

**ANCHORAGE METROPOLITAN AREA TRANSPORTATION SOLUTIONS
JOINT POLICY, TAC + COMMITTEE MEETING**

**12001 Business Blvd
Eagle River, Alaska**

**March 24, 2011
1:00 p.m.**

Policy Committee members Present:

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

Also in attendance

Name	Representing
Jennifer Witt*	ADOT&PF Central Region, Planning
Kim Rice*	ADOT&PF, Central Region Pre
Cindy Heil*	Alaska Dept. of Environmental Conservation (ADEC)
Steve Morris*	MOA/Dept. of Health & Human Services
John Crapps*	MOA/Traffic Department (TD)
Jerry Weaver*	MOA/Community Development Dept. (CDD)
Lance Wilber*	MOA/Public Transportation Department (PTD)
Lois Epstein*	AMATS Air Quality Advisory Committee
Bruce Carr*	Alaska Railroad Corporation (ARRC)
George Mayberry**	Alaska Division of Homeland Security
David Barton**	Access Alaska
Mike Saville**	Public Transit Advisory Board
Loran Frazier**	Knik Arm Bridge and Toll Authority
Marc Lamoreaux**	Eklutna Tribal Council
Aves Thompson**	Alaska Trucking Association
Brad Sworts**	Mat-Su Borough
Karol Fink**	Alaska Dept. of Health & Social Services
Toby Smith**	Alaska Center for the Environment
Linda Kovac**	CBERRRSA
Craig Lyon	MOA/CDD
Vivian Underwood	MOA/CDD
Erika McConnell	MOA/CDD
Teresa Brewer	MOA/CDD
Jon Spring	MOA/Consultant
Gary Katsion	Kittelson and Associates
Phil Worth	Kittelson and Associates
Bart Rudolph	ADOT&PF

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

1. CALL TO ORDER

CHAIR CAMPBELL called the meeting to order at 1:32 p.m. Mr. Traini was absent.

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.

CHAIR CAMPBELL explained the subject of the meeting is to present information on the 2035 Metropolitan Transportation Plan update. A presentation will be given by the consultants, Kittelson and Associates. He asked if the public could hold all questions until after the presentation at which time any comments will be taken and heard.

MR. KATSION welcomed the attendees. The good news is that the project is up and running and we are moving ahead. While the schedule is tight, it is realistic. MR. KATSION pointed out the MTP team members. The team members not only include Kittelson and Associates, but also members from ADOT&PF, the MOA Transportation Planning Division, and Traffic Engineering. Other project support includes CH2MHill and Word Wrangler. MR. KATSION appreciated the time that the PC and TAC Plus set aside for this update. Regular updates will be provided throughout the course of the planning process. This way there will be no surprises along the way. The first project meeting took place about a month ago. It is important for the PC, the TAC Plus, and the public to be at “the table” at the same time to hear the same message.

MR. KATSION introduced the project team, and then the PC and TAC+ plus members followed with self-introductions.

MR. KATSION explained the federal nomenclature for “MTP” – which means Metropolitan Transportation Plan. The Metropolitan Transportation Plan is basically the same as a Long-Range Transportation Plan (LRTP). However, this Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP) update will combine the Anchorage Bowl 2025 Long-Range Transportation Plan and the Chugiak-Eagle River Long Range Transportation Plan – so that the metropolitan area is covered in one document. Today we will discuss the MTP update activities, accomplishments, schedule, and summary of accomplishments. MR. KATSION emphasized that this is an ongoing process and there is a constant update of projects and needs. MR. KATSION noted the draft goals and objectives and guidelines for the MTP.

Accomplishments since Project Kickoff Meeting in January. The work plan, schedule, and public involvement plan have been updated to reflect a realistic and doable timeframe. In order to allow for additional time for further public participation and comments, a request for an extension to the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) June 2011 deadline is being prepared. It is expected that this request will be approved by FHWA.

