

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

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

**April 14, 2011  
2:30 p.m.**

Technical Advisory Committee members present:

Name	Representing
Bart Rudolph	Alaska Dept. of Transportation & Public Facilities (ADOT), Central Region, Planning
Kim Rice	ADOT, Central Region
Cindy Heil	Alaska Dept. of Environmental Conservation (ADEC)
Steve Morris	MOA/Dept. of Health & Human Services
Todd Cowles	MOA/Port of Anchorage (POA)
John Crapps	MOA/Traffic Department (TD)
Lance Wilber	MOA/Public Transportation Department (PTD)
Lois Epstein	AMATS Air Quality Advisory Committee
Bruce Carr	Alaska Railroad Corporation (ARRC)

Also in attendance

Name	Representing
Craig Lyon	MOA/Community Development Department (CDD)
Vivian Underwood	MOA/CDD
Jon Spring	MOA/Consultant
Art Johnson	Kinney Engineering
Walt Parker	

**1. CALL TO ORDER**

CHAIR CRAPPS called the meeting to order at 2:35 p.m. All Technical Advisory Committee members were present with Mr. Wilber arriving at 2:42 p.m., Mr. Hansen and Mr. Weaver were absent, and Mr. Rudolph is sitting in for Ms. Witt. A quorum was established.

**2. PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT ANNOUNCEMENT**

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

**3. APPROVAL OF AGENDA**

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

MR. LYON noted that on the agenda were six sets of minutes for approval but he missed printing out January 13, 2011. They have been out on there as long but he just didn't get them printed in time. In addition, if we could move up 5c Anchorage CO Maintenance Plan to first. MR. RUDOLPH asked that AMATS Funding Allocation stay under business items.

*Hearing no objections, the agenda was approved unanimously.*

**4. APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES**

**January 28, 2010** – MS. HEIL motioned and MR. CARR seconded. MR. RUDOLPH noted he had some minor edits and would give them to Mr. Lyon to incorporate. *Hearing no objections, the minutes were approved unanimously.*

**May 13, 2010** – MS. HEIL moved to approve and MR. COWLES seconded. *Hearing no objections, the minutes were approved unanimously.*

**June 10, 2010** – MS. HEIL moved to approve and MR. COWLES seconded. MR. RUDOLPH commented there is a lot of wordy and choppy sentences and a minor change regarding the 3<sup>rd</sup> page of the operating agreement. He would move to send them back to staff for further review. MS. HEIL withdrew her motion.

**July 08, 2010** – MS. HEIL moved to approve and MR. COWLES seconded. *Hearing no objections, the minutes were approved unanimously.*

**October 14, 2010** – MS. HEIL moved to approve and MR. COWLES seconded. MR. RUDOLPH commented there are a lot of wordy and choppy sentences. Postponed and given back to staff for further review. MS. HEIL withdrew her motion.

**January 13, 2011** – MS. HEIL moved to approve and MR. COWLES seconded. *Hearing no objections, the minutes were approved unanimously.*

**5. BUSINESS ITEMS**

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

MR. MORRIS asked the TAC to recommend the approval of technical revisions to the Anchorage CO plan. He noted that these revisions were precipitated by a release of a new emissions model called MOVES by the EPA. It replaces the current model called MOBILE6. The MOVES model is supposed to be used for all conformity determinations starting March 2, 2012. If a transportation plan is prepared after that date, MOVES must be used for modeling. Alaska DEC had Sierra Research investigate how switching from MOBILE6 to MOVES might have on our ability to show conformity and it didn't look good. MOVES generates much higher CO emission rates than MOBILE6. The conformity budget in the State Implementation Plan (SIP) was developed with MOBILE6. The Sierra Research analysis showed that any MOVES-based conformity analysis was likely to bust the MOBILE6-based budget in the SIP. For this reason we did a technical update to the CO plan that will replace the MOBILE6 budget with one prepared with the new MOVES model. The emission estimates increase a lot with MOVES and the emission budget goes up considerably. We've redone the maintenance projections but the net effect of all these changes on the conclusions drawn from the new modeling and the narrative in the plan is pretty minor. The main result is that we should not have problems meeting the new MOVES-based conformity budget in future transportation plans.

