

**ANCHORAGE METROPOLITAN AREA TRANSPORTATION SOLUTIONS  
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING**

**Planning and Development Center  
Main Conference Room  
4700 Elmore Road  
Anchorage, Alaska**

**February 10, 2011  
2:30 p.m.**

Technical Advisory Committee members present:

Name	Representing
Jennifer Witt	Alaska Dept. of Transportation & Public Facilities (DOT&PF), Central Region, Planning
Kim Rice	ADOT, Central Region
Cindy Heil	Alaska Dept. of Environmental Conservation (ADEC)
Steve Morris	MOA/Dept. of Health & Human Services (DHHS)
John Crapps	MOA/Traffic Department (TD)
Jerry Weaver	MOA/Community Development Dept (CCD)
Jerry Hansen	MOA/Project Management & Engineering (PM&E)
Bruce Carr	Alaska Railroad Corporation (ARRC)

Also in attendance

Name	Representing
Craig Lyon	MOA/CCD
Teresa Brewer	MOA/CDD
Vivian Underwood	MOA/CDD
Jon Spring	MOA/Consultant
Bart Rudolph	DOT&PF
Debbie Ossiander	Assembly Member
Susan Gorski	CER Chamber
Anne Brooks	ARRC
Lora Reinbold	ER Trails
Claire Chan	

**1. CALL TO ORDER**

CHAIR CRAPPS called the meeting to order at 2:35 p.m. All Technical Advisory Committee members were present with the exceptions of Jody Karcz and Todd Cowles were 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**

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

MR. CARR asked to move the Alaska Railroad update to the beginning of the Informational Items.

Motion to approve the agenda as amended. *Hearing no objections, the agenda was approved unanimously.*

**4. APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES - NONE**

**5. BUSINESS ITEMS**

**a.) EAGLE RIVER CBD STUDY**

MS. UNDERWOOD noted the project was nearing completion, and that they had been through the public involvement period with the PZC. To refresh everyone's memory, this study creates an actionable plan, so that implementers could carry it forward and get something done in Eagle River to help with the worsening congestion problem. It could be used in two ways: to help recommend projects for the LRTP, which is a concurrent project, or it could be used by the community to carry forward when ready to support projects that might not score well in the LRTP.

MS. UNDERWOOD mentioned that before the committee was the memo, PZC minutes and resolution, and the staff issue and response summary. The final report looked at three big-picture, overall solution strategies. Those strategies relied on two elements; one, a couplet, and the other, a new collector to the east of Old Glenn Hwy. What they heard from the public was that they were not ready to consider one-way streets, and not ready to consider projects that are going to significantly and negatively impact residential areas. However, they did like the idea of common elements that are common to all three of those big-picture strategies. Kittelson and Associates prioritized them and the higher priority projects, for the most part, the public supports. The main concern is Artillery Rd and Old Glenn Hwy area. Projects #10 and 11 are going to address that area. Another

problem is Farm Avenue, a partial interchange from Farm Ave to Old Glenn Hwy and a direct connection from Eagle River Loop Rd and Farm Ave. Two other projects were to simultaneously align intersections and add new signalized intersections along the Old Glenn Hwy. Those are higher classification roads and it makes sense those projects might be considered for the LRTP.

MS. UNDERWOOD directed the TAC members to the memo with PZC recommendations. PZC unanimously recommend support of the report and they had three recommendations; the first one was to add language in the final revision or next phase of studies that we consider adding text of the interdependency and timing for some of the projects. An example is the two Farm Ave projects, as they are related. Another recommendation was to add text to the study explaining the pros and cons of providing on-street parking. The third one is, in the next phase of the study, to analyze the proposed road projects for their effectiveness implementing the Eagle River CBD Plan. Staff concurs with that and the plan actually does that; it takes recommendations for traffic circulation directly from the 2003 Revitalization Plan.

MS. UNDERWOOD stated they had great participation from the public during the whole process. Staff would recommend to the LRTP the top 6 projects and let the community take the rest of these recommended projects, when they are ready take them, to the legislature when they are ready and carry the study forward to fruition.

