

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

**Planning & Development Center  
Main Conference Room, 1<sup>st</sup> Floor  
4700 Elmore Road  
Anchorage, Alaska**

**Tuesday, Dec. 6, 2011  
1:30 p.m.**

Technical Advisory Committee Members Present:

Name	Representing
Jennifer Witt	Alaska Dept. of Transportation & Public Facilities (DOT&PF), Central Region, Planning
Ken Morton	DOT&PF, Central Region
Cindy Heil	Alaska Dept. of Environmental Conservation (ADEC)
Steve Morris	MOA/Dept. of Health & Human Services
Stephen Ribuffo	MOA/Port of Anchorage
Stephanie Mormilo	MOA/Traffic Division
Jerry Weaver	MOA/Community Development Department (CDD)
Lance Wilber	MOA/Public Transportation Department
Lois Epstein	AMATS Air Quality Advisory Committee
Bruce Carr	Alaska Railroad Corporation

Also in attendance:

Name	Representing
Craig Lyon	MOA/CDD
Vivian Underwood	MOA/CDD
Bart Rudolph	DOT&PF

**1. CALL TO ORDER**

CHAIR MORMILO called the meeting to order at 1:32 p.m. All Technical Advisory Committee members were present with MS EPSTEIN arriving at 1:33 p.m., and MR WEAVER arriving at 1:47 p.m. 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

\*\*Continuation of AMATS meeting from Dec. 1<sup>st</sup>, 2011. No agenda to approve, continuing on with business item 5A, completing the review of 2035 MTP comments. Informational reports will be placed on next month's meetings.

### 4. APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES

### 5. BUSINESS ITEMS

a. MR KATSION stated that comments have been numbered in such a way as to create a key for review. The comments that necessitate a change or discussion are #'s 1-87. There are comments where we need to respond but we're recommending no changes to the documents are all numbered 88. The ones that are deemed to be opinions are numbered 99.

The TAC Oversight Committee was seeking guidance from the TAC about creating a new chapter. We prefer not to make that change, unless there is some driving issue from the TAC standpoint. The preference is to keep it integrated within the project/chapter structure that currently exists. The Knik Arm Crossing is a project that is considered to be part of the entire plan for the roadway improvement projects, and a good job has been done in each section when it comes to defining what the project is, how it's being funded, and how the revenue sources are being allocated. A new chapter would require a re-structure and re-write, and that isn't necessary because of how it's already set up. MS EPSTEIN asked what the initial reason was for considering separating the Knik Arm Crossing project into its own chapter. MR KATSION stated that there was some thought about going back to how things were set up in the previous document, but it was decided that it would be better to keep the project within the current chapter setup. CHAIR MORMILO stated that the project was a separate chapter before because it was added to the document.

No further comments or questions.

MS WITT moved to accept the recommendation to keep the document showing the Knik Arm Crossing integrated throughout all chapters. MS HEIL seconded. MR CARR was opposed, and it was suggested that decisions be delayed until the committee looked at all of the comments for chapter six. *The motion was withdrawn.*

Comment 3: Changes were proposed for the wording of the last three paragraphs on page 6-34. Discussion centered around stating "it is expected" vs "it is assumed the state of Alaska will be asked to maintain...." MR CARR ascertained that the committee will know whether or not they will have the availability payment by April or May. If that payment is not obtained, MS

WITT stated that the regulations show that, if a long range transportation plan is adopted and some of the assumptions change, it is not required by law to go back and change it only to reflect it in the next update. If the assumptions on the availability payment don't pan out in the current legislative session, they may pan out in a future session. The choice can be made to update assumptions if they have a substantive impact on the plan.

There were no further comments or questions on the proposed verbiage for comment three.

MS HEIL moved to approve the proposed language for 6-34 as amended. MS WITT seconded. *Hearing no objections, this motion was approved.*

Comment 4: This addressed confusion that may have been caused by including the Knik Arm Crossing in table 7-3 in chapter 7. The recommendation is to put the Knik Arm Crossing in its own table so as not to confuse the fact that the project is being funded by regular AMATS sources. It is still a recommended project and part of the plan, but it has separate funding.