The memo in your packet describes the details. If you look at Figure 1, it shows what will happen if we don't change the emission budget in the SIP. As you can see, MOVES estimates of future emissions far exceed the MOBILE6-based budget. It is clear that once MOVES becomes a requirement on March 2, 2012, we won't meet conformity requirements. In order to avoid this problem we replaced this MOBILE6-based budget with a budget computed with MOVES, Figure 2 shows that the new MOVES budget is about 60% higher than the current budget simply because MOVES estimates higher CO emission rates than MOBILE6. As you can see in Figure 2, projected actual CO emissions in Anchorage are about 20% below the new MOVES-based budget. This means we would meet conformity requirements with a new MOVES-based budget.

The TAC released the technical revisions for 30-day public comment on March 10 and we've received no public comments. We met with AMATS Air Quality Advisory Group on April 4 and they support these technical revisions. We also had an informal interagency consultation with the EPA, FHWA and ADEC. Jeff Houk from FHWA provided some useful suggestions that we have now incorporated in a revised draft Plan. His comments are technical in nature. He suggested that we establish a static emission budget rather than one that declines over time. He suggested removing the prescriptive procedure for evaluating the background concentration for project level analysis because if EPA changes their guidance on how it should be done we'll have to revise the SIP, which is a long involved process. If this procedure is pulled out of the SIP we can still require that any procedure that is used to estimate background CO be reviewed through the interagency consultation process. He also found a very minor error in the modeling that we have done that change the numbers by less than 0.2%. We've included all of Mr.

Houk's suggestions in a new draft and the Air Quality Advisory Committee was supportive of the revisions.

MR. MORRIS asked Ms. Heil if she knew whether EPA might extend the period when MOBILE6 can still be used. MS. HEIL responded at the National level they were talking about the possibility of extending the deadline but at this point it's not clear if, when or how this might happen. They are looking for ways to continue to encourage those people like us to update their budgets with MOVES and giving an extension only to those who really need it and who are unable to meet that deadline. After talking with Mr. Morris, ADEC thought it would be better to continue to with the process of updating the SIP and conformity budget with MOVES rather than delay. The MTP due date is coming up in the same time frame as the MOVES requirement. If we have a MOVES-based budget ready for the MTP it would save a lot of work later on. If we don't have a MOVES budget approved for the MTP and use MOBILE6 instead we would have to do another conformity determination later with MOVES anyway. For efficiency sake she said she hopes that we can continue on to stay on track with the CO emission budget update with MOVES. All along we have been working together with the EPA, FHWA, the State and the Municipality to develop this emissions update so we don't anticipate any problems. MR. MORRIS commented that he hoped to get the PC to approve the technical revisions to the CO Plan with the new budget on April 28 and the Assembly on May 10. The timeline is pretty tight to meet the March 2, 2012 MOVES deadline. He requested that the TAC recommend approval of the revised draft of these technical revisions.

MS. HEIL moves to recommend approval to the PC of the Anchorage CO Maintenance Plan to replace Mobile6 model with the MOVES model on the emissions budget. MR. COWLES seconded. *Hearing no objections, the Technical Revisions to the Anchorage CO Maintenance Plan replacing the Mobile6 emissions budget with one based on MOVES was approved unanimously.*

MS. HEIL left at 3:15 p.m.

**a. OBLIGATION REPORT**

MR. RUDOLPH noted before them was the obligation report and he explained the status of the projects in the report. He also requested Committee approval on the following projects:

- Victor Road – request to program an additional \$213,000 for increased design and utility relocation costs. This is a State funded project and the DOT&PF is still working with the MOA to get the agreements in place to transfer the monies to DOT&PF. AMATS originally approved \$285,000 in TIP funds to keep the project moving forward. This request is in addition to that original approval.