Travel demand modeling efforts have also been underway. In order to determine what future transportation needs would be by 2035, data such as population, employment, and traffic data was also examined and used to develop initial travel demand forecasts. This included travel demand data and information from a number of other studies, and subarea studies (such as the Hillside District Plan, the Eagle River Commercial Business District Plan). It is important to use already adopted plans and take advantage of the work already completed. Kittelson and Associates have also developed a “straw man” draft document. MR. KATSION anticipates that draft Chapters 1 and 3 will be available soon.

Additional public involvement efforts have included updating the constant contact mailing list, providing newspaper inserts to reach underserved and limited English proficiency populations. Project staff is also providing outreach to numerous boards and commissions to provide information on the MTP planning process. The intent of this effort is to reach a broad group of stakeholders and interested community members.

Furthermore, the schedule has also been revised. There are three primary areas reflected on the project schedule. First, plan development - from January 2011 to August 2011, it is expected that a draft plan will be created. Public engagement is a key element of this process. Second, draft recommendations and project strategies will be developed to meet future network deficiencies. As part of this effort, there will be time dedicated for public involvement and review. A Citizen Advisory Committee will also provide review and public hearings will occur through out the plan development. This is expected in September 2011. However, MR. KATSION stressed that public comments will be taken throughout the entire project. Please call, e-mail, or fax comments to AMATS. In the spring of 2012, the draft document should come back before the PC and the TAC plus as an official document ready for adoption. After the PC and TAC plus adopt the draft MTP update, then it would move onto the Federal Transit Authority and the Federal Highway Administration for final approval. MR. KATSION gave a quick overview of the current draft chapters being developed. By April 2011, the MTP update draft chapters should include the Introduction, the Goals and Objectives, and the Status of the System today.

Status of the System Today – Accomplishments since last plan update. MR. SPRING described the transportation projects completed since the last plan update and the results of those infrastructure improvements. MR. SPRING reviewed a list of Chugiak-Eagle River and Anchorage Bowl projects. In Eagle River, two major road projects included the Eagle River Loop expansion and the Old Glenn Highway reconstruction. These projects mainly addressed safety issues. Within the Anchorage Bowl, there were a cluster of projects in East Anchorage that primarily addressed congestion, safety, and delay; including the Elmore Road extension, the

Dowling Road extension, the Dr. Martin Luther King Jr. Blvd. construction, and improvements to the Lake Otis Blvd. and Tudor Rd. intersection. The cumulative impacts of these projects were to significantly reduce congestion, especially during peak periods. The Lake Otis Blvd. corridor saw the biggest improvements in terms of reduced travel time. Travel times along all of the major roadway corridors have been collected in 1998, 2006 and 2010 using the pilot car method which essentially records travel times, vehicle speed, and stops. The combination of projects described above had the effect of providing a full decade of congestion relief along the Lake Otis Blvd. corridor from Debarr Rd. to O'Malley Rd. In other words, the travel time is the same in 2010 as it was in 1998 in spite of the tremendous growth that the UMED district has experienced during that time period.

Other projects, such as the new Bragaw interchange and the 5th Avenue expansion have also provided travel time improvements along the Glenn Highway corridor. In spite of the retail, commercial, industrial, institution, and medical growth, there have been tremendous improvements in travel time.

On the other hand, the Dimond Blvd. and 36th Ave. corridors have experienced steadily increasing travel times, due mainly to the rapid retail development (in the Dimond area) and office development (in the southern Midtown area).

Road improvements do not provide the "whole story." Major transit, pedestrian, and bicycle improvements have been accomplished in the last few years..

In 2008, People Mover surpassed the 4 million annual ridership level for the first time in its history carrying a total of 4,220,667 passengers. The 2009 ridership figure also exceeded this mark and was 34 % higher than in 2002. This is due largely to the implementation of the "Blueprint Plan" for transit. This plan outlines transit recommendations for new routes and transit facilities. The improvements initiated under the 2002 People Mover Blueprint plan which improved the frequency of service and consequently improved service convenience had a multiplier effect on transit ridership with ridership increasing substantially faster than service hours. When ridership increased faster than service hours then productivity climbs. This is a very good achievement for any bus system in the nation.

