

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

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

**May 12, 2011
2:30 p.m.**

Technical Advisory Committee members present:

Name	Representing
Todd Cowles	MOA/Port of Anchorage (POA)
Stephanie Mormilo	MOA/Traffic Division (TD)
Steve Shrader	MOA/Project Management & Engineering (PM&E)
Lance Wilber	MOA/Public Transportation Department (PTD)
Jennifer Witt	Alaska Dept. of Transportation & Public Facilities (DOT&PF), Central Region, Planning
Kim Rice	DOT&PF, Central Region
Bruce Carr	Alaska Railroad Corporation (ARRC)

Also in attendance

Name	Representing
Craig Lyon	MOA/Community Development Department
Teresa Brewer	MOA/CDD
Vivian Underwood	MOA/CDD
Erika McConnell	MOA/CDD
Jon Spring	MOA/Consultant
John Tolley	MOA/H2H
Lori Schanche	PM&E
Mark Parmelee	DOT&PF
Alvin Tabert	DOT&PF
Kelly Petersen	DOT&PF
Aves Thompson	Alaska Trucking Association
Stewart Osgood	DOWL HKM
Angelina Burney	DOWL HKM
Maryellen Tuttell	DOWL HKM
Walt Parker	Citizen

1. CALL TO ORDER

CHAIR MORMILO called the meeting to order at 2:35 p.m. All Technical Advisory Committee members were present with Lois Epstein, Jerry Weaver and Steve Morris absent and Steve Shrader sitting in for Jerry Hansen. 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. WILBER moved to approve the agenda. MR. CARR seconded. *Hearing no objections, the agenda was approved unanimously.*

4. APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES

MS. WITT moved to approve the March 18, 2010. MS. RICE seconded. *Hearing no objection the March 18, 2010 minutes were approved unanimously.*

MS. WITT moved to approve the September 23, 2010. MS. RICE seconded. *Hearing no objection the September 23, 2010 minutes were approved unanimously.*

MS. WITT asked if Mr. Lyon could give the committee a status update on clearing the backlog on where we are on the current minutes. MR. LYON responded he believes Ms. Klunder just sent an email today with 6 current minutes and he's pretty sure Mr. Rudolph got the email as well but he is out of town so he will give him a call when he gets in and we're almost there. MS. WITT asked about keeping us current? MR. LYON replied he is hoping we'll not be more than a month behind; he knows in the past when Wordsmith was doing them we were a month behind.

5. BUSINESS ITEMS

a. 2035 METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION PLAN (MTP)

MR. SPRING noted he always tries to bring the TAC up-to-date on the status of the MTP. The only thing he wants to bring to your attention today is the workshops that are coming up next week. Everyone should have received an email asking for your participation. What we tried to do is divide up the workshops into four topics that we've all been discussing on various modes and strategies groups. The first workshop is May 17, 2011 from 8:30-10:00 a.m. This workshop will primarily be roadway connections, streets and highways and freight topics.

The second workshop follows the first on Tuesday, May 17, 2011 from 10:30-12:00 p.m. this is the catch all workshop with Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS),

Transportation Demand Systems, Signals, Safety and Security. Then we have a couple of workshops on Friday, May 20, 8:30- 10:00 a.m., dealing with Transit and Land Use, than the next one from 10:30-12:00 p.m. is on bicycle and pedestrian transportation.

We are trying to stick to a 1.5 hour schedule for all of these; it is pretty ambitious so we are going to try and focus on primarily where the gaps are and the needs for these topic areas. We committed ourselves to adopting the existing projects that are in the Plan and reevaluating them and see in these workshops where the gaps are still remaining after we implement those existing projects. For the roads, we'll be looking at where there is still congestion out there and how we resolve those congestion problems.

For Transit, we'll look at maps where there is density of households, where the existing system does not serve parts of Anchorage and look at ways to plug those with new projects in addition to what is already in the MTP. He really encourages the Committee to participate and hopes that the Committee will find them useful. It's really going to help propel our development on the Plan beyond this stage which is a very critical phase of the Plan.

MR. CARR stated he would like to show up for the May 17th one, because he can't make the May 20th one. The Alaska railroad does move a lot of freight and we do have a lot of connections with the trucking industry and we are just as much interested in the roadway system as we are transit.