MR. MORRIS asked about number 2, the suggestion to add discussion on the relative merits of on-street parking, and asked if the study offered a position on that. MS. UNDERWOOD replied that the study does address on-street parking as a means to help create a more vibrant downtown. Neither Title 21 nor the 2003 study addressed on-street parking, but did address making adequate off-street parking available in downtown, for all uses. On-street parking should probably be discussed with the public in the future.

MR. COWLES asked how this fit into the Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP) that we discussed at the Citizens' Advisory Committee. It seemed to him like they were doing a lot of effort here that was really going to be folded into and redone again next year. How did they plan to rework that? MS. UNDERWOOD replied the plan was to get the study approved as quickly as possible to be in sync with the LRTP (MTP) plan. They originally thought they would take it to the Assembly but after talking with Ms. Ossiander, staff planned to take the study to the PC hopefully this month. MS. UNDERWOOD stated that normally they did not take studies to the Assembly. Once this study is approved, they could nominate projects to the LRTP (MTP). Probably the top 6 would be considered.

MR. WEAVER asked what staff is asking the PC to do with this. MS. UNDERWOOD responded staff was asking them to approve the final public review draft - the final report - and it would be good to consider some of these projects for inclusion into the LRTP.

MS. WITT stated it's a two-pronged process. They want the recommendations or the identification of need out there as part of the study so that the appropriate priorities - those that affect the arterial system and the interstate - could be modeled, incorporated and considered as part of the LRTP; and that it goes through the public process. Her concern right now regarding staff recommendations to accept some of the PZC comments or recommendations was she wanted to see the language and where it was going to be in the study before she adopted it - similar to how they adopted the Bicycle Plan. MS. WITT stated she was not comfortable being asked to adopt something without seeing a copy of the final document before her, and her suggestion to the group was to continue this meeting and allow staff the opportunity to make the text recommendations for the study before they actually adopt it.

MS. UNDERWOOD responded she was not actually recommending any changes be done to this study now. What staff understood from the PZC is that these recommendations could be done now or in the next phase of studies. MS. WITT asked if there were no change from the document or recommendations that went out to the public. MS. UNDERWOOD replied there is no change.

MS. UNDERWOOD stated the study would be approved as is, to be used later, and as projects are more developed and get refined, they would then consider these recommendations.

DEBBIE OSSIANDER stated she is a 30+ yr resident of Chugiak-Eagle River and she represents this area in the Anchorage Assembly. Her community for a number of years has been very concerned about specific transportation and traffic problems in the Eagle River area. She is one of a group of people who lobbied for the funding for this study and is now eagerly awaiting its results. She participated in most of the public meetings on this and is very keen to see it happen. Also, in the process, she did not attend the PZC meeting specifically because in general Assembly Members are discouraged from attending the meetings because they are making recommendations to us. Her sense was the PZC went sideways a little bit, in that they delved into specifics of the projects rather than globally looking at these as a variety of proposals that can solve the problem. She stated that she really appreciated the comments made in the last few moments about these specific PZC recommendations to be included in the next phase.

MS. OSSIANDER stated she had a draft resolution to hand out for the TAC to consider. She stated they are in flux right now because the CERLRTP is being considered-actually merged into the Anchorage Bowl LRTP and because of that Ms. Underwood did call her and asked about this plan coming before the Assembly. With some trepidation she said that it doesn't have to come before the Assembly because it needs to be done and they were under a time crunch. The frustration with that was that she wanted to urge the incorporation and adopt by the PC so it could actually be used in the LRTP. Basically

that is what her resolution does. It's critical because of the incoming LRTP and because there are group of people who are already actively advocating for some of the projects on the combined prioritized list and there is a little time window here where we can acquire some property fairly cheaply. On the practical side this study is very important to be adopted; also, it is important because of the direction that the PC took at the last meeting to say that only projects that are described in adopted studies or plans will be incorporated or consider for adoption into the LRTP. Finally, I urge you adopt it and the specific recommendations from P&Z be incorporated into further study when we get into actual consideration when to construct those projects.

