in some ways by not even allowing ourselves to study something we deny a future for this City that should be considered. As such, he noted when AMATS talks about Hillside connections he assumes we are talking about Elmore primarily between Abbott and O’Malley, although he does not know specifically what the Hillside connections were that were removed. He stated when AMATS talks about taking those

connections out for terrain constraints he is disappointed that at a planning level we have so much knowledge on a project about the terrain constraints that we can make that kind of decision. He further stated it does not seem to him that that is where a planning level document should be. He thinks there is a bigger picture in mind here that AMATS should always be considering.

CHAIR CAMPBELL expressed concern if we limit ourselves to certain things. He stated he appreciates some of the work that has been done on some of these studies. He thinks those are good things whether it is some of the Hillside studies, some of the transit studies, and those are good things to have. He hopes they can be done expeditiously so AMATS can move forward with some of those concepts coming out of those studies. He thinks there are some needs out there that really need to be worked on whether, again, it is the connections on the Hillside, signalizations in town need to be studied, and some other things out there as well. He would hope those things are moved for through the TIP process where the TAC gets a chance to look at those.

MR. KATSION continued his presentation with a review of the schedule. He indicated they are asking the Policy Committee to recommend releasing the public hearing draft as soon as they can get it out. He noted a work session was held with the PZC earlier this week. He indicated nothing of substance came out of that meeting to change any of the recommendations that were presented to this Committee at this meeting. He believes AMATS is on the PZC hearing scheduled for January 9, 2012, and he thinks the notice goes out on December 22, 2011. He also noted after the work session a couple of the PZC commissioners asked to get the document to them as soon as they could because they felt they need more than the seven days. He stated the plan for the Anchorage Assembly hearing is to introduce the MTP in February and hold the hearings in March. He noted this would be followed by the TAC and Policy Committee adoption, and then the submittal to FHWA as soon as we possibly can after that. The schedule for the MTP was provided to the Committee, and MR. KATSION indicated the schedule is still on target.

In response to Mr. Flynn, CHAIR CAMPBELL confirmed the Assembly can make amendments to this document as part of their review. MR. FLYNN indicated he would work with Mr. Starr on the trail and try to handle it on that level. CHAIR CAMPBELL clarified the Assembly motions are advisory in nature.

CHAIR CAMPBELL stated, and Mr. Lyon confirmed, the Committee will be continuing this meeting, and a specific motion on the MTP is not needed at this point.

b. 2011 Unified Planning Work Program – Major Amendment

MR. LYON explained this amendment pertains to the planning funds AMATS staff utilizes as directed by the Policy Committee for the two year period the budget is controlled by. He noted when the budget is created at the end of the year for five elements of the UPWP that in each

element AMATS can spend up to 110% of the budget. He further noted if an element goes over 110% then AMATS does not get reimbursed by the FHWA for that work, and for this reason the budget is reviewed at the end of every year to determine if funds need to be moved around. He stated that this is what the amendment is for, the TAC reviewed and approved the amendment, and it is before this Committee for final approval.

There were no comments from the public.

In response to Mr. Flynn, MR. LYON confirmed the total work effort of Freight Mobility, Task 260, was \$13,200 and with this amendment half the budget is being moved. He noted during the previous year staff did a lot work under Task 260 including a couple tours with the Freight Advisory Committee, which had just gotten ramped up again requiring more work, and a freight mobility study with the University. He indicated staff had expected a similar amount of work this year, which was not the case, primarily because of limited staffing. As a result, he stated there was more money in Task 260 at the end of the year than was needed.

MAYOR SULLIVAN moved to approve the major amendment to the 2011 AMATS Unified Planning Work Program. MS. EDWARDS seconded.

CHAIR CAMPBELL stated the motion was to approve Table 2, Annual Element Budget modifications as presented.

Hearing no objections, the motion passed unanimously.

c. Other Business Items - None

6. INFORMATION ITEMS

a. 2012 Association of Commuter Transportation Leadership Academy

MR. LYON explained Jamie Acton, the AMATS Mobility Coordinator, will be doing some work next year that will be supported by AMATS. MS. ACTON reported she was one of the participants selected to participate in the 2012 Association of Commuter Transportation Leadership Academy. She stated this is the 5th year of the Academy, and she is the second Alaskan selected. She explained this means she will be traveling out of state three times next year and participating in a variety of working groups with all sorts of different learning opportunities along the lines of transportation demand management, which is one of the things she works with as Mobility Coordinator for the Public Transportation Department. She noted the first trip will be to Washington, D.C. during the reauthorization of the transportation bill, the second trip is to Tampa, Florida, to C.U.T.R., which is the Center for Urban Transportation Research, and the third trip will be to Savannah, Georgia for the International Commuter Transportation Conference, which includes graduation from the Leadership Academy, and where they will meet people from all over the world and see what is going on in transportation demand

management. She expressed her appreciation that her participation was 100% funded by scholarships and contributions.

MR. LYON stated the UPWP amendment just passed included some travel funds not utilized by AMATS staff, which they were able to move over for this use.

b. Other Informational Items - None

7. Committee Comments

CHAIR CAMPBELL asked about informational reports before the TAC recently on a Reconnaissance Study for the U-MED District. MR. LYON explained there are 3 items before the TAC this month that were postponed to January due to work on the MTP as follows:

U-MED Reconnaissance Study
Eagle River Interchange Study
Intelligent Traffic Systems (ITS) Update

CHAIR CAMPBELL noted the importance of the U-MED District, and indicated his interest in hearing some of the latest thoughts on what the demand and need is, and what the possible solutions are.

MAYOR SULLIVAN noted for several meetings these Committee's meetings have coincided with fairly big lunch events on his schedule including the Governor's budget release, and he apologized for his late arrival.

CHAIR CAMPBELL noted the record the MAYOR SULLIVAN arrived at approximately 1:13 p.m.

7. SCHEDULED AMATS MEETINGS

Technical Advisory Committee, January 12, 2012
Policy Committee, January 26, 2012
Technical Advisory Committee, February 9, 2012
Policy Committee, February 23, 2012

8. ADJOURNMENT

MR. FLYNN moved to continue the meeting to Wednesday, December 21, 2011 at 1:00 p.m.
MAYOR SULLIVAN seconded.

Hearing no objections, the motion was approved unanimously.

At 2:30 p.m., the meeting was continued to December 21, 2011.