JUDY DOUGHERTY suggested that this be handled with a footnote to the table rather than extracting the Knik Arm Crossing into its own table to allow readers to see how all the projects measure up to each other.

MR KATSION responded by stating that the Knik Arm Crossing was being shown with the rest of the projects in table 7-2, but the focus was on pulling the Knik Arm Crossing from table 7-3 so that the projects within the MTP could be compared with the funding parts of chapter 6. MS DOUGHERTY agreed that this made sense.

There were no further comments or questions.

MS HEIL moved to approve the recommendation to pull the Knik Arm Crossing from table 7-3 and give it its own descriptive paragraph. MS WITT seconded. *Hearing no objections, this motion was approved.*

MR WEAVER joined at 1:47 PM.

Comment 5: In Table 6-13, the funding sources and use of the funding sources were listed. It was noticed that the project reserve fund was on both sides of the equation, which is part of the financing. To be consistent with other projects that listed only the capital, operating, and maintenance costs, it was suggested to pull the \$150 million from both sides of the equation and add a note to the table stating that the operations maintenance is the responsibility of the developer and that \$240 million of operator maintenance and \$203 million of toll collection costs are reflected in the financial model cash flows.

MS EPSTEIN stated that there is an October 28 proforma with slightly different numbers. The recommendation was to use the up-to-date numbers, because the latest version includes the

settlement with the Municipality of Anchorage. These newer numbers could lead to a \$35 million dollar difference, which is significant.

MS WITT responded that a \$35 million plus or minus on a \$700 million plus project was within reason. MS EPSTEIN responded by stating that it would be difficult to explain to the public why AMATS was not using the most up-to-date information, especially because the settlement with the municipality was not included. CHAIR MORMILO questioned whether or not this was an updated proforma, and MS. Witt responded that the FHWA has not reviewed the information from October, although not all of the numbers had been reviewed by them. MR CARR recommended that, as the committee was in the draft stage, it makes sense to use up-to-date information.

MR MORRIS shared that he was having difficulty understanding that \$204 million of O & M and \$203 million are the responsibility of the developer, but that is not reflected in the funding uses. MR MORRIS asked if there were \$400 million dollars of operating costs that were not in fact reflected, or if the comment was related in a confusing fashion. MS. DOUGHERTY stated that these dollar amounts were expenditures for operations and maintenance through the whole term of 2035. MS DOUGHERTY stated that KABATA includes major overlays in their O & M and things that would be considered a new project anywhere else. MR MORRIS didn't understand why a developer would assume costs that weren't going to be reimbursed. MS DOUGHERTY stated that developers receive the availability payment regularly over time. MS EPSTEIN stated that the availability payment and finance charges are not included in this chart, nor is maintenance. MR MORRIS stated that maintenance is required to be included in the rest of the network but isn't included either. MS DOUGHERTY suggested including a note to clarify these things.

MS WITT stated that this confusion would be solved by changing the term "development and construction" listed at the bottom of table 6-13 to "design, build, operate, maintain." MS DOUGHERTY added that, while there has been reference to a port settlement, there is no port settlement in the current proforma. MS DOUGHERTY stated that there are retaining walls in this section. MS EPSTEIN asked if the additional costs for the design changes resulting from the settlement had been developed for the municipality. MS DOUGHERTY stated that KABATA had shifted the roadway and narrowed the right-of-way, possibly resulting in less cost. MS EPSTEIN stated that, according to the Mayor, there is a cost that had not been calculated. MS DOUGHERTY reiterated that there was nothing in the proforma that addresses any monetary cost.

After review and discussion, it was decided that there are no additional costs resulting from the settlement.

MS EPSTEIN stated that KABATA agreed to a 9200 foot bridge instead of a 8200 foot bridge, which would change the cost by about \$15 million or 2% of the overall cost, which is a great deal of money for Anchorage. She would like to see these new numbers reflected in the

document. MS DOUGHERTY stated that the construction funding placed in the construction account will earn more interest than the \$15 million in the first year. Thus, they didn't include the \$15 million in any of the proformas to date. She stated that the information presented is good, planning level information.

