

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

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

**August 11, 2011  
2:30 p.m.**

Technical Advisory Committee members present:

Name	Representing
David Post	Alaska Dept. of Transportation & Public Facilities (ADOT), Central Region, Planning
Kim Rice	ADOT, Central Region
Cindy Heil	Alaska Dept. of Environmental Conservation
Steve Morris	MOA/Dept. of Health & Human Services
Stephanie Mormilo	MOA/Traffic Division
Jerry Weaver	MOA/Community Development Department (CDD)
Jerry Hansen	MOA/Project Management & Engineering (PM&E)
Lance Wilber	MOA/Public Transportation Department
Lois Epstein	AMATS Air Quality Advisory Committee (AAQAC)

Also in attendance

Name	Representing
Craig Lyon	MOA/CDD
Teresa Brewer	MOA/CDD
Lori Schanche	MOA/ PM&E
Anne Brooks	Brooks and Associates
Bart Rudolph	ADOT
Jon Spring	Spring Planning Services

**1. CALL TO ORDER**

CHAIR MORMILO called the meeting to order at 2:38 p.m. All Technical Advisory Committee members were present except Bruce Carr and Todd Cowles. 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

CHAIR MORMILO asked if there were any changes to the agenda. MR. LYON noted we are adding an informational item on the 2012-2015 Draft STIP. MR. WILBER moved to approve the agenda. MR. HANSEN seconded. *Hearing no objections, the agenda was approved unanimously.*

### 4. APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES - None

### 5. BUSINESS ITEMS

#### a. 2025 MTP UPDATE

MR. SPRING reported the results of the TAC+ meeting on the MTP project roadway list. A revision to the list was suggested by TAC+ members in response to the discovery of a revenue shortfall that required us to move an additional project from the long-term list to the illustrative list. The recommendation is to reduce the stated project cost of the interchange at O'Malley and Seward Highway from \$150M to \$75M and fund a short term design study (\$500K) to determine the final design and cost of the project. At this point is uncertain whether a full systems interchange is needed or whether a partial interchange will do. The rest of the project list was left alone.

CHAIR MORMILO asked how we were proposing to treat the remaining balance of the O'Malley and Seward Highway Interchange project (\$75M). MR. SPRING responded that was going to be moved to the illustrative list.

MR. SPRING noted typically we try to have the TAC make a formal recommendation for approval of the roadway recommendation list to the PC. We're going to be taking this list to the PC on the 25th and ask for their formal approval. He asks if Mr. Post or Mr. Wilber will so move to recommend. MR. POST so moved, MR. HANSEN seconded.

MS. EPSTEIN noted there was some discussion about adding the Knik Arm Crossing project to the roadway list along with its estimated cost.

MR. WILBER noted that he has been working with KABATA to create a format listing of the financial assumptions used in their Pro Forma analysis. He volunteered to create a text element that would show the difference between the adopted plan and the new update. The major difference between the financial assumption of the previous plan and today's update is that KABATA is now looking for State funds to make the project work. This will require that AMATS determine what effect this will have on the State funds we were planning on. Frankly that's hard thing to do and the PC will have to weigh in.

MR. WILBER recommends we move forward with what staff has done and keep this table separate.

MS. EPSTEIN expressed her concerns regarding this issue and noted that AMATS approved a resolution that said KABATA would be subject to the same level of fiscal scrutiny as every other project in terms of fiscal constraint. As a result, she would like to see the KAC project included on the same roadway project list as the rest of the projects including the scoring rank. We should be able to do it right and not scrambling to get something to the PC.

MR. WILBER noted that Kevin Hemenway, KABATA's Chief Financial Officer offered to discuss KABATA's financial plan with AMATS when their consultants Wilber Smith are in town on August 18.

MS. EPSTEIN asked if after the briefing, it can get pulled together and put on one document for the PC.