CHAIR MORMILO asked for public Comment. No public comment.

**b. 2010-2013 TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM,
AMENDMENT 2**

MR. LYON noted we have an item title 5b and he also made a legal size copy of just the page that was affected by the amendment. There are two projects listed in red which are both ITS projects, they were in the current STIP but we didn't reflect them in the TIP. This amendment is to add them in and because we are adding to the TIP it has to be a Major Amendment. Because our two air quality experts both Ms. Heil and Mr. Morris are not present or in town we were not able to convene an air quality consultation team to do the analysis on this. MR. LYON stated he believes that there wouldn't be an issue with these two projects and they might be exempt from analysis but we do need to have a meeting saying so. His suggestion was to get the information before the Committee and we should continue this meeting or bring it up at the next meeting and then take care of it.

MR. WILBER confirmed what the current amendment consisted of. He suggested this could be taken care of with a minor amendment.

MR. LYON commented he looked at what the latest language was related to Administrative Modifications with Mr. Rudolph, which is what a minor amendment used to be called, and their conclusion was it should be a Major Amendment. MS. WITT noted because it is adding new projects to the TIP.

MS. WITT explained it's something we would be happy to have as a minor amendment or as a minor adjustment; otherwise we are looking at critical months to get it through the process with the Assembly. If there is a way maybe we can suggest if over the intervening week that staff can take a look at it. Right now the schedule we looked at would put us in August for approval. Another item to note is that there is a difference in the dollar amount shown in the TIP pages for project ID 419202 and the amount shown in the STIP. The challenge is to match up the documents.

MR. WILBER suggested if we are going to do a Major or Minor Amendment and since we just received the material today and we haven't had a chance to fully review it, give us a continuation for another week to review it and give us another meeting to take up this item only. He encourages the Committee to go that direction and also encourage staff to look at it to see if it really requires a Major Amendment. His recommendation is to continue the meeting to take action next week.

No public comment.

MR. WILBER motioned that we continue this meeting to next Thursday to take up the 2010-2013 TIP, amendment #2 for these ITS project. Mr. CARR seconded. ***Hearing no objections, the item 5b 2010-2013 Transportation Improvement Program, Amendment 2 was unanimously postponed until next Thursday.***

c. URBANIZED AREA BOUNDARIES MODIFICATION

MR. LYON noted the current boundary of AMATS and stated this modification concerned technical changes staff would like to recommend. He believes that FHWA is who actually set the boundaries but we can make a request to them. Before you is a letter numbered 5c from the DOT Highway Program Manager, outlining the minor technical changes that they have requested. He doesn't have any issues with this from a staff perspective and we would recommend to FHWA that they make this change. We look to you to recommend to the PC and get their approval as it is pretty technical in nature and look for your guidance on this.

No public Comments.

MS. WITT moved to accept staff's recommendation to make these adjusts to the Small Urban Boundary and the Urbanized Boundaries consistent with the request from

DOT&PF highways data program manager in Juneau and that we recommend this to the PC. MR. WILBER seconded. *Hearing no objections, the Urbanized Area Boundaries Modification was approved unanimously.*

d. OTHER BUSINESS ITEMS - NONE

6. INFORMATION ITEMS

a. NON-MOTORIZED TRANSPORTATION UPDATE

MS. SCHANCHE announced they had started work on the Areawide Trails Plan and one of the transportation planners, Erika McConnell, is going to be joining the team. We're working to start off with a survey and get that out to the user groups. MS. SCHANCHE also discussed the Bike Map she had been working on to be handed out in time for Bike to Work Day. MR. WILBER asked whether Bike to Work Day is on the 20th. MS. SCHANCHE stated it is next Friday and there are going to be stations around town. The Bacon Station is back, it's at Chester Creek and the Seward Highway. CRW and DOWL HKM are sponsoring a booth at C Street, just north of Tudor. She has all her volunteers out at 12 different stations and noted that this is the 5th year we are counting and that will be really nice for all the data.

b. NORTHERN ACCESS TO UMED

STEWART OSGOOD with DOWL HKM presented the results of their recon study in the UMED District that was prepared in conjunction with DOT&PF. This was 18 months in the making and we are at the draft report stage. DOT&PF is currently reviewing the document and we are accepting comments through the end of June. The purpose of the project is to identify and move forward to improve the mobility of people and goods through the area. As everyone knows this is a very important employment district and growing ever more important with each passing day with another tower at Providence, and the sports complex, etc that are going up and that are planned for the area in the relatively short term. We know it is a large employment district with a lot of arterial streets that are at capacity and operate at a full level of service and we have some high crash rates around the corridors surrounding the UMED area.