Another component of public transit is the vanpool and Share-A-Ride services. The Vanpool program has increased the number of vans arriving from the Mat-Su Valley from 42 to 55 vans since 2007. The vanpools take about 700 vehicles a day off the Glenn Highway. MS. EPSTEIN asked what percentage of traffic is on the Glenn Hwy. MR. SPRING replied that approximately 11% of total traffic is the morning peak on the Glenn Hwy. The Glenn Hwy. represents about 8.5% of all total traffic. MS. EPSTEIN wondered how the Valley Mover data was included in this total. MR. SPRING responded that the current data only includes the vanpool and Share-A-Ride as ridership and other data was not available from the Valley Mover at this time. However, MR. SPRING stated that he would try and find out this information.

With respect to trails, bike lanes, and sidewalks, the MOA has largely implemented the greenbelt trail systems recommended in the 2025 Long-Range Transportation Plan. For instance, Chester Creek, the University of Alaska Anchorage trail, Ship Creek, and Kincaid trail systems are now connected. A total of 35 miles of new sidewalks and a total of 31 miles of bike facilities have been constructed within the Municipality of Anchorage since 2007. Many of these facilities are located along roadways, such as the E. Dowling extension, Elmore Road, Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. Blvd. and others.

Draft Goals & Objectives, Plan Development. MR. KATSION discussed the combined draft goals and objectives. These combined draft goals and objectives were from both the Chugiak-Eagle River Long-Range Transportation Plan and the Anchorage Bowl 2025 Long-Range Transportation Plan. This will provide the Metropolitan Plan Update with a logical, orderly, and guiding principle. With the changes to federal regulations (SAFETEA-LU) and the requirement by FHWA to combine both plans, the MTP update must incorporate both studies and their separate goals and objectives together. The draft goals and objectives will be used to further develop performance measures. During the last two months, with input and scrutiny from the public and the TAC Plus committee, the project team crafted the draft goals and objectives. From this, eight goals were developed. Draft Goal #1 is a very broad and encompassing goal, which was gleaned from the Chugiak-Eagle River Long-Range Transportation Plan. It covers balancing transportation needs with environmental concerns, etc. Goals 2 & 3 relate to security and cost effectiveness. We must have a realistic way of funding for long-range transportation projects. MS. EPSTEIN noticed that pedestrian and bicyclists did not appear to be addressed; these users face safety issues and other challenges. MR. KATSION responded that we will take a look at pedestrian and bicyclist issues and we could adjust the goals or develop performance measures separately to address those concerns.

CHAIR CAMPBELL asked for individuals to hold their comments or questions until after the presentation. MR. KATSION reviewed Goals 4 & 5; these goals address economic and community livability and sustainability. Goal 5 also examines year-round and seasonal road and weather conditions. Goal 6 & 7 provide mobility to the community. Mode choices are not limited to motorized vehicles, but also should include other transportation options, such as transit, pedestrian, bicycle. Not all of our community members can afford vehicle costs, such as car payments, insurance, and fuel expenses. Goal 8 emphasizes the need to take care of the beautiful place and environment that we live in. The draft goals and objectives must meet the minimum requirements for SAFETEA-LU and the federal regulatory process. As currently drafted, these goals and objectives exceed the federal requirements.

