

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

**Mayor's Conference Room, 8th Floor
632 West 6th Avenue
Anchorage, Alaska**

September 22, 2011

Meeting Continued from September 15, 2011

8:00 a.m.

Technical Advisory Committee members Present:

Name	Representing
Jennifer Witt	Alaska Dept. of Transportation & Public Facilities (DOT&PF), Central Region, Planning
Kim Rice	DOT&PF, Central Region
Cindy Heil	Alaska Dept. of Environmental Conservation (ADEC)
Steve Morris	MOA/Dept. of Health & Human Services
Stephanie Mormilo	MOA/Traffic Department
Jerry Hansen	MOA/Project Management & Engineering (PM&E)
Lance Wilber	MOA/Public Transportation Department
Lois Epstein	AMATS Air Quality Advisory Committee

Also in attendance

Name	Representing
Craig Lyon	MOA/Community Development/Transportation Planning (CDD)
Jody Karcz	MOA/Public Transportation Department
Lori Schanche	MOA/PM&E
Bart Rudolph	DOT&PF
Aaron Jongenelen	DOT&PF
Ken Morton	DOT&PF
George Mayberry	Alaska Division of Homeland Security & Emergency Management
Anne Brooks	Brooks and Associates
Gary Katsion	Kittelson & Associates

1. CALL TO ORDER

CHAIR MORMILO called the continued meeting to order at 8:04 a.m. Emily Cotter, Jerry Weaver and Bruce Carr were absent. A quorum was established.

2. PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT ANNOUNCEMENT

CHAIR MORMILO encouraged public involvement in this meeting of the AMATS Technical Advisory Committee. She 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. WILBER seconded. *Hearing no objections, the agenda was approved.*

4. APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES - None

5. BUSINESS ITEMS

a. 2035 Metropolitan Transportation Plan – Release of public review draft

GARY KATSION with Kittelson & Associates and the consultant's project manager for the 2035 Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP) provided a presentation on the MTP. He noted staff and consultants have been working to gather information responding to some of the issues that were raised at the work shop. MR. KATSION reviewed the draft MTP chapter by chapter noting changes and items still to be completed. His discussion of each chapter and the status is outlined below in italics, and comments and discussion by the TAC is in standard type.

***Cover.** Changed to reflect the two components of the MTP, Anchorage and Chugiak-Eagle River, and includes identification and date of the draft.*

***Chapter 1.** Minor edits with the air quality. Figure 1-1 still needs to be clearer, and they are looking for the original.*

***Chapter 2.** Make sure that some type of implementation action is in Chapter 8 for the Public Involvement Plan Update. Done.*

***Chapter 3.** Done.*

***Chapter 4.** This chapter is still being reformatted. Original graphics are being compiled to provide clearer graphics. The change ensuring the National Highway System Map shows the connection between the Glenn Highway and Joint Base Elmendorf-Richardson was made. With regard to maps for Eagle River for peak hours, this is something which will probably be worked on over the next month. MR. KATSION indicated they would try to get maps from Municipal*

staff. He anticipates having those figures included by the time they get to the public hearing draft. He hopes to have these figures ready for the open house by the end of October. The intent is to use the information gathered in the Eagle River CBD Study and put it on a map similar to the Anchorage Bowl map. MR. KATSION noted the recommendation then of the plan is to make sure when the Status of the System Report is updated to make sure the Eagle River-Chugiak area is getting similar treatment as the Anchorage Bowl has been getting in those Status of the System Reports. He indicated they worked with MS. KARCZ to ensure those statistics were the most up-to-date, and they have already been changed.

Chapter 5. In the process of updating the figures using clear and precise graphics.

Table 5-7. A question had been raised regarding the 2035 base plus transit trips, which have been updated and were provided at Tuesday's work shop.