MR. CARR commented Ms. Ossiander had captured his question better than he did, and that AMATS had just gone through a public process with the community that asked the public to come in and participate, and now we have another public process to go through with the LRTP, with the stated primary purpose to combine the two documents. The TAC is going to be out again in the Chugiak-Eagle River area asking what kind of projects does the public want. His concern is based on what PZC said what they understood was going to be input into that plan. MR. CARR stated that he got the sense that Ms. Ossiander would like to see this study just adopted wholesale into the plan that has priorities that may or may not compete with the rest of the prioritized projects in the new LRTP. MR. CARR asked how we are going handle the expectations of those the public have said, here are our project priorities, and yet now as part of the larger plan, is going to be competing with all those others at a different level.

MS. OSSIANDER noted she thinks that was made more difficult that by the PC decision to only consider projects that have been studied in accepted plans. If that is the case then the projects that come in the citizen's comment period on the LRTP are not going to be open beyond what is here and possibly projects uncovered with the Travel Demand Model (TDMs) that could be another source of projects. If a group of citizens in one neighborhood think of a particular thing, her understanding is that will not be considered because it is not in an adopted plan. MS. OSSIANDER stated that made her more nervous, and it's more imperative that this be adopted.

MS. WITT stated, to clarify, she was at the PC and for full disclosure; she is a resident of Eagle River. In terms of the implementation part, she can explain her understanding of how and why and agrees with Ms. Ossiander to get this adopted by AMATS so it is one of those approved studies and plans that we can draw projects from, and one of the things to be clear on-in terms of working with the project oversight committee, the consultant and the project manger on this effort is as part of the LRTP update. We would be incorporating projects, specific ones, the recommendations at a minimum would be those green ones. The ones that affect the function of the arterials you have between the Old Glenn Hwy and the Glenn Hwy are important for circulation and to accommodate the congestion and not to mention future growth. There are some of those recommendations that typically do not affect the collectors and local streets that are more controversial and

that are typically not identified by line and grade in the LRTP. She asked if that was other's understanding, and that they are pretty important because it affects when you model for Air Quality, and when you do everything else, it absolutely affects circulation. The way she had understood it, we would be identifying those key ones to get modeled and recommended. MS. WITT stated that she appreciated Ms. Ossiander had done a resolution. It wasn't until she was at the PC, that she was aware that they were not clear on that; on the fact that this study is one of the key ones they need to draw from. MS. OSSIANDER stated that certainly was her understanding.

MS. WITT stated this study was going with the public involvement component developed and they are not just going to dump a whole plan on the community all at once and say they have 20 days to review. Their intent is that as they come up with a section, they will be coming through a public review process and each chapter will be adopted through the next several months. Regarding Eagle River, she did not see just incorporating the major projects, but to consider them as part of the fiscal constraints analysis and accommodating future needs out there with out being specific. It is important, as part of the fiscal constraints analysis, to acknowledge and accept that we are not ready to say we're going to do the entire study – especially the red and blue ones out there - but to recognize that the area is a high-growth area, and we need to accommodate it, so that would be working with the consultants and the oversight committee to work the approach.

MS. OSSIANDER stated Ms. Witt had mirrored the big comment she gave going through this, which is this looks great but "let's get real." There is limited money out there, and energy.

MR. CARR asked Ms. Witt if there was a rush to get this done. He stated he likes some of the things that happened in the past, but likes her suggestions. MS. OSSIANDER stated she believes it's really dependent on what their schedule is for the LRTP and she had not seen that enough to know. She knew they had a contractor but did not know exactly what the steps are. Her understanding was based on the PC actions that it's critical to adopt this prior to the LRTP.

MR. CARR noted based on the public meeting last week the LRTP is several months out.

MS. WITT commented they should look to the consultant and the project manager because one of the key things that the Project Oversight Committee was working with was that they need to select the projects to model. Process-wise we should have the study adopted, but she would defer to others on the TAC.

MR. SPRING commented he didn't have any concerns that the study isn't going to be adopted before the LRTP is adopted; it should be adopted long before the projected LRTP adoption date. The MTP is scheduled for adoption in late January or early

February 2012 and that Ms. Witt is correct about the modeling work. We need to have some idea of about which projects to bring forward from these recent studies into the updated LRTP in order to model their effect on future congestion levels. He proposed they make an assumption that the study is going to be adopted, and those projects that Ms. Underwood described as having consensus, the top 6, which are the green plus the two intersections improvements on the old Glenn Hwy that create the 4-way intersection be the ones we carry into the modeling exercise. We have to make some assumption before this study is adopted.