MS HEIL moved to accept the proposed changes For table 6-13: removing the project reserve fund of \$150 million from both sides and to change fund uses, development, and construction, operation to "design, build, operate, and maintain" while adding a note to the table. MR CARR seconded. ***Hearing no objections, this motion was approved.***

CHAIR MORMILO asked for proposals for other changes. MS EPSTEIN made a motion to revise the design/build/operate/maintain costs based on the application by KABATA to the Army Corps of Engineers in November of 2011, which agrees to a 9200 foot bridge with an additional cost of \$15 million. MR WILBER seconded for purposes of discussion. He then questioned how this would be shown in the document. MS EPSTEIN stated she would show this in table 6-13. MS DOUGHERTY stated that doing this would make the numbers inconsistent with the proforma agreements for both the TIFIA and TIGER grant applications, and that KABATA would have another proforma out in a few months, so it doesn't seem reasonable to stray from the FHWA approved information.

***Hearing objection a vote voice was taken with an equal number of committee members in favor of/opposed to the motion and it failed.***

MS EPSTEIN submitted a separate motion to revise the text of chapter 6 to include the cost of a 9200 foot bridge based on KABATA's application to the Army Corps of Engineers in November of 2011. The text would describe KABATA's agreement to a longer bridge and the \$15 million dollar cost increase, or roughly 2% of the project cost. MR CARR seconded for purposes of discussion.

MR WILBER stated that the issue is with making sure that the plan reflects the latest information, but it is also necessary to acknowledge that the information will change by the month. The project is garnering much attention, it is necessary to use the most recent information available. As KABATA is putting out new information and costs, he recommended that the document maintain clarity about the flexibility of this project while it is in the planning stage. As staff presents this information to the public, the changing nature of the project must be addressed.

***Hearing objection a vote voice was taken where it was defeated 6:4.***

Comment 6: This comment requests clarification about which proforma was used on page 6-30. Though it specifically states that the proforma being used is from February 2011, the comment suggested that the text in that area change from "a likely scenario" to "one potential scenario." Again, we recognize the fact that this is a changing process and we didn't want to

imply that this was the most likely scenario that would occur. Additionally, the question is whether or not to change the February proforma to the October 2011 proforma.

There were no comments from the public.

MR MORRIS moved that the committee accept the change that the POC recommended and add a sentence explaining that this is an evolving process and indicating that a new but essentially unchanged proforma was created in October, and that new proforma would continue to be generated throughout this process. MS HEIL seconded. ***Hearing no objections, this motion was approved.***

Comment 7: This comment recommends the addition of a pie chart at the end of chapter 7. This chart will show that the amount of dollars in the roadway projects in the Chugiak/Eagle River area is between 15% and 16% while their population from the 2010 census is 12%. This shows that Chugiak/Eagle River is well represented in dollars.

MR WILBER stated that the plan and the TIP does not (and should not) allocate funds based on population, but rather based on need and priority. He isn't opposed to showing the information to share how things are vetted out, but voiced concern that there is an implication that money is being distributed based on population percentage. MR CARR felt there was no need for the pie chart, as it may be misleading to the public and encourage inaccurate comparison of fund distribution by population.

There were no comments from the public.

MR WEAVER moved to approve these changes as presented by the POC. MR WILBER seconded

***Hearing no objections, this motion was approved.***

Comment 8: The recommendation is to add "within the arts" after "voter approved bonds", in the first bullet point on page 6-7.

CHAIR MORMILO stated that the point of the comment is to recognize that CBERRSA does not benefit from the bonds that are voted upon for arts; that money cannot be used out there.

There were no questions or comments from the committee or the public.

MS WITT moved to approve these changes as presented by the POC. MR RIBUFFO seconded. ***Hearing no objections, this motion was approved.***

Comment 9: This comment looks to clarify a policy that has been developed by AMATS about how much federal funding is allotted to non-motorized projects. The recommendation is

to add a statement to page 6-27 in the column following projects that are shown in table 6-12: "Funding for non-motorized projects are based on historic revenue trends, including federal, state, and local sources. Federal funding for non-motorized projects is based on 10% of non-NHS funding, which is the established AMATS policy. Sidewalk, bicycle, and trail improvements included as part of the roadway projects are in addition to the non-motorized projects shown in these tables." There were many questions about why only 10% was allocated. This would also clarify that there are many non-motorized projects that are part of the roadway projects as well.