MR. MORRIS asked if Mr. Wilber was talking about the project lists or the financial plans. It just seems we're going to have another document for the financial plans for the bulk of the projects here and it seems to him it should be one document with two sections. As Mr. Wilber explained how they may be separate but have some influence on each other; if there are State funds that go to KABATA that may add some uncertainty to what we might expect for the rest of the program.

MS. EPSTEIN stated she thought that the intent was to put all of the information in one document with a separate document that provides more details regarding the KABATA financial plan. She thought it would be better to have all of the information in one spot. MR. MORRIS agreed they should be scored through this screening analysis to see how all things fall out but he really thinks the funding is separate. MS. EPSTEIN asked why, because the resolution was to include all of it together. MR. MORRIS stated he understood there could be a decision about funding coming forward if the threat of additional costs to support the bridge from the State if that may threaten the rest of the program than maybe we need to proceed. It really is two separate sources of funding. It's a little confusing to people to say we're funding this all from the same program.

Discussion occurred regarding KABATA, funding and placement of the project. Ms. EPSTEIN suggested a friendly amendment describing the relationship and the potential dollar trade offs. MR. WILBER seconded for the purpose of discussion.

MR. POST asked if the projects within the LRTP are located solely in the AMATS area. Is Knik Bridge the only one...MS. EPSTEIN replied the Knik Ferry. MR. POST also asked if the fiscal constraint is contained solely in the LRTP. His point is there are some differences with this project versus every other project within the LRTP.

MS. BROOKS asked for clarification from the document standpoint; Ms. Epstein had mentioned a cover memo. MS. EPSTEIN replied a cover memo should be submitted with the list when they are presented to the PC. MR. SPRING agreed.

MR. POST stated so he understands we're voting on friendly amendment for a cover memo that would show specifically what's happening. MR. SPRING replied he would write the memo. We're also creating a separate spreadsheet for KABATA that will be presented to the PC. The cover memo will link the KAC and the other financially constrained roadway projects and talk about the relationship between the two.

MR. POST noted he has no objection to the friendly amendment. MR. HANSEN concurred. *Hearing no objections, the motion was approved unanimously.*

MR. SPRING explained there are 3 project lists, one is the roadway list just voted on, the second is the bike/ped/trail list, and the third is the transit list. The TAC + also discussed the bike/ped/trail list and there are 3 projects moved to the illustrative list which includes Fire Creek Trail, Glenn Hwy Trail Extension out to Mat-Su Valley, and Eagle River Valley Trail; he thinks it would be appropriate to recommend that list for approval to the PC.

MR. HANSEN so moved. MR. MORRIS seconded. *Hearing no objections, the motion was approved unanimously.*

MR. SPRING stated in order to get the final plan preparations complete there are a couple of other items needing to be addressed. It includes the transit list of projects and their operation and maintenance costs that we haven't finished compiling yet, which is probably the driving force behind the transit recommendations and trail operating costs. There is also the KABATA financial analysis part that Mr. Wilber is working on. He recommended another meeting to coincide with the KABATA presentation or after the meeting to discuss these final items.

**c. OTHER BUSINESS ITEMS - NONE**

**6. INFORMATION ITEMS**

**a. HSIP REPORT**

MR. LYON presented a handout for the report, as there was no one at this time to make a presentation. The report noted all of the HSIP projects planned in the AMATS area and which years funding was anticipated to be obligated. MS. EPSTEIN noted that she saw on the DOT&PF web site they are going to start reporting annual performance measures on safety.

**b. STATUS OF THE SYSTEM REPORT**

MR. SPRING explained this was one in a series of Status of the System reports that AMATS produces every 3 to 4 years. The first one was in 1998, then 2000, 2003, 2007, and 2010. It keeps the same format as the previous ones. The idea was to collect the same information every 3 years and try and build up some type of trend analysis capability. We keep adding things to it every time we publish the report however.