MR. CARR commented it was a perfectly valid assumption Mr. Spring made - you just can't ignore it because it wasn't adopted. That would be a disservice to the public.

MR. KATSION stated they are not proposing any changes to the study and the study has been in front of AMATS for awhile, unless they had specific issues with the resolution.

MR. CARR stated that he did not see any reason why they would delay it, unless there is a specific reason.

MR. WEAVER commented that he hadn't seen it either and actually appreciated the resolution, and it's all factual and correct, so he had no objection to issuing an approval.

MS. GORSKI stated she is also a 30 yr resident of C-ER and had served 20 yrs as the Executive Director to the Chamber. They had been intimately involved since the inception and the beauty of the public process in all this was they came up with those elements and those common elements in the upper tier were really highly regarded as solutions to the increasing congestion along the Old Glenn, which is turning into somewhat of a nightmare. She stated the Chamber was ahead of AMATS in terms that their legislative policy committee had meet with 7 of their legislators and they talked about the main ones, #10 – 11, that are real critical to ease the stress out there. They need to ensure that all the work to-date is all for naught.

MS. WITT noted on the intersections that Ms. Underwood pointed out - the two in Eagle River, the lining up ones. Her concern was to identify anything in this LRTP that is going to create a huge problem if it is something that is not critical right now. Their Traffic Safety Engineer absolutely supports getting some of those intersections online and signalized out there.

MS. GORSKI noted there is no controlled left turn access except at Fred Meyer's, and the Loop Road. It is a mess; they need to get control of the flow and the ability to have left turn access in areas that will ease this congestion. As to the degree of controversy, she could not say, and could not remember which analysis drew controversy, or what discussion was on those projects.

MS. UNDERWOOD noted there was one piece; project 4b is actually 2 pieces, to connect Breckenridge with Marcus and then there was another piece. So what they are recommending is only the eastern connection be built as part of project 4b. This was controversial for the people who live on Marcus, even though we are recommending it for emergency access and connection. The Fire Dept would love to see the connection. People living on Marcus are already experiencing people careening down Breckenridge Drive going through a barrier, driving really fast down their road. Those same people are not adverse to the eastern connection.

MS. WITT mentioned that meets the requirements for signal spacing and resulting in a signalized intersection there. MS. UNDERWOOD clarified that it would be either 5 or 4b, you wouldn't have both.

MS. OSSIANDER stated every aspect of this will have controversy. The first level of controversy will be folks are just now just reacting to the idea we are having only one LRTP. There are some people very upset about that in her district and even the military have weighed in on one road. So just give everyone more chance to look at this again through the citizen's review process and you'll be able to win them over a bit.

MR. HANSEN commented that he could guarantee that once the project is started there will be even more.

MS. GORSKI stated her sense was that if you are limiting to the corridors along the Old Glenn to ease congestion, you are dealing primarily with commercial and some of these properties are actually vacant. Depending on how it is engineered, she believed there is great hope.

MS. WITT commented that from a DOT perspective and as a TAC - ER resident, to be able to start addressing some of those problem points along the Glenn Hwy and some of the solutions this study has identified will certainly help with the Glenn and Old Glenn.

MS. WITT suggested this body consider adopting this resolution but that she had some suggested clarifications the 3<sup>rd</sup> whereas.

CHAIR CRAPPS asked Mr. Lyon if the resolution needed to go out for public review before acting on it. MR. LYON replied they had done this in the past and that it could certainly be acted on. They just needed a motion. MS. HEIL motioned to approve and MR. CARR seconded it.

MS. WITT suggested changing the 3<sup>rd</sup> whereas to say the AMATS 2035 MTP update was underway: "The ER CBD Study and Residential Core Circulation Study must be approved before any of its recommendations can be considered into the MTP." She stated that she wanted to make this clarification so there was no misunderstanding that all

those red items would be costed out and included into the LRTP, because it could be problematic.

MS. HEIL asked for a clarification on if it says the TAC is going to approve – were they going to approve or were they going to recommend for the PC to approve? MS. WITT stated they could say “we, the AMATS TAC approve and recommend that...” MR. MORRIS believed it was fine as written. MS. HEIL commented it said “approved by.” MR. CARR stated he believed it was approving the resolution. Ms. Heil agreed.