The reconnaissance study does not come up with a preferred alternative; it only identifies feasible alternatives that should be carried forward. We made a point with the public, as we've gone out and talked with them that this is step one and under a normal federal project development, we're looking at 8 to 10 years for development of the roadway or roadway construction. This is not something that we will be starting construction on this year. Through the last 16 months we went out to the public tried to get some of the concerns out on the table.

MR. CARR asked Mr. Osgood if that was really reflective of the demography of the City? MR. OSGOOD replied yes, it might be that housing in the downtown area is more expensive so is not available to students. What it does show is we have a lot of cars that want to come in from that direction.

Acquisition B or Concept B would likely require the acquisition of parkland. Although not all is parkland but certainly around Goose Lake it is, and it is rather tight through there just where that loop from Goose Lake sticks over.

We investigated new roadway options off to the east, we called them concepts C, D, E, F, and I. Options C, D and E, all go through APU Campus. Option C was suggested early on and is the Pine Street corridor that would connect from this reverse curve on Northern Lights down the power line into Tudor Centre Drive and ultimately into Tudor Road.

Certainly APU is not in favor of any of those roadways that come through their specific campus. We evaluated them anyway because they came out of our public involvement process as we didn't want to eliminate anything. The other one is to connect into from reverse curve on Northern Lights Blvd; those are options I and F. There are a number of trail impacts from the roadways, if you wanted to impact the highest number of trails probably pick C, D or E. All of APU's trail wanders through the little hills up there and would be a rather significant impact from either of those alternatives.

We looked at more likely and obvious options, like option G that would create a straight connection between Elmore and Bragaw. There were those that suggested if we wanted to calm traffic or discourage use of the roadway, we would need to offset the intersection of Providence and Elmore so that it would create a jog in the alignment that would discourage use by through movements and encourage use of going to or coming from the general area. The impetus behind options I and F was to eliminate this notion that if we connect those two noted points that we're going to get significant travel through the Universities instead of to and from traffic. The public was very interested in creating a circuitous route that would allow for access in but discouraged movement through.

MR. WILBER asked if any of the improvements show reductions in delay on all of the streets you mentioned earlier including Lake Otis, Tudor, Northern Lights and inside the campus. Yes replied MR. OSGOOD; the report has it intersection by intersection, but we tried to lump options together rather than split them up for this presentation.

The study is recommending that options G, I, K, and L be carried forward. These options here are carried forward for additional analysis if the project is to be carried forward. We can go back to the graphic and G was the option of node to node through the extension, I, J, K and L were options that come out to Northern Lights. We eliminated those through APU and we eliminated the one with the jog in it. The idea there was maybe there was a

way to extend those through to create an access road rather than 100 feet at a time as we add campus buildings on to UAA.

The context sensitive design issue came up and we looked at some options and actually there are some options that we can do rather than a four lane straight road. There is an option to do some cut and cover work, and to create some green concept where we would split the traffic out one on each side and something that fits in the area with the UMED District. DOT will make a decision whether to forward with the project and the likely scenario would be a preliminary environmental study hopefully taking the four options with merit and advancing from through the process.

MS. UNDERWOOD asked if they had considered the UAA demonstration project car sharing. MS. TUTTLE responded she doesn't think that was specifically in there.

MS. MCCONNELL asked how come they're going north along Elmore from Elmore-Tudor up to University Drive and Providence Drive. MR. OSGOOD responded it looks like an arrow is missing on the graphic. Some of the improvement that we see is the result of that Lake Otis project connecting into the Glenn Highway and also the H2H project has a significant impact on what goes on throughout the network. It really shows you how important those connections and projects are in the future.