MR CARR asked whether or not AMATS would change the 10% funding plan if that allocation amount was changed in the Highway Reauthorization Bill. CHAIR MORMILO stated that, unless a new transportation bill makes those types of activities ineligible, changing the amount of funding would remain a policy decision by the NPO and would be looked at in the future.

There were no comments or questions from the committee or public.

MR CARR moved to adopt the POC recommendation for comment 9. MR WEAVER seconded. ***Hearing no objections, this motion was approved.***

CHAIR MORMILO asked if there were any other comments that the committee would like to discuss for chapter 6. MS EPSTEIN wanted to look at comment 189 on page 9. MS EPSTEIN questioned whether or not the MTP addresses public financing charges for any projects as the size of this project can overwhelm other projects to the point that they may not be able to go forward. Given the scale addressed, MS EPSTEIN felt that it would be helpful to provide the public with a sense of this from a disclosure standpoint, as this includes more money than just construction costs. Other projects that are done by the state or municipality do not have as substantial a difference. MS WITT stated that she would be comfortable with suggesting a statement that would make it clear that no finance charges are included in any of the budget costs. MS EPSTEIN felt like this would not provide the public with all the information but did not provide a motion at this time.

MS WITT moved to accept the 88s and 99s for chapter 6 with no additional changes to the document. MS HEIL seconded. MS EPSTEIN opposed because she is still gathering information related to comment 189 to see if Anchorage's MTP is consistent with MTPs around the country.

***Hearing objection a vote voice was taken where it was approved 9:1.***

CHAIR MORMILO stated that the committee agreed to table the discussion on the first comment for chapter 6, which was whether the Knik Arm Crossing should be integrated into the chapter or moved into its own separate chapter.

MR MORRIS moved that the Knik Arm Crossing should be integrated into chapter 6. MS HEIL seconded. MR CARR opposed. He stated that, due to the uncertainty and size associated with the project and the lack of a defined financing plan, the project lends itself to a separate discussion rather than inclusion in chapter 6. MS HEIL asked if it would be easier to update or amend a project if it was spread throughout a document or if it was in one place. MR SPRING stated that there would still be necessary to make changes throughout the plan, even if the project was separated into a chapter form.

CHAIR MORMILO opened the floor to feedback from the public.

VIVIAN UNDERWOOD stated that she recalled that changes to the 2000 plan were not major, and suggested that the committee not let that color their opinions about whether the Knik Arm Crossing should be a separate chapter. She stated that having the project as a separate chapter for ease of review might be more important than the fact that other changes will need to be made in the remainder of the document.

AVES THOMPSON stated that it would be good to have the project in a separate chapter to make it easy to enact major changes, if they are needed.

The motion before the committee was to leave the Knik Arm Crossing integrated rather than listing it out into a separate chapter.

***Hearing objection a vote voice was taken where it was defeated 6:4,*** thus the committee voted in favor of separating the Knik Arm Crossing into its own chapter. It was noted that this change may delay the release of the public hearing draft of the document.

## Chapter 7

There are three different sections in chapter 7, and the first section is general topics. Projects 104, 114, and 201 (Seward Highway to Glenn Highway connection projects) are pulled out as a separate discussion item.

Comment 1: The recommendation is to add a summary table for the roads, transit, and non-motorized projects. All of the presentations given to the public, the planning and zoning boards, and the TAC and policy committee included a summary table that added up all of the projects in short term, long term, and illustrative. The report did not have a summary table showing the total costs, and this would be beneficial for the public to see.

There were no questions or comments from the committee or the public.

MS HEIL moved to approve the POC recommendation for comment 1 in chapter 7. MR RIBUFFO seconded. ***Hearing no objections, this motion was approved.***

Comment 2: This comment suggested adding a pie chart to show the allocation of funds vs population, and was already addressed in previous discussion.

Comment 3: This comment recommended separating the Knik Arm Project out of table 7-3 to show it as a separate cost. We've already addressed this as well.