CHAIR CRAPPS stated they had a first and second to approve the document and they had a recommendation for a change and no second. MR. MORRIS seconded. *Hearing no objection, it was approved*

CHAIR CRAPPS asked if anyone had any object to the language change on the 3<sup>rd</sup> to the last. *Hearing no objections it was approved.*

CHAIR CRAPPS asked if there was any objection to approving the document with the one change. *Hearing no objections it was approved.*

#### **b.) UPWP, MEETING MINUTES**

MR. LYON stated at the previous TAC meeting there was discussion on minutes and catching up on the backlog and there was a suggestion to look at the existing UPWP and see if we can identify any ways to set aside a pot of money to hire someone to work on the minutes to get us caught up. We discussed this with internal staff and we decided to handle this internally; we have started having Ms. Klunder catch up our meeting minutes. By the end of today we will have 5 in draft mode being sent out. 4 have gone through our system and are now at DOT to get their final suggestions. We are well on our way and we have 16 more and she is working through them pretty quickly. MS. WITT stated so we have 9 down and 16 more to go. No, we have 5 down and 16 more to go replied MR. LYON.

MR. LYON noted the idea once we are caught up, Ms. Graves would be too able to keep up with it; since the issues with PZC have been worked out, she will now be working on them. The amount of time it takes to get a contract through Purchasing, etc. We can have Ms. Klunder doing them and in 3 or 4 days have 5 of them down. MR. LYON stated he didn't have an amendment now, but thought we can go with what we have proposed and don't have to amend the UPWP right now. If in the future we are not getting there we can move towards an amendment.

MS. HEIL asked what the timeline is. MR LYON responded if she has done 5 in a week's time that would suggest; we have 16 more to go, I'd say 2-3 more weeks' time. MS. HEIL stated so at the next TAC meeting we should see all of them. MR. LYON

replied in the affirmative. MS. WITT asked if they will be drafting and reviewing them. MR. LYON stated the practice in the past has been we'd get the draft from whomever was doing them and we would send them around to people who were presenting, and then make corrections and return them to the TAC for final approval.

**c.) 2035 MTP UPDATE**

MR. SPRING stated that the Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP) update has begun and a schedule for completion has been developed. The schedule calls for the adoption of the Plan by the Policy Committee to occur around the end of January or the beginning of February 2012. The current deadline for adoption set by FHWA planning regulations is June 14, 2011. Since we won't have the plan adopted by then, AMATS will need to formally request an extension of the date from FHWA and FTA. The draft extension letters are addressed to David Miller, FHWA, Rick Krochalis, FTA. If recommended by the TAC, the letters will be forwarded to the PC for their approval at their February 24<sup>th</sup> meeting. At that time we will have Chair Campbell sign it.

He stated the schedule appears reasonable with the public review draft scheduled to be released around August of this year. Part of the reason for the release date is in order to complete all of the work necessary to have a public review draft but also to sure the public has an opportunity to review it during the fall instead of the summer time. Starting the actual formal adoption process at that time erases any controversy regarding summer time review by the Community Councils, some of which do not meet during the summer. A public review draft is completed, incorporating comments from the public review draft. At that time the formal adoption process is begun with a 45-day review period which ends with a public hearing in front of the PZC. The approval then continues with the TAC review, a Municipal Assembly review and approval and finally the adoption by the AMATS Policy Committee.

Some leeway was allowed in the schedule to allow for unexpected delays. As a result, the extension deadline, requested from FHWA and FTA was set for the end of March. Make it at the end of the quarter, sounds like it makes a lot of sense. This should give AMATS ample breathing room to avoid asking for second extension.

MS. HEIL commented that the conformity is going to lapse on June 14th. MS. HEIL stated she understood the rules to mean that AMATS is going to be in a lapse regardless of whether or not it is granted an extension. As a result, she is not sure what AMATS will get by asking for this extension and what is going too happened during this lapsed grace period.