- Huffman Road – Anticipate not using the \$2.3 programmed and deobligating some monies from last year due to low bids. (no approval needed, just information)
- Eagle River Road Rehab - request to program an additional \$150,000 for increased design costs
- Old Glenn Rehab – construction overrun of \$2.4M (no approval needed, just information)
- Muldoon Road landscaping and Pedestrian Improvements – Anticipate fully funding this project in FY2011 and not A/C anything from 2012, freeing up those funds to use on another projects in FY2012. (no approval needed, just information)

In all, MR. RUDOLPH reported that we're required to be within 10% of what's programmed and expected to be obligated. We are at 6.81% and there is about a \$2.5M funding gap, but Dowling Road remains the bulk of the program and excess funding will most likely be absorbed with that project.

MR. LYON noted that there is nothing that requires PC approval; the two projects mentioned here only require TAC approval.

MR. WILBER motioned to recommend approval of staff's recommendations for those additional funds for projects G1 Victor Road Reconstruction and G3 Eagle River Road Rehab. MS. RICE seconded. *Hearing no objections, the Obligation Report was approved unanimously.*

#### **b. AMATS FUNDING ALLOCATION**

MR. LYON noted before the committee is a sheet of paper with some discussion of the formula and before that is a copy of the letter when MR. WILBER was Chair of the TAC AMATS sent to DOT&PF. This was after a presentation by Pete Christenson of DOT&PF Headquarters, who came up to present on our allocation. To refresh your memory, when they figure out how much money trickles down to AMATS or MPO's in general; in all the states except in Alaska and Hawaii, they have a formula set aside in the authorization bill that says this is the dollar amount you get. In Alaska they say we'll allow the state to figure it out, we'll want to look at the formula they use but will allow them to decide what's best for them. At the back of the letter marked 5b you'll see what the allocation formula currently is and was back then and has been for some time. At the bottom you'll see 9 different criteria the State can utilize to figure out how they are going to allocate the formula funds to the MPO's. The ones they actually use are at the top; population, major accidents, all accidents, etc. When we looked at these, the TAC had a lot of discussion about it, as it doesn't look like we are getting a fair shake here. For example, we basically have 42% of the population; but that particular criteria is only weighted 10% when they allocate. We have 49% of major accidents, but that is weighted

10%. We put this letter in and basically we didn't get traction down in Juneau. The reason this is coming back up again is that STIP revision #20 is out right now; it's a good time for us to take another stab at it. We have contacted FMATS but have yet to hear back from Donna Gardino, the FMATS Coordinator. The idea is, if we can get both MPO's to come up with the same formula and put that in together, hopefully it will have more traction in Juneau and, if not, through DOT&PF Headquarters.

MR. LYON noted the previous time we talked about it, the idea was to look at these and come up with a different set of numbers. For example, instead of saying 10% for population, say 30%; instead of using lane miles-we use capacity of local population to support the transportation system. We didn't come up with that formula specifically when Mr. Wilber wrote this letter, but my thought is to approach it with the committee and if it is agreeable, he could meet with DOT&PF.

The bigger spread sheet is what they are using now. It will show you at the top, Statewide Lane Miles. MR. LYON stated he would contact Peter Christenson down in Juneau on how he come up with the statewide lane miles idea, but right now they're weighing it high and we get a low number. MR. LYON noted there is a lot of information out there and he would like a sense from Committee if they'd like us to begin the process of throwing the allocation out there if you think it's okay.

MS. RICE asked Mr. Lyon to call DOT&PF Headquarters and tell them we were discussing this as it seems we should get a response before discussion takes place. MR. LYON noted in the past they've said you guys should feel fortunate because if we use the formula set out in the federal funds you would get a lot less. Nothing formal was sent back to us. MR. WILBER responded he did follow up and from an AMATS perspective we didn't get anything back but he knows they did get it as he talked with Geoff Ottesen to specifically see that they got it within the comment period. So he doesn't recall receiving anything verbally and he's knows we didn't get anything in writing. MS. RICE asked do they have to respond. MR. WILBER stated he didn't know if they had to respond but he did want to make sure they got them.

MR. WILBER noted he had one more comment and asked Mr. Lyon what window we are working in right now with this STIP amendment. MR. LYON stated he doesn't remember and asked Mr. Rudolph if he knew. MR. RUDOLPH noted he does not think its part of the STIP amendment but part of the new STIP they are delivering now with new projects. We have a couple months, but not a lot of time.