The question was whether the BRT model run included the full build-out of the initial phase, or just the initial phase. He indicated the one in Chapter 5 included the entire build-out of the system. Chapter 5 talks about the 2035 conditions, which basically covers the entire wish list or needs list of the 2035 conditions, and so the BRT scenario included the entire BRT network in developing those numbers. Next, when they went through the financial analysis in Chapter 6, it resulted in having to cut projects. In Chapter 7, the 2035 MTP network removed the full blown BRT network and just put in what was being recommended in the Plan. The illustrative project was pulled out. He indicated they will make sure there is a comparable table added in Chapter 7 that will show the transit trips from the Plan recommendation network.

Chapter 6. Revisions were made to some of the text, and they are making sure the tables are in the correct form. There were some minor problems with translating from Excel to Word tables. They should be ready by tomorrow.

As far as the Knik Arm Crossing (KAC), verification is still needed for the description of Phase 1 and Phase 2, and still need to get the 2010 cost estimates for both phases. MR. KATSION indicated they were working with MR. WILBER and the Knik Arm Bridge and Toll Authority (KABATA) on getting those final numbers, and then the tables would be adjusted for those.

MR. WILBER noted he talked with Judy Dougherty from KABATA, and initially her reaction was the text in the Plan is good enough for the draft review. He indicated he sent her a more detailed description of Phase 1 and Phase 2, and is waiting to hear back from her with cost estimates. MR. WILBER noted Phase 1 basically includes the numbers and dollars for the bridge, the approaches, the connection in the Mat-Su, the 3-1/2 miles to Kinsey Road, the A/C Couplet Connection, and the cut and cover through Government Hill, and this is the part he needs from KABATA. Phase 2 is new viaduct, and then widening to 4 lanes. He needs confirmation from KABATA, but noted that is what is described in the existing adopted LRTP. MR. WILBER indicated he wants to make sure there have not been any changes and that the numbers are good.

MS. EPSTEIN explained she looked back at the TIFIA application, and noted she can confirm what MR. WILBER says. She indicated what that means is that the TIFIA application does include four lanes of revenue, and only two lanes of cost for construction, and it is an inconsistency. MR. WILBER will contact MS. DOUGHERTY from KABATA about this issue.

MS. EPSTEIN noted the TIFIA Pro Forma from 2011 shows there will not be a surplus until 2033. She indicated this means there will be quite a bit of traffic, and the need for Phase 2 to start sometime before there is a surplus. She believes this could potentially pose another major \$100 to \$200 million problem and is a big issue. She looks forward to seeing the numbers for Phase 1 and 2, but was not sure how AMATS is going to address the problems with Pro Forma at this point.

MR. WILBER clarified the date of KABATA'S Pro Forma Plan is not August 11, which is the date it was printed, but is actually February 26, 2011 and delivered by KABATA in March 2011 as their Pro Forma Plan for the TIFIA application.

Although she thinks it is important to work with KABATA, MS. EPSTEIN feels if we are not getting the full information, AMATS needs to be doing its own homework on this issue. MR. WILBER noted he is trying to make sure that what we have we are in agreement with and share rather than have several people take a look at it. He noted he also looked at Wilber Smith's maintenance operations and their cost plan as it relates to the maintenance expectations, and he indicated that is where he discovered the four lane expansion, which was in the out-years because that is when they expect the maintenance.

MS. EPSTEIN noted she had the page from the TIFIA application that says that is future construction.

In response to MS. EPSTEIN, MR. WILBER indicated he had not asked nor heard that there was any progress on the TAZ socioeconomic data.

MS. EPSTEIN asked if there is a deadline. MR. WILBER indicated he would leave it up to Mr. Lyon to follow-up with Jon Spring on the financing noting it was not his job although he had asked.

MS. WITT indicated that pending the response that Mr. Spring receives from KABATA that AMATS as a body may need to decide whether or not to actually pay for the data separately. She indicated the initial estimate for the data only is approximately \$3200. She noted the \$13,000 would include several hours of Wilber Smith's time to work with staff to figure out the differences. MS. WITT indicated this expense would have some impact on the work program. She thinks what AMATS could ask for is a report and a recommendation from staff at the next meeting, and to have that information during the public reviews so the TAC as a committee can take a look at it.