MS. WITT asked if all the modeling assumed that both those connections are made. MR. OSGOOD confirmed everything he presented assumes those two projects. We did a limited amount of analyses with them out and it's included in the report. If you removed them this is what it would look like and it's not great.

MR. WILBER noted he had a couple questions and that Mr. Osgood had answered one of them about the assumptions. He can appreciate from UAA's perspective but really if there is a benefit to moving a connection like UAA Drive to the east would there not also be an opportunity to actually combine the UAA campus that's on both sides of UAA Drive right now. There is also the difference of UAA and APU which is an educational institution but its survival is based on the value of its land unlike UAA. It will be very interesting to see their comments on the report.

MR. OSGOOD noted it is and we talk about these entities like there is one voice that represents all of them and of course that's not true. If you are a library user and you're at APU you want to make sure you have that ability in a non-motorized way to get back and forth from the library and the sharing of the facilities. What you say is true, UAA Drive largely cuts through the middle of UAA and if we could do something and vacate that or turn it into a walking street or a plaza street that would add value to them. He thinks the Chancellor recognizes that as a potential alternative for them. What Mr. Osgood was referring to was maintaining the pedestrian access across whatever is constructed and whatever else they are sharing between them.

MR. WILBER asked if the information Mr. Osgood shared about where the trips are coming from and all of the work we've done in planning and in traffic, if those numbers are consistent with what we did in planning and the results are there.

MR. THOMPSON asked if there has been consultation with or consideration with the commercial vehicle activity in and out of the area. MR. OSGOOD commented above and beyond kind of measuring truck traffic along with single axle vehicles, he doesn't know if there has been. MS. TUTTLE responded besides talking with the Anchorage School District about their bus activity, they talked with People Mover and the Fire Department in terms of emergency access. MR. THOMPSON asked if they had talked with anyone in the freight community that would be delivering freight like the hospital or to the University of Alaska, or to APU or to any other activities in the area. MR. OSGOOD replied he doesn't think they did and that is a good comment and we will.

MR. KATSION stated part of the issue in this whole area is you have a lot of people coming in and out of the area and there is not a lot of housing yet in the area. UAA for the size of the University, it has a small amount of housing. Over the next 20 years was that taken into consideration of increasing beyond campus housing and then was that taken into consideration whole area south where Providence is between 40th and Tudor seems like a huge area that could be redeveloped. He knows it's pretty common in other communities where Universities and Medical centers are starting to subsidize housing for their people so they get them closer. How much of that was taken into account instead of the travel demand modeling to get people living closer to work.

MR. OSGOOD noted it's ultimately the best way. We did have a conversation with UAA and APU; it's more of a bigger deal at UAA than APU. He got the impression that the build out they envision at UAA has very modest amounts of initial housing on campus.

MS. TUTTLE explained we did start out with the land use information from the LRTP Model but then we actually went into the institutional master plans and updated the forecast within the district to show their plan in student housing and forecasted increases.

MR. OSGOOD noted on a percentage basis on the growth it doesn't eat into that percentage basis, a fairly modest step and a lot of it comes down to the land is so valuable for other purposes that they see it as being hemmed in and that it becomes the responsibility of the community to provide the housing.

MR. PARKER expressed he was glad to see we're this far along but 35 years ago Anchorage had half the people and the UMED area had about 10% there. He would like to submit his comments to you but watching the way Boniface has backed up of the last two years coming from commute and before it was a block of traffic now is four blocks

and he would try and not shove any of the Valley or Eagle River traffic over to use Boniface.

MS. TUTTLE encouraged everyone to come to the public meeting next Wednesday night and she's sure there will be a very good turn out and it would be good to hear a few different perspectives. MR. OSGOOD he thinks they put together with DOT&PF a good report that addressed the options in a clear and concise manner.

e. OTHER INFORMATIONAL ITEMS

f. COMMITTEE COMMENTS

MR. CARR talked about AKRR efforts this summer in the Mat-Su Valley, specifically in the Point Mackenzie area.

7. SCHEDULED AMATS MEETINGS

Policy Committee, May 26, 2011
Technical Advisory Committee, June 9, 2011
Policy Committee, June 23, 2011
Technical Advisory Committee, July 14, 2011

8. ADJOURNMENT

At 3:42 p.m. the meeting was continued to next Thursday.