MR. CARR noted just a couple of observations. One, we really didn't ask them a question here, all we did was say here's our feelings, here's a comment. It's within their rights not to respond. On top of what Mr. Wilber mentioned, Mr. Ottesen has always said we've had a big state and we have to make sure we allocate these funds throughout this big state. He agrees with working with FMATS and getting the two organizations

together to work on a formula. If we both agree, it will make a much stronger statement. He doesn't think we're going to get FHWA involved in this fight. This is done by administrative code and they won't step into state rights. He certainly thinks working with Donna Gardino and FMATS is a worthwhile exercise and, if nothing else, will fire them up because as you well know Fairbanks always believes we are getting too much money anyway. No matter what we get, if we can work with them so both of us receives more money, it should go more smoothly.

MR. CARR asked what we are asking here. Are we just asking to re-date this letter and have Chair Crapps sign it? MR. LYON responded no, his thought was to work with staff and whoever else is interested in a work session or small meetings to come up with a new weighting formula, one that makes more sense, and have FMATS agree and present it that way. He was just looking for the TAC's blessing to do that.

MR. MORRIS expressed it would be helpful to see this all laid out including the federal formula for the other states and how that would affect a sampling of Alaska communities like, Anchorage, Fairbanks, Sitka, moderate size cities, so we're not tweaking this in a vacuum. We need to be fair and realize what the impacts would be in other communities and what they are getting now.

MR. CARR also commented we haven't heard if the valley also has an MPO or not. It could be a couple more months before we hear that, so there is the potential for introducing another MPO in the core area. MS. RICE asked who does that. MR. CARR noted it was the US Census Bureau by formula.

MR. MORRIS stated he must have misunderstood as far as other communities' allocation that are not MPOs, is it just at the discretion of the State. MR. LYON stated he believes so. MS. RICE stated it doesn't get divided up by community, it's divided up by a needs list and scoring. MR. MORRIS noted so it's only Fairbanks and Anchorage right now.

MR. WILBER recommends and asks the committee to ask staff to prepare a recommendation as part of the updated STIP development to review the scoring criteria, review the dollars and make a recommendation to this Committee to forward to the PC for their review. He doesn't believe the rules of engagement have changed and though there is a new STIP process out there and comments are being made he thinks similar to the last time; AMATS and PC should weigh in on the allocation and in concert with FMATS as per Mr. Carr. MR. WILBER asked staff to put together the briefing paper, present it to us and we'll forward a recommendation to the PC. MS. RICE seconded. *Hearing no objections, the recommendation was approved unanimously.*

**d. 2035 METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION PLAN**

MR. SPRING stated there is no business item before you but every month we will be coming before you to give you an update/progress report on what we've been doing and what we expect to do over the next months. Most of you are aware of the activities as you participate in the TAC+ joint meeting with the PC last month. He noted he would review the various tasks with the TAC. Public Involvement, AMATS staff is primarily involved in going to the Municipal Commissions and Boards and introducing themselves, establishing contact with them, and informing them about the plan update. A lot of these boards have never really been approached by AMATS before so it serves as a dual role of not only giving them the opportunity to weigh in on this major transportation plan update, but also providing AMATS staff the opportunity to explain what AMATS does. Some of the commissions we have already met with include: the Senior Citizen's Commission, the Diversity Commission, The Women's Commission, Watershed Commissions and the Health Human Services Commission. We will be meeting with the Transit Advisory Board tomorrow night.

MR. SPRING stated he's only been to one of them but has found it very useful. The Health and Human Services Commission provided some valuable suggestions with respect to groups we might want to contact for Environmental Justice purposes. A lot of these commissions are tightly integrated into servicing low to moderate income populations and minority populations so they have some really valuable input to offer us. We have been informing the commissions that we would like to be invited back when we get a public review draft done in August or September to hear their comments on the draft plan. Other public involvement tasks include updating our project website, which you can access through the AMATS site, updating the email lists, and preparing a newspaper insert. Not only will they be inserted in newspapers but they will be placed in strategic places throughout the community. While the insert is not completed, it is anticipated that it will include a review of the achievements AMATS has made over the last few years in transit, roadway improvements, and bicycle and sidewalk improvements. The insert will also layout the schedule for our plan update and some of the issue we are facing in this update and ways to contact us for further information. The insert will be an excellent way to notify a broad range of the public on this MTP update endeavor.