MR. SPRING replied that he thought the extension avoided the lapse. MS. Heil stated that the rules are very clear that the conformity of the transportation plan must be completed no less frequent than every 4 years and that if more than 4 yrs lapse after

DOT's Conformity determination without the MPO and DOT determining conformity of the transportation plan, a 12 months grace will be implemented. There is no extension. AMATS staff should seek FHWA guidance on what is going to happen during this lapsed period.

MR. SPRING stated that he understood that the FHWA would look favorably upon an extension if it was submitted with a schedule and a specific explanation for its need. So if we do this there is no lapse because they are extending it.

MS. HEIL stated SAFETEA-LU took out the teeth in the air quality conformity regulations so there are no serious consequences in at conformity lapse if it is less than one year. She asked if anyone on AMATS staff specifically asked FHWA what the effect of the lapse would be on the grace period. Several replied no.

MS. HEIL stated that there is another issue to take into consideration involving the March 12, 2012 grace period for using the MOVES air quality model. Mr. Morris just gave the state a draft update on the emissions of the CO Maintenance plan. This plan will update the emissions budget with the use of MOVES. Staff has worked really hard to get the CO Maintenance Plan with the updated CO emissions budget to EPA in order to get an adequacy finding before the grace period ends. If that happens the grace period is shortened to the point of time of the EPA budget approval.

MS. HEIL commented that with the MTP schedule moving out to 2012 staff will need to work with EPA on timing of the approval of the emissions budget. We have to make sure that the conformity is approved through FHWA before EPA approves the emissions budget so it doesn't cause a problem in that realm. If AMATS needs a Plan amendment at any point in time after the March 12, 2012 air quality model grace period, it will not be possible to do so unless the emissions budget is approved. She hopes to have both Anchorage and Fairbanks emissions budget out for public comment this summer maybe as early as June depending on the AMATS approval process. The EPA will have 40-60 days from the time AMATS approve the budget in order to make their determination of adequacy.

MR. CARR asked does whatever you say impact the letter we have here. MS. HEIL replied she thought so. MR. CARR stated that it was his opinion then that the letter was not ready to go out yet and that staff should meet with Ms. Heil to make sure that the letter is correct. MS. HEIL recommended that they call FHWA and FTA to find out what a lapse would mean to AMATS and if this extension would have any effect on the lapse.

MR. WILBER commented he thinks the schedule is good. If we try to make this go too fast to meet a conformity process, the public process is going to suffer. MR. WILBER agreed with Mr. Carr; we need to make sure that we understand the ramifications of a conformity lapse. He recommended that the date not be March 31 but actually June 15,

2012. If staff can get it done faster, it would be good, but one thing we don't want to do is ask for another time extension

MR. MORRIS concurred with Mr. Wilber. He stated that the schedule is what it is. If we find the conformity is a big enough issue that we have to accelerate the MTP schedule we can always try to shorten it.

MS. HEIL responded the worse case would be to have to redo the whole thing. MS. WITT commented that MOVES kicks in once EPA has approved the emissions budget. MS. HEIL suggested strategically you might want to wait until after EPA approves the budget before we do a new MTP conformity so that you don't have to do another one in less than 2 years.

MR. SPRING stated to simply things a little bit, the reason we are submitting this letter is in response to specific findings and discussion by FHWA during the certification review. The extension letter is needed in order to take care of the FHWA Metropolitan Planning Regulations requirement that the MTP be updated every 4 years. The FHWA said specifically if you can't make that deadline make a schedule, identify milestones and submit a letter requesting an extension of the MTP that is justified by this schedule. Our request is to extend the MTP. You have legitimate concerns on the conformity lapse and we need to follow that up. Whatever the answer is we still need to take care of that requirement in the metropolitan planning regulations to extend the MTP. Mr. Spring's recommendation is to proceed on that path and to request an extension now that we have the schedule and milestones and submit it to them asap so we know that we have that extension and proceed on parallel track to clear up some of those questions regarding the conformity lapse. Regarding extending to June, we have to be careful that we justify whatever request we make. It may be difficult to explain why we need an extension to June when our schedule clearly says it will be done 6 months before hand.

MR. MORRIS noted he had one question regarding the financial analysis section of the schedule. In order to meet the fiscal constraint requirements it may be necessary to take projects out of the plan which could increase the amount of time needed to finish this section of the plan.