2035 Forecasts. MR. KATSION discussed the forecasted population, traffic, and employment growth expected by 2035 within the metropolitan area. By determining where the growth will be located, then we can understand traffic movement, patterns, and potential volumes on specific facilities. The travel demand model used recent data from the Institute of Social and Economic Research (ISER) at the University of Alaska, Anchorage. This data needs to be consistent with other forecasts. Forecasts from ISER have been used for a long time. Recent adjustments to the

ISER data have slightly reduced the overall expected growth for the region. Also, ISER forecasts extend out only to 2030. From 2027-2035, it is anticipated that the population will increase by 21%. The forecast also presents population and employment data for the Mat-Su borough. Individuals and commuters from the Mat-Su borough travel into Anchorage. As a result, future transportation facilities – such as the Glenn Hwy. need to have the capacity to handle potential increases in traffic volume. Initial results show that the Mat-Su Borough population is forecasted to grow by 113% during this same time period. In conjunction with population, it is necessary to determine employment growth and where employment centers may be located. It is interesting to note the areas of growth and projects implemented since the last Long-Range Transportation Plan. With population, household, and employment data, forecasts for the travel demand model can be developed. With these 2035 forecasts, we can then identify potential deficiencies in the network and transportation system that future transportation projects may not address.

Travel Demand Forecasting. MR. WORTH summarized the various forecast maps and the differences between these maps. Travel Demand Models are used to forecast future growth in population, employment, and households. These forecasts are then used to analyze the potential demand to transportation facilities and infrastructure. One of the first steps to developing a forecast is to establish a new study year. In this case, the new horizon year is 2035. This will allow us to plan out far enough into the future and give us the ability to plan funding to meet these forecasted infrastructure needs. While planning out 20 to 40 years seems nebulous, it helps communities to financially prepare beforehand in order to implement future projects. Nevertheless, remember that Travel Demand Forecasting is “just a tool” and not “the gospel.” The purpose of Travel Demand Forecasting is to see how well current and planned projects meet future needs. Equally, these forecasts assist in determining whether new projects are needed to meet future demands. The Travel Demand Model has specific parameters and guidelines. Instead of overestimating demand, most analysts prefer to use conservative numbers. Likewise, the MTP project team did the same. If the demand is underestimated, we can always revisit and update the forecasts and projects. For instance, if we find a project is needed before 2045, we can always consider implementing it by 2040. At this time, two model runs have been completed. One model run represented the system as it is today (this is called a No Build Scenario). The second model run pretends what the system may look like in 2035 based on population, employment, and number of households. MR. WORTH noted the No Build Forecast map and discussed the level of service – indicating where deficiencies and delays are predicted to occur. The 2025 Anchorage Bowl Long Range Transportation Plan and its recommended projects may meet future demands by 2035. MR. WORTH showed the map of 2025 projects and the resulting level of service. Major improvements to the level of service were noted with the implementation of these projects. It appears that many of these projects will meet not only 2027 demand but also demand beyond 2027. MR. WORTH explained that the No Build model run(s) and the associated map(s) provide a quick glimpse into how the transportation system and network operates at this time. CHAIR CAMPBELL asked how many committee members and the public would like to comment. About 10 individuals responded. CHAIR CAMPBELL stated that each individual please limit comments to a total of three minutes. This will allow everyone an opportunity to provide public comment.

Comment. SUSIE GORSKI inquired about the employment and population percentages forecasted for the Chugiak-Eagle River communities and how these forecasts were derived. She asked if the 2010 Census data was used in the estimates. Also, she wondered how these allocations affected the funding of transportation projects for the Eagle River area. Her concern is that the Chugiak-Eagle River communities are not receiving their fair share of transportation funding – in comparison to the funding that Anchorage receives. MR. SPRING responded that the model uses a land use allocation model. The land allocation model is developed by obtaining building permit data, population and household data, and parcel data. MR. SPRING developed that model. The overall Municipality of Anchorage population numbers for 2035 are projected to be around 350,000 – which included the Chugiak-Eagle River communities. The Chugiak-Eagle River is allocated a percentage of this total based on the assumptions derived from the Chugiak-Eagle River Comprehensive Plan. The existing population estimate did not utilize the 2010 Census data since it was not available at the time the estimate was completed. While the budget probably doesn't allow for a complete update of the population and employment allocation, staff will compare the new Census data with the existing estimates to see if there are any major discrepancies

MS. OSSIANDER stated that she sincerely appreciated the fact that the meeting was held in Eagle River. She expressed concerns over the draft goals and objectives. Community members are worried that the Chugiak-Eagle River area will be “swallowed up” by Anchorage. She had hoped from some differentiation between Chugiak-Eagle River and Anchorage (i.e. portion of assets, percentage of funding). MS. OSSIANDER thanked the PC and TAC plus members.