MR. KATSION noted that one of the discussion at the meeting on the work session on Tuesday was to put into the report a comparison between the land use assumptions that were used, both the population or the households because actually in the Wilber Smith document there was not a direct table showing the population for 2035, there was households. As such, he noted they did not want to make any assumptions on how that correlated. MR. KATSION stated their report had both households and population. He put together a table that is a side by side comparison of households, employments and the traffic data, but the column for the KAC has not been filled in yet, but he indicated they are getting that data and have people researching it to make sure they have the latest figures so when it is shown they have something they can also hand the source of that data so it is a direct comparison.

In response to Mr. Wilber, MR. KATSION noted he would reference the sources on the table.

MS. EPSTEIN thinks that source will be confusing because what it says on there is that KABATA'S data is from ISER and IRC, and it is actually an IRC document. She does not think ISER would take ownership for that.

MR. KATSION stated they can show them as the only source because actually they used ISER information. He thought it was a fair comparison at least for the public at this point in time to understand there are differences, but the bottom line is that in the traffic numbers there is not a whole lot of difference.

MS. EPSTEIN noted that what that does not show is the difference in the toll assumption. She indicated they might want to include that as well because that would be confusing for it to look identical without putting in the toll assumptions.

In response to Ms. Witt, MS. EPSTEIN confirmed she was talking about a comparison between the two models, one with toll and one with traffic, which is another line that might be added.

MR. WILBER thinks the AMATS number shows without toll.

MS. WITT thinks it was summarized to the TAC in response to Mr. Kenworthy's concerns initially, and there was a good explanation of the differences between the two models, and maybe an abbreviated version of that would be useful because it did state that one was with and one was without. She indicated she would look into that, and if it is okay with this body to add that in.

MR. WILBER indicated it would make sense to explain the numbers.

Chapter 7. MR. KATSION explained the changes in this chapter were primarily on the tables to make sure that some of project descriptions were labeled correctly. This was for the Knik Arm Crossing, Phase 1 and Phase 2, and to make sure the cost estimates were consistent with those

used in Chapter 6. It also includes the modification of the Farm Avenue project description to say partial interchange versus a slip ramp. They went back and looked at the cost estimates, and it did include the over crossing so it is truly a partial interchange. This is consistent with the recommendations that came out of the Eagle River CBD Study and with the cost estimate. They will make sure that clarification is there. The other item was to change the language in regards to the illustrative projects noting there was some proposed language to make sure illustrative projects with identified funding outside of federal sources was found, federal, state and local transportation dollars, could move forward with those other types of funding. This will be clarified in the tables, and it would apply to all types of projects, not just one or two. MR. KATSION noted it was a definitive statement that any project that got moved up from the illustrative, regardless of the funding, that it would take a major amendment to the MTP to get that project moved up, and they just want to make sure that if other funding is found from other sources that the project can get added.

MR. WILBER asked if depending on the project that gets advanced, and AMATS does the conformity, whether the conformity would include the illustrative projects.

MR. WILBER indicated this needs to be thought about before AMATS adopts the plan to make sure that there is not a significant project that gets advanced that was not part of the conformity. MS. HEIL noted it would still require a conformity analysis. MR. WILBER noted it would also require a major amendment.

MS. HEIL noted even if it is a reasonably significant project, and even if it is not, they would find out if it a definite project within the boundaries, it would require a conformity analysis. MS. HEIL noted the particular project in Eagle River is going to be exempt anyway since it involves a trails project.

MS. WITT clarified that where she proposed the language was really specific to the non-motorized transportation program, which is where it is appropriate. She indicated if it was also applied to roads, such as having a developer put in a major facility, that it would impact air quality. She noted it should just be left on the non-motorized section.