MR. CARR agreed with Mr. Wilber's recommendation to move the requested time extension to June 14, 2012. If staff gets it done sooner, great. It is best not to take a chance on having to ask for another extension

MR. CARR moved that we table this until the next meeting and let staff resolve the issues we brought up here. MR. HANSEN seconded. ***Hearing no objections the item was tabled until next meeting.***

MS. WITT stated for clarification FHWA approves only the Air quality conformity and the fiscal constraints now.

**d.) OTHER BUSINESS ITEMS - NONE**

**6. INFORMATION ITEMS**

**d. ALASKA RAILROAD UPDATE**

MR. CARR left at 3:39 p.m.

MR. PETERBURG stated he included a system map of the railroad. He indicated all the projects on the map here need some funding and this is some of those funds, we have some internal funding, we receive funding from the Federal Railroad Administration, Federal Transit Administration, (ARRC provides local match from internal funds, FHWA, FEMA and some Homeland Security). Our federal match is not from the State of Alaska general fund or gas tax matches it is solely from ARRC earnings. ARRC does not receive operating funds or receive reimbursement from the State operating budget. MR. PETERBURG gave a detailed breakdown of this year's projects, track rehab is the biggest use of funds.

MR. WILBER asked Mr. Peterburg if the double tracking through Anchorage is almost done or is there work to do. MR. PETERBURG responded the segment we are working on through NEPA is called the Anchorage Capacity project. It runs from our yard by the depot out towards the Spenard Builders Supply at Tudor and Minnesota; it's about a 4 miles segment. Right now, we don't have funding for the work. We have progressed the NEPA to a point where our funding agency FTA is not going to look at it any further until we have funding. Otherwise, the double tracking is done from SBS to Klatt Rd.

MR. WILBER commented on the vegetation mgmt, it's a good idea and more cost effective than other measures and if people would do a little research on it will find out that the application of the material you are putting down is less than half of what we would use in our yard. The concentration is so small. It is effective and has the same ingredients you would get at Wal-Mart in Roundup replied Mr. Peterburg.

MR. WEAVER asked about the Port McKenzie project is there planning for that, an actual schedule. MR. PETERBURG responded there has been some construction inside the port area going on the last 2 summers. We hope to get our record of decision from the Surface Transportation Board soon. The draft EIS has been out for a year and we are hoping to get our final decision yet this spring and go to construction outside the Port

heading towards our track, which ever alignment is chosen. MR. HANSEN commented it looks like it's fully funded.

**a. EVERY DAY COUNTS**

MR. LYON gave an update on the Every Day Counts Initiative workshop put on by FHWA in Vancouver Washington that he attended at FHWA's request. This initiative is designed to identify and deploy innovation aimed at shortening project delivery, enhancing the safety of our roadways, and protecting the environment.

MS. RICE asked if there were any Alaska examples used in the workshop and if they made any recommendations on any of our projects. MR. LYON responded there weren't any asked in the workshops he went to and he didn't know if they asked the DOT people in the sessions they were in.

**b. FEDERAL CERTIFICATION REVIEW RESULTS**

MR. LYON stated AMATS had our Federal certification review last September and we received a draft internal document around mid-January. There are some corrective actions in here along with recommendations and findings. We need to get our comments back to FHWA and FTA tomorrow; we are trying to get an extension but haven't heard back yet. There are some areas where we can push back and that was the idea; they would give us this draft and if they were way off on some things or missed some stuff or we didn't explain ourselves and they would listen to that and then finalize their recommendations.

We are finalizing our comments to give them that information. They are scheduled to come up here for the Feb. PC meeting and we are not certain how likely they are to give us an extension. Again, this is an internal document because of those actions and they wanted us to comment before making it public.

MS. RICE noted her comment was on the Fed Cert letter and that it is not out publicly. Would it be out publicly in time for the PC meeting if they are coming up here? If they decide it is to be final, it's their document not ours so if they keep to their schedule it would be replied MR. LYON.

MS. RICE asked if Mr. Lyon would keep them informed if they are coming up. MR. LYON commented they are coming up because they have other meetings to attend, if they keep to their schedule it would be.