MS. KOVAC, TAC Plus member followed up on Ms. Ossiander's comments. MS. KOVAC noted that some goals that she had proposed were not included in the draft goals and objectives. For instance, MS. KOVAC reviewed the section “road maintenance factors.” This proposed language was rejected and MS. KOVAC wondered why. MS. KOVAC reiterated that Chugiak-Eagle River residents feel that their local projects are – at times, overwhelmed by the needs in Anchorage. MR. WORTH assured Ms. Kovac that this particular goal was not rejected, but rather this level of detail could be used for specific performance measurements. In general, goals are usually broad statements. Whereas, performance measures offer identifiable benchmarks – we would like details in performance measurements. MS. KOVAC asked about the study areas. MR. SPRING stressed that the project team is very interested in pursuing strategies within the MTP for performance measures and adding this type of strategy in the implementation plan. Usually, explicit and clearly defined strategies do not fit into overall goals and objectives.

MS. KOVAC discussed how to address project funds and costs. MS. KOVAC would like to include a section on pro-rated funding for Chugiak-Eagle River within the action plan chapter. MR. WORTH mentioned that this could be added into the action plan chapter as it relates to the decision making process. MR. WORTH underscored that this is a policy level decision and this will be worked on during the planning process. Items that are often folded into MTP updates include what needs funded, the characteristics of such costs, the most effective alternatives (keep

maintaining existing facility, consider new facility, etc.). MS. KOVAC stated that Chugiak-Eagle River is usually on the “bottom” when transportation projects are prioritized and funded. Repairs and upgrades are not only needed on the Glenn Hwy. but also other roads important to Chugiak-Eagle River residents. MS. KOVAC stated that her proposed pro-rated funding approach may help to overcome this concern. MR. WORTH responded that as we develop evaluation criteria, this may be good to consider for the MTP update. Other factors for prioritization can include regional and social equity. These elements can be incorporated into the scoring and weighting criteria. Again, MR. WORTH stressed that this would be a policy decision. MS. KOVAC discussed Goal #4 and noted a correction needed to add Chugiak-Eagle River. MR. WORTH stated that Goal#4 would be corrected.

MR. CARR observed that the definition of “community” carries many meanings. This MTP update is for the AMATS boundaries which is a federally mandated area. This jurisdiction covers from Girdwood to the Knik River Bridge. MR. CARR stated that while he shares some of the Chugiak-Eagle River resident’s concerns, he felt that integration is important. MR. CARR stressed that the national policy is shifting from maintaining facilities to moving people using different modes (bus, rail, mass transit, and pedestrian and bicyclist facilities). Congress is moving that direction. This plan is based on the Highway Authorization Bill. Our plan is out of date with this new policy direction and we need to address this in the MTP update. MR. WORTH responded that it is good that people keep informed and alert to new national policy direction. We need to know where federal funding will be appropriated – such as will more funds go to sidewalks, etc. It is smart to plan ahead and know where to follow the dollars. MR. CARR stated that we needed to build on the MTP and the travel demand forecast for projects are currently based on the old national policy rather than the new federal direction. MR. KATSION stated that we can see accomplishments of the bus, sidewalks, bicyclist facilities that were implemented from the current long-range transportation plans. As part of the MTP update, we can look to where the funding may be in 20 years and provide our best guess. The next update will occur in 4 years and we can also adjust the MTP to reflect new policies and SAFETEA-LU requirements. MR. KATSION thanked Mr. Carr for his comments.