The project team is working on 4 separate model scenarios that use 2035 as the planning horizon. The scenarios include the 2035 No build scenario which assumes that no new projects are implemented. This scenario is designed to test what level of congestion we can expect to face if nothing is done. The 2035 Base Case Scenario includes all the transportation plan projects currently in the existing MTP. The results should show how much congestion improvement we will achieve in 2035 if we continue to implement our existing plan. The third scenario includes the Base Case plus new projects that we identified in some of the subarea plans that have been approved since 2007. These plans include the Downtown Plan, Hillside District Plan, and the Eagle River Circulation Plan and the blue print plan for the Transit/People Mover. We're going to take all those projects and add them to the existing array of projects in the old transportation plan and

run the model again. The remaining deficiencies will then be examined to determine where new projects need to be added. There might not be a lot of deficiencies at this point as most of the projects we've identified will solve most of the congestion problems but he suspects there will be some hot spots remaining that aren't taken care of in existing plans. One final scenario will test the effect of removing the H2H project from the existing MTP.

With the respect to the actual plan preparation, a straw man document has been prepared. The project team is now in the process of updating and editing each chapter to bring them up-to-date and combine the Anchorage Bowl and Chugiak-Eagle River Plans. At this point the consulting team has developed a draft Chapter 1, which is basically an overview. We are preparing Chapter 3 Goals and Objectives that will be finished this month. We are also starting Chapter 4 Current Conditions which is like the Status of the System chapter.

Other tasks that we are engaged in include the update to the financial plan. ADOT has been trying to develop cost estimates for all ADOT owned projects currently in the old transportation plan. The MOA PM&E Division is compiling similar cost estimates for MOA projects. ADOT is also working on the revenue side of the equation. When both are complete, we will be able to see if the future revenues are sufficient to fund the projects listed in the Plan.

MR. COWLES asked if Mr. Spring was going to meet with the Port Commission. MR. SPRING responded he doesn't think they are on the list but he will be happy to put them on the list.

MR. CARR commented it's going to be interesting to see gas prices solve a lot of our congestion problems. He also asked if the project team was going to look at new projects or was it simply going to combine the separate Anchorage Bowl and the Chugiak-Eagle River Transportation Plans.

MR. SPRING replied that the direction given by the Policy Committee was to focus on re-evaluating the existing projects contained in the two plans. He suspects however that some additional projects will be added if it appears that the existing array of projects cannot meet future transportation demand.

**e. OTHER BUSINESS ITEMS – NONE**

**6. INFORMATION ITEMS - NONE**

MR. LYON commented he just sent out the final Federal Certification to both Committees and he hasn't had a chance to look at it yet. There were 3 or 4 more corrective actions. Please take a look at it and make comments.

MS. EDWARDS asked if that would always be a TAC+. Will the PC meeting always be a + meeting. MR. SPRING replied no this is the last one - the last joint one. We may schedule more later on but we'll schedule separate ones. MS. EDWARDS asked how often the TAC+ will meet. MR. SPRING responded it probably will be every month until August.

MR. CARR announced there is an open house at the Railroad Headquarters on May 7; free rides and children's activities including free face painting. Also, just to forewarn DOT&PF, our coal trains are increasing so our crossing at C Street will increase. Our gravel service is expected to start maybe tomorrow and it looks like we'll be moving about 4 cars a day through Anchorage which means 8 trains a day across C Street.

**7. SCHEDULED AMATS MEETINGS**

Policy Committee, April 28, 2011

Joint PC, TAC and TAC+, April 28, 2011

Technical Advisory Committee, May 12, 2011

**8. ADJOURNMENT**

The meeting adjourned at 3:45 p.m.