**c. FREIGHT MOBILITY**

MS BREWER stated in your packet there is a memo outlining the freight mobility and the Freight Advisory Committee (FAC) duties in the past year. Those familiar with the group will recognize these as on-going activities. One of the major activities they took on was a Freight Prioritization Study which is still in Draft form and is not ready for your review. They are still deciding on what type of weight method to use to prioritize freight related projects. This document is to launch them forward into seeking funds, matching dollars in for freight related projects and to give them a solid foundation for a regional freight study in the future.

- Worked on identifying designated freight routes in the AMATS area
- Workshops on the federal regulations, Title 9 updates
- Work on site plan and road design reviews, putting in input to various freight related access and circulation
- Explored some grant seeking opportunities; we submitted a grant request with the State Legislature request through the Mayor's Office
- Working with the Port on some stimulus opportunities
- Invited to speak at several freight speaking events like APA, Freight Speaks, TRB conference
- During the Cert review, they and staff were commended by the FHWA & FTA
- Applied to the FHWA Peer-to-Peer freight Program and we meet with a roundtable group in Seattle, Puget Sound Regional Council
- Developing an Annual report on our Freight Activities
- Working with FHWA for a Virtual Freight Advisory Committee

MR. LYON asked to share the language from Federal Certification for the Committee. "The Freight Advisory Committee defines and amplifies an energized and substantive input to the MPO planning process and the Policy Committee." Ms. Brewer has done a great job and the Freight Committee itself has been really active. FHWA & FTA realize this is how a sub-committee should be run and hopefully we'll do the same thing with the Non-motorized transportation committee.

**e. OTHER INFORMATIONAL ITEMS**

**f. COMMITTEE COMMENTS**

MS. WITT announced they received direction from FHWA that the Knik Arm Crossing Bridge has been added to the National Highway System with the qualification that it doesn't become part of the system until it is complete.

MS. RICE stated there is a 6:30 meeting on the Road to Nome.

LORA REINBOLD stated this is a little premature but she wanted to ask because she was asked to submit a form tomorrow. She would like be added to the next meeting if there is not enough information at this time. The last 4 yrs she has been working on the Eagle River Trails Project around the ER High School. We have 8.9k of trails we use around the HS and there is a development at the Mental Health Trust for housing -a new housing development that is pushing the trails down into the Chugach State Parks so that the HS can have access and the community for trails. We would like to get a connector between Yosemite...and we would like to get a connector over to the trails. MS. REINBOLD is going back to ask for a formal recommendation. What she is asking for today is if you are supportive of trail connectivity between the different property owners.

MR. LYON asked Ms. Reinbold if she was asking to nominate a project for inclusion into the LRTP or the TIP. She replied she not sure of how high a level because it is a simple overpass for trails across Yosemite Drive. The POC office has asked if this has gone through formal bodies on the form. She wants to make sure she goes through the right process and bodies as she is a volunteer.

MS WITT asked if she was asking for a letter of support. Yes replied MS. REINBOLD. MR. WEAVER asked if she took this before the Parks and Recreation board. MS. REINBOLD responded in the affirmative.

MR. WEAVER stated he was just curious about trail connectivity and what it is on the trails plan. What do they connect to, are they established trails because in the trails plan they talk about disconnectivity. It just seems it should be a capital project out of the Parks and Recreations Dept. MS. REINBOLD replied the overpass would out of P&R; we just put 8m to the Mac Center and it will be a long-long term process for that. MR. WEAVER stated he was familiar with Yosemite and elevating the upgrade to Yosemite to improve it more. Key question is what trails this would connect to, are they in the trails plan and on school property.

CHAIR CRAPPS mentioned she should talk with Lori Schanche, the Trails Coordinator. MS. REINBOLD stated she was already working with her. CHAIR CRAPPS said she would have a much better idea of funding, how it lays out in trails and possibly funding that's how it works.

MR. LYON stated we could have her do an informational briefing at the next meeting..

MS. HEIL asked if the March 24<sup>th</sup> PC meeting was going to be the big meeting and it was out in ER. Yes replied MR. LYON. We'll have our regular meeting and then have the joint meeting.

## **7. SCHEDULED AMATS MEETINGS**

Policy Committee, January 27, 2011  
Technical Advisory Committee, February 10, 2011

**8. ADJOURNMENT**

The meeting adjourned at 4:47 p.m.