MS. EPSTEIN shared Mr. Carr’s concerns and stated that fiscal constraint had not been addressed. MS. EPSTEIN believed that we need to show the leadership that we may or may not be able to do all of the projects within the MTP. MS. EPSTEIN added that the travel demand forecasts and fiscal constraint projections must be consistent with the Knik Arm Crossing. This is also true for the Mat-Su Borough’s forecasts and projects. MR. SWORTS mentioned that the Mat-Su Borough is currently undergoing the same process and is in the first stages of their LRTP update. They will use the 2010 Census data; they are leaning toward using the census numbers for socio-economic data. HDR is doing the Mat-Su Borough’s projections. HDR will also incorporate the University of Alaska Anchorage Institute of Social and Economic Research (ISER) data. MR. KATSION stated that Kittelson and Associates is also working and coordinating with HDR.

MR. FRAZIER mentioned that the Knik Arm Authority used the ISER data along with Wood & Poole Economics, and State of Alaska Department of Labor data. The Knik Arm Crossing estimates are conservative. With the Knik Arm Bridge, the forecasts are lower for the Glenn Highway. MS. EPSTEIN asked if the TAC would review the traffic forecasts. MR. WORTH stated that the TAC would absolutely review the forecasts. Most of this will be provided in April. MS. EPSTEIN wondered if this would include the Knik Arm Crossing numbers. MR. FRAZIER responded that the Knik Arm Crossing forecasts are available online at their website. MS. EPSTEIN pointed out that the maps shown do not include the Knik Arm or the access ramps. MR. SPRING stated that there are two maps. One map shows the existing conditions (as they are now today). MS. EPSTEIN asked about the potential impacts with the bridge at the access sites. MR. SPRING responded that the Ingra/Gambell connection is shown on the second map. This would alleviate the impact to the downtown corridor. MR. SPRING stated that the bridge would be shown. MR. KATSION also noted that the base map does not currently include studies such as the Eagle River Commercial Business District. However these studies and plans have been adopted and will be included in the MTP update. At this time, only projects included in the existing MTP are shown on the base map.

MS. FINK would like to see bicyclist and pedestrian infrastructure added to Goal #2. Bicycle lanes while part of the solution are not always appropriate and by using the term bicyclist and pedestrian infrastructure then we can capture more options. MS. FINK also noted Goal 7e and Goal 7a. For 7e, she recommends adding “public health.” For 7a, “networks” may prove a better term as “trails” may not capture the bicyclist community. MR. THOMPSON also noted Goal#5d and asked what a multi-use trail was. MR. SPRING stated that a multi-use trail has more than one use and can be used for biking, skiing, walking, rollerblading, etc. MR. THOMPSON stated that the Anchorage Bike Plan takes individuals off the multi-use trails. MR. SPRING responded that the Bike Plan supports and uses the entire system and also provides recommendations for construction of new bike lanes as well as new multi-use paths where appropriate. MR. THOMPSON asked about Goal#6b which discusses reducing vehicles miles traveled (VMT) per capita. MR. WORTH explained that as the population grows, then the per capita of vehicle miles traveled increases. If we can manage VMT, then we can produce a more efficient system. By incorporating walking, bicycling and other modes, we can lower VMT. Higher VMT also contributes to poor air quality and pollution. By keeping VMT to a minimum, then the hours of travel are also reduced. As a result, delay and congestion is also minimized. MR. THOMPSON noted that VMT reduction is a factor in heavy freight demand. The demand for freight in the region is expected to grow exponentially within the next 20 years. MR. WORTH stated that the forecasts do reflect freight and the different types of categories of employment found in the freight industry. MR. SPRING stressed that the forecasts do not necessarily reduce freight VMT; this is not really applicable to trucks and freight. Aves Thompson stated that was his main point.