Comment 4: This looks at project 125, the northern access to the UMED/University district. The recommendation is to modify the cost estimate to \$18.8 to reflect the latest information. This shows up in both tables 7-2 and 7-3.

There were no questions or comments from the committee. CHAIR MORMILO opened comment to the public.

WALT BRICKER stated that he hoped that the northern access would get the maximum priority possible because traffic will back up by the University and continue to get worse. MR BRICKER also recommended getting demographics on the University and hospitals affected by this project, stating that Boniface became a traffic jam almost overnight.

There were no further comments.

MS HEIL moved to approve comment 4 as recommended. MR MORRIS seconded. ***Hearing no objections, this motion was approved.***

Comment 5: This comment recommends removing project 319 from the illustrative study area and moving it into a specific study to define alignment as part of either project 135 or 216. Comment 6 was included in this discussion as it also revolved around changing the status of a project from illustrative to either the 135 or 216 designation.

MR MORTON asked if there would be a cost estimate for a study and whether or not it would need to be reflected as opposed to a cost estimate for a project, or whether this would be a point at all since the project is illustrative.

MR KATSION stated that there is a \$6 million dollar fund for studies in the short term and long term projects, projects 135 and 216. That keeps the funding levels balanced. CHAIR MORMILO ascertained that, at this point, project 319 is an illustrative project and the proposal is to remove that designation and move it into a study to determine what the short or long term alignment would be. MR KATSION confirmed this.

There were no further comments from the committee or the public.

MR WEAVER moved to accept the proposed changes for comments 5 and 6. MS HEIL seconded. ***Hearing no objections, this motion was approved.***

Comment 7: The changes were previously addressed by the committee.

Comment 8: This comment is similar to the previous comment and recommended deleting project 318 (Goldenview Drive Extension) from the illustrative and moving it over into a study area. MS HEIL asked that the language of the comment be amended to match the language used when proposing to move other projects (avoid using the word delete; instead say "change project").

There were no further comments from the committee or the public.

MS HEIL moved that the comment be approved with language amendments. The motion was seconded by MR MORRIS. ***Hearing no objections, this motion was approved with amendments.***

Comment 9: This comment addresses whether or not the Chester Creek Pathway Bridge over Northern Lights would have to be reconstructed. After looking at that and ascertaining that it would not need to be reconstructed, no change is recommended for the project. In the project description for project 111 we recommend adding in "a drive" to the project description in regards to possible intersection improvements.

There were no questions or comments from the committee or public.

MS HEIL made a motion to approve comment 9 as stated. MR WEAVER seconded. ***Hearing no objections, this motion was approved.***

Comment 10: This comment seeks to amend the description of project 118 to add that the purpose is to improve safety as well as capacity.

MR MORRIS made a motion to approve comment 10 as stated. MS HEIL seconded. There were no comments or questions from the committee or the public. ***Hearing no objections, this motion was approved.***

CHAIR MORMILO suggested that the committee begin to look at comments by page rather than by number to move things along.

MR KATSION stated that, while pages 6 and 7 had minor changes and reflected comments 11-15, comment 12 needed to be discussed in depth as it recommended moving a project from long term to short term. MR KATSION stated that this project was on the borderline of being scored as a short term or long term project. When looking at the project funding availability under short term, this project could be shifted to short term without affecting the flow of money overall. Nothing had to be shifted to long term because of this change.

There were no questions or comments from the committee or public.

MS HEIL moved to accept the changes proposed by comments 11-15. MR MORRIS seconded. ***Hearing no objections, this motion was approved.***

MR CARR stated that comments 16-24 could be taken as one because they all dealt with public transportation and the People Mover system and were very reasonable. MR SPRING stated that the project number on comment 16 should be project 805, not 822. The comment addresses moving the South Anchorage Hillside plan from long term to short term.

MR CARR moved to approve the recommendations in comments 16-24. MR WILBER seconded. MR WILBER proposed an edit to the listed headways to South Anchorage. The handout stated headways would occur every 15 minutes, but they should say every 30 minutes. ***Hearing no objections, this motion was approved with a minor amendment.***

Comments 25-27 were examined as a group.

There were no comments or questions from the committee or public regarding these comments.