Chapter 8. Changes are completed. The changes that were asked for were to put an alpha designation for each of the action items in the table so it would be convenient for staff and others to follow along. MR. KATSION noted he created a kind of checklist of how we implemented the plan, and how we are doing with the implementation of the plan. There was also a change to make sure the Hillside Intersection Study was called out specifically in the action item plan. It is in the recommended studies as part of the short-term AMATS studies project. There is a list of about \$6 million of projects in the short-term for AMATS types of studies, and the Hillside Intersection was included in that already.

MR. KATSION indicated the full document with all the figures and tables should be in good shape by tomorrow and everything is coming together.

There were no comments from the public.

MS. WITT indicated as the AMATS schedule has little time between the public hearing draft being released and the end of the public involvement period, it is her understanding that the intent is to regularly bring forward to the Committee some of the comments being received and to have the Committee make recommendations for changes so the public hearing draft can be worked on in the interim.

MS. BROOKS and MR. KATSION confirmed this is the plan. MS. BROOKS discussed the sample sheet for tracking changes on the previous LRTP, as well as the process of how changes were tracked as the comments came in, and the document went through this Committee, the Planning and Zoning Commission, the Assembly and adoption.

MS. WITT moved for the Committee as a body to recommend release of the Metropolitan Transportation Plan as a public review draft with the changes Mr. Katsion has recognized that AMATS talked about the other day at the work session, as well as the additions of the KABATA information in Chapters 5 and 7 adding the model language as discussed. MS. HEIL seconded.

MR. KATSION clarified that the KABATA information Ms. Witt was referring to in her motion was in Chapter 5, and Chapter 6 was that all of the Knik Arm Crossing project descriptions and dollars were all consistent.

MR. MORRIS indicated there was a good point brought up by Ms. Epstein. He noted that when 2035 was modeled it was assumed the Gambell/Ingra connections there, and it sounds like there is considerable doubt there will be enough money. Basically, the plan says that when toll revenues, if there are enough excess revenues they will build Gambell/Ingra, and he thinks given the fact that there is some uncertainty he thinks it might be of interest to AMATS to see what the level of service is on C Street in 2035 without the Gambell/Ingra connection. He thinks that was a major concern in the first LRTP of the disruption of traffic and affect on downtown, and it sounds like there is enough concern now that it is not going to be in place in 2035, and AMATS should see what the modeling looks like without the connection.

MR. LYON confirmed the plan is for the Policy Committee to meet today to get a briefing, and then to act next Thursday to release the document.

MR. MORRIS is not opposed to forwarding this, but he thinks that is a concern AMATS should get resolved, and certainly before the public hearing draft.

MR. WILBER noted that Mr. Spring did a modeling run on what A and C would like, and it was in the existing adopted Transportation Plan, but did not remember if he saw it in this one. He thinks Mr. Morris's question has been answered, but indicated they can confirm whether it is included in this draft. He noted that the model run looked at what the impact would be on A and

C, particularly Downtown, because the previous mayor had serious concerns about not having an Ingra Loop/Gambell connection with all the traffic. MR. WILBER thinks the model run has been done, and if it is not clear, he thinks by next Thursday they can share it with the Policy Committee. He noted that Ms. Epstein brings up good points about the traffic numbers being on a certain size of facility, and he indicated he will have to go back and look at the Pro Forma at 2033 rather than 2015/2025.

MR. WILBER thinks this will get a lot of comments through the public process, and he hopes it gets a lot of attention and a lot of review. He thinks the team has done a great job noting it is a lot of moving pieces to bring two plans together, do updates and use financial information at two different scales and try to put it under one cover and make it clear. He is going to support the motion to get it recommended to the Policy Committee. He thinks monthly briefings not only on the comments, but to let the Policy Committee know how things are going. In response to Mr. Wilber's recommendation to schedule work sessions with the Planning and Zoning Commission, MR. KATSION noted two work sessions had already been scheduled.

Amendment

MS. EPSTEIN moved to amend the motion that AMATS would allow release of the document contingent on verification of Knik Arm Crossing Phase 1 and Phase 2 cost data and project descriptions. MR. WILBER seconded.