The most recent version was somewhat expanded and contains an analysis of the impacts of projects implemented since 2007, the date of the last report. One of the purposes was attaching new analysis and trends and use it as an evaluation tool to see if where the projects are achieving the objectives they were intended to achieve and in terms of congestion relief. There was a substantial amount of investment in new roadway capacity in the northeast part of the Anchorage Bowl, including projects such as Elmore, Dr Martin Luther King Blvd, East Dowling, as well as, the intersection improvements at Lake Otis & Tudor, which had the effect of greatly reducing the congestion in the area. The implementation of these projects essentially; gained about a decade's worth of congestion relief along Lake Otis and Tudor Road despite the fact that the UMED district was one of the fastest growing areas of the city. A lot of cities would be very happy to see that kind of improvement.

In general this report says Anchorage is not doing that bad in terms of keeping up with transportation needs. Not only in roadways but we made substantial improvements in the number of bicycle trails, particularly bicycle lanes, and sidewalks AMATS should give itself a pat on the back for solving and meeting the transportation needs of the public. He would like to distribute this to a wider audience; it will be on the web and we're going to send out a notification that it's available to the public.

**c. 2012-2015 DRAFT STIP**

MR. POST explained these are excerpts to the Draft STIP that pertain to Anchorage. He noted he would go through them on a page-by-page basis and comments are due September 18.

Page one, is referencing the AMATS program, there is a significant swing in 2012 where we are anticipating a \$36M drop in funding in anticipation of a new transportation authorization bill based on the recognition that the Highway Trust Fund has had to receive large supplemental amounts and will be unlikely to continue at that level. We are looking at a 30% decrease in funds that will impact 2013-15.

MR. LYON asked what "TPF" stood for. MR. POST responded third party funding. Third party funding is usually the Municipality. He explained the matching funds.

Page two; he included everything in the State that happens to be on the NHS within the AMATS region. These are projects that are outside the AMATS program funding but within the AMATS planning area.

MS. EPSTEIN asked about Need ID number 20255, the funding amount that she's always heard was \$686M, costs of the Knik Arm Crossing and the numbers in 20255 are substantially different. MR. WILBER replied the current cost estimate for Phase 1 is between \$715 and \$720M. MS. EPSTEIN asked where that comes from. MR. WILBER responded KABATA. It's in their latest Pro Forma that they are using for their investors. MS. EPSTEIN asked if he could send it to her. MR. WILBER responded he would and also noted it was on their website.

MS. EPSTEIN asked if Need ID 20255 was new in the STIP because Need ID 20256 says project 2 of 3 and that one does identify 2 of 3. MR. POST replied those others happen to be in the Mat-Su Borough. MS. EPSTEIN concurred but asked if it was new. MR. POST responded both happen to be in the existing STIP and that he would work with ADOT HQ for further clarification.

MR. POST noted the Seward Highway project, 36<sup>th</sup> to 20<sup>th</sup> Avenue was also known as Midtown congestion relief. We requested \$1M in funding for that.

He stated that on Page 3, the National Highway System (NHS) funds are mostly informational. There are a couple of small projects outside the AMATS area. The Olympic Circle Road in Girdwood happens to be an earmark and we were able to get a grant thanks to Mark Parmelee, DOT&PF Planner, for the abatement stabilization control on Portage Glacier Road.

**d. OTHER INFORMATIONAL ITEMS – None**

**e. COMMITTEE COMMENTS**

MR. WILBER commented he missed the TAC+ this morning because Public Transportation had an open house at the Transit Center downtown. It was very well attended and one of the informational items passed out was a quick fact sheet and he brought extra copies for anyone. He also noted they are going to have a spot at the Fair this year.

**7. SCHEDULED AMATS MEETINGS**

Technical Advisory Committee Continued, to be announced  
Policy Committee, August 25, 2011

**8. ADJOURNMENT**

The meeting adjourned at 3:30 p.m. and will be continued some time next week.