MR CARR moved to adopt comments 25-27 as proposed. MS HEIL seconded. ***Hearing no objections, this motion was approved.***

MS WITT suggested jumping to comment 31 which discussed proposed changes to the Eagle River Greenbelt Trail. She asked to hear the rationalization for the recommendation as it is not a transportation project. MR SPRING stated that advocates for the Greenbelt trail are attempting to find non-traditional sources of funding. Under the budget constraints, MR SPRING found it possible to include one section of the plan, 1A, as an initial phase. That extends the trail from the Briggs Bridge to the Driftwood Bay subdivision. There was room in the budget for the \$3.75 cost of that phase of the bridge project. The thinking was that it would be best to include this in the plan as a project to allow it to be funded through non-traditional funding sources or state funding. It would be good to add clarification that it's not feasible to assume that this will be funded by federal money and that this could be categorized as a non-federal funded project so that this isn't misperceived as something that can be done traditionally through the AMATS process. MR WILBER asked if there was an assumption that the \$3.75 was coming from a particular source or a source in general. MR SPRING stated that they looked at the total trail budget as a whole and they had looked at taking out a few other projects that involved pedestrian improvements in the area between Tudor and Arctic Boulevard. The project there would be better served as a road improvement project. They looked at taking out part of another big project along the Glenn Highway as well. That seemed to balance the overall budget for the trails while including the Greenbelt project.

MS WITT reminded the committee of language that was added to the public review draft on page 7-19 that reads: "the use of private funds or volunteered labor to develop trails on the illustrative list would not require an amendment to the MTP." She voiced concern over

removing pedestrian related facilities to create funding for a recreational trail. There is no ability to develop this project as a federal aid project, and that is where the majority of the funds for the bicycle and pedestrian improvements come from.

MR MORTON stated that there are complications for delivering this project using the federal aid process. The comment about using non-federal funds could be a reasonable compromise.

CHAIR MORMILO clarified that the recommendation was to break the project into phases and include some phases in the short term while also including a note that identifies the project is not eligible for federal funding. MR WILBER added that he hoped the merit of a project would not be based solely on the funding available to it. He stated the project in question was a good project that should be included with a note.

CHAIR MORMILO opened the floor to comments by the public.

LORA REINBOLD shared that she has been working on the Eagle River Trails project for some time. She is working with State Parks and the Division of Wildlife Conservation and the Historic Iditarod Alliance. In addition, there are other funding sources that are showing interest such as the Military Readiness Program. Other funding in the form of in-kind donations has been secured. MS REINBOLD recommends that the project be moved to a class 3, which is Natural Services and as such is much less expensive.

MR MORRIS moved to accept the POC's recommendations for comment 31 with an amendment to the language stating that no federal funding is assumed. MS HEIL seconded. MR CARR opposed this, stating that the project is not identified as part of the transportation network. MR CARR supports the project but suggested that this was a good candidate for being presented to the legislature to be funded with state general funds, allowing the community to go forward with making the case for completing this project. MS WITT was in agreement with Mr. Carr, stating that the fiscal constraints are built around assuming a generous appropriation from the legislature as well as local and federal funds. When we incorporate recommendations from the pedestrian and bicycle plans as priorities for the community, it is inappropriate to deviate and include recreational trails. A considerable amount of highway funds have already been spent on this project. MS EPSTEIN agreed with Mr. Carr and MS. Witt, stating that this is a project where the legislature might help. MS. HEIL clarified that the proposal is to leave the project as it stands today, in the illustrative section. CHAIR MORMILO further clarified that the project can go further with other funding, and the proposal further recommends breaking the project into four phases, where phase 1A goes to the short term list and phases 1B, 2, and 3 go onto the illustrative list.

***Hearing objection a vote voice was taken where it was defeated 8:2.*** The project will remain in the illustrative section.

Comments 28: MR SPRING stated that the recommendations in comment 28 were no longer applicable since the committee decided not to approve the proposal in comment 31. In

addition, other comments and proposals presuming the adoption of the proposal for comment 31 to balance the budget would be impacted because of the decision to not accept the proposal for comment 31. MS WITT clarified that, if the committee accepted the proposal to