MS. WITT looked to Mr. Wilber and Mr. Katsion with regard to this because everything is contingent on the release next week, and whether they see a problem. MR. WILBER stated he is waiting on Judy Dougherty to review what he gave her yesterday, and indicated she stated she would have something to him today. MR. WILBER indicated he has no doubts on that, noting that although they might not agree, they will get the information, and it was not going to take a week.

The amendment passed unanimously.

Main Motion

Hearing no objections, the motion passed unanimously.

b. Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP)

MR. LYON reported this is the Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP) and is for the AMATS staff for the most part. He noted it also includes some funds for Health and Human Services and Transit, and a small portion for DOT&PF. He explained this is a two year plan with a one year budget that has not yet been finalized. Mr. Lyon stated this plan is similar to the previous 2010-2011 UPWP. He noted one major change from past plans was that in almost every task where

particular tasks are shown it now includes a specific timeframe or schedule for completion of the task. During the recent AMATS certification review, Mr. Lyon explained FHWA were clear that AMATS needs very specific schedules for task completion, and if during the life of the UPWP we are not able to get it something done, as long as AMATS lets them know what the obstacle was or what occurred to cause the schedule slow down, then as long as there is a good reason and it is clear, AMATS would not be penalized.

Mr. Lyon stated there were some new tasks in the Plan, and a couple of them had grown out of the certification review and resulting corrective actions. New tasks included:

- Title 6, Limited English Proficiency Implementation Plan.
- Government Hill Neighborhood Plan
- East Anchorage Plan
- U-MED District Plan Update.

MR. LYON explained AMATS Staff is not managing the neighborhood and district plans, but will provide assistance to the Long-Range Planning staff on transportation work for these plans.

In prior years, MR. LYON noted when AMATS has adopted a UPWP it usually starts in the October timeframe. However, it is before AMATS earlier because this requires DOT&PF approval and goes through Federal Highways as well, and Federal Highways has asked for more lead time than they have had previously. He noted the proposed plan is scheduled for a hearing before the Planning and Zoning Commission in November.

MS. HEIL asked if there was anything in the Plan, especially in the year 2013, that starts to address some of the recommendations in the MTP although it has not been finalized.

MR. LYON confirmed several documents were compared in creating the Plan as follows:

- AMATS certification, which showed all the things AMATS needed to work on or AMATS talked about doing, and things that might have been recommendations this time that you could see would be corrective actions next time if something was not done.
- Recommendations in the draft MTP if there were expected to be done within two years.

In response to Ms. Heil's concerns with regard to cross-referencing those recommendations, MR. LYON discussed a table staff has drafted, but not yet completed that will define all the items in the UPWP that have a time specific date. Any item in the table which is a corrective action will have an asterisk, and it will say this is a corrective action that grew out of that. The table will also include who is responsible for the task, what is to be done, and the anticipated completion date. MR. LYON noted this table will be included as one of the UPWP appendices.

In response to MS. HEIL suggestion, MR. LYON indicated another symbol could be added to the table to show the item is a recommendation from the MTP. MS. HEIL noted one of the

recommendations is the new traffic numbers have to done in two years so that it is done when this is ready in four years, and she thinks there should be an easy way to track all of that. MR. LYON explained this was the idea of that table; to see everything with time specific dates in one place. In response to Ms. Heil, he indicated the start of the LRTP timeline for the next update would be included.

MS. WITT suggested tabling action on this plan until the next meeting because she would like to see the summary, as well as the allocation of funds by task, and how much of the funding is going to be staff driven or consultant driven.

MR. LYON stated it has been clear that the 2012 funding is being built with same funding AMATS had in 2011. He indicated they have been told to expect a one-third cut in 2013, which suggests consulting services would not be done through the PL but possibly through the TIP.

In the past, MR. LYON stated in the past this has always been a two year program and a one year budget. As such, he noted those fund cuts would not be done until late 2012, and staff would bring the budget forward then.