MR. BARTON observed that in the Goals, especially the “pedestrian” language that perhaps one word could be used to highlight accessibility. MR. BARTON stated that he works with disabled individuals and various related projects. MR. BARTON has used the term “accessible” with success and it is easily tied into SAFETEA-LU requirements. MR. BARTON mentioned right-

of-way and how design goals could be used. Also for Goal#3, MR. BARTON responded that there is a difference between equality of users and social justice. Dave wondered if this term “equality” meant the same thing or if this was a redundant use or a requirement for the new funding language. MR. SPRING agreed that the term is slightly redundant, but it does relate to the environmental justice requirement. Environmental justice ensures that a transportation infrastructure project does not unfairly impact one individual over another. For instance, projects within low income and minority areas need examined. The social equity terminology implies a balance among different modes of transportation such as transit and roadways. Fairview, Mountain View, and Muldoon have a higher proportion of lower-income families and as a result the MTP update and plan must consider transit options.

MR.FLYNN extended his appreciation to the Chugiak-Eagle River friends and that he was cognizant of their concerns. MR. FLYNN asked if the corridor travel times that Mr. Spring discussed were taken at the same time of year. MR. SPRING stated that all of the travel times were done in the fall. However, in 2003 the travel times were taken in the spring. The 2003 travel times were dropped as they were not consistent with the other travel times completed in the fall. Seasonal conditions and variations will occur in travel times depending upon the time of year that they are taken. MAYOR SULLIVAN noted the ISER study. MAYOR SULLIVAN asked if economic assumptions such as the reduction in oil production by the Alyeska pipeline, the development of the natural gas pipeline, and other energy solutions were considered in the forecasts. MR. SPRING replied that he was fairly certain that the forecasts included those variables. ISER traditionally uses a panel of experts to provide feedback regarding the likelihood of specific economic assumptions occurring. However, MR. SPRING was not certain if the pipeline was addressed or not. MR. SPRING explained the various assumptions used. First, it is expected that military, tourism, medical, and permanent fund spending will continue and increase. All the forecasts and resulting travel demand is derived from employment and population increases. The economic outlook is an important component. MAYOR SULLIVAN inquired if the energy assumption(s) (likely decline) for the Cook Inlet was considered. In other words, will the Cook Inlet natural gas be sustainable? MR. SPRING stated that he did not know if the production levels of Cook Inlet natural gas was incorporated or not.

MS. KOVAC discussed Goal#3e and the road standards. Eagle River and Chugiak are primarily rural roads and she did not find rural road standards. MS. KOVAC asked if this was intentional. MR. WORTH stated that it was not intentional from his recollection. MS. KOVAC stated that urban road standards would not be applicable in the Eagle River/Chugiak area or on the Hillside in Anchorage. MR. WORTH said okay. CHAIR CAMPBELL asked Mr. Katsion if this was the end of the presentation. MR. KATSION stated that he would provide an overview of the next steps in the MTP update. MR. KATSION gave an overview of the upcoming activities and public involvement opportunities. A project website, newspaper inserts, and other timely media will help give the public a chance to weigh in on the project. Some other key work efforts underway include the development of performance measures, which takes the draft goals and objectives one step further. Each performance measure in the old plan(s) was equally weighted. It is the project team’s intent to craft performance measures that mean something. Furthermore,

the project team will start work on initial project costs and estimates. These estimates will consider system preservation and maintenance. The project team will also examine revenue forecasts. MR. KATSION also let individuals know that the next MTP update meeting is scheduled for April 28, 2011. This will be held downtown at City Hall. PC Chair Rob Campbell encouraged the public and the committee members to stay involved and engaged in this complicated issue. MR. LYON offered a friendly reminder to TAC Plus members to bring their name tag to the next meeting. If TAC Plus members have lost their name tag, then please let staff know so that we can make a new tag. MR. KATSION stated that the PowerPoint slides and presentation will be available on the project website soon.

8. ADJOURNMENT

Meeting adjourned at 2:55 p.m.