MR. WILBER asked if Ms. Witt's desire to wait until October to release this plan is to see the funding table with allocations for 2012. MS. WITT confirmed it was basically the budget she wanted to see.

Based on the tasks and doing things for the certification, MR. WILBER asked if the allocation of funds by task is going to be much the same, or there will be less effort on the TIP. He wanted to get a sense how similar, or significantly different it might be. MR. LYON thinks 2012 will be very similar. He noted the main differences they had was the vast majority of the AMATS money in 2011 was in the MTP task, and there would not be as much there.

With regard to the timeframe of three weeks until October 13, MR. LYON indicated it should be fine. He noted he drafted a budget about two weeks ago, but since then the Long Range Planning group indicated they might be asking for help on U-MED and East Anchorage, which are new and are not in the draft budget yet.

MR. WILBER noted it would be good to have that allocation laid out and to AMATS a week before the meeting. He did not have issues with the Work Program, but was interested in the level of effort required by staff. MR. LYON indicated he expects to be able to send this out sometime next week.

MS. HEIL asked if a work session was needed.

MS. WITT noted one of things which will be important in building and aligning the budget with the tasks is to keep an eye on 2013 to see if AMATS can afford everything being recommended although the details do not get worked out until there is a firm number for 2013. She also

indicated as the TIP amendment moves forward, which needs to happen soon, AMATS needs to keep this in mind in case there are large efforts such as a travel survey that may need to be supplemented by capital funds. As AMATS looks at the budget, she indicated they should keep an eye on this.

MR. LYON plans on taking the 2012 budget he built to draft a 2013 budget using a one-third cut to see a thumbnail result. He needs to consider items that might be pushed out to 2013, as well as items that begin in 2012 and need to be finished in 2013.

MS. WITT noted the need to identify early on the tasks might be a capital line item.

MR. LYON noted the last time the regional household travel survey was done, which was in 2000 or 2001; Mr. Spring thought it was approximately \$250,000. MR. LYON stated even in 2012 numbers AMATS is not doing that out of the PL; it has to be out of the TIP. He also thinks the survey will be more of a regional survey this time with more work in the Valley with more households, which will cost more. MS. WITT thinks this is a good item to go ahead and add to the TIP when it is amended, and MR. LYON noted it is on the list.

MR. LYON does not think there is a problem with not releasing the UPWP until October. He stated the PZC is scheduled, and the Assembly will be scheduled soon. Although it will be tight, he noted DOT&PF and FHWA will have a copy of the document; it just would not be the approved version.

The TAC did not act on this item, and it was tabled to the next meeting.

In response to Ms. Witt, MR. RUDOLPH stated he had no problem with an October release of the UPWP. He noted FHWA has given a deadline that they want to have the document at the end of November, and if the Policy Committee adopts it in November, it should be okay.

MS. HEIL thinks the TAC should release the plan complete with the budget and the table discussed earlier. MR. LYON stated he does not have a problem waiting to release the plan.

There was no change, and this item remained tabled to the next meeting.

c. **Other Business Items - None**

6. INFORMATIONAL REPORTS - None

7. COMMITTEE COMMENTS

Mr. Morris, Ms. Witt, Chair Mormilo, Ms. Heil and Mr. Hansen will not be available for the October 13th TAC meeting. Mr. Lyon will contact the members to determine if a quorum is available for the meeting.

MS. EPSTEIN announced the STIP has introduced an amendment with the new numbers for the Knik Arm Crossing. She noted she and Mr. Wilber were puzzled by those numbers a few meetings ago. She stated it turned out the numbers were inaccurate, and there is a new public comment period that is open with new numbers. She believes the comment period closes October 16 or 17, but it was issued September 16 or 17. MS. EPSTEIN confirmed the amendment was just for the Knik Arm Crossing, not the entire STIP, with two projects in there.

8. SCHEDULED AMATS MEETINGS

Policy Committee, September 22, 2011

Policy Committee, September 29, 2011

Technical Advisory Committee, October 13, 2011

Policy Committee, October 27, 2011

9. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 8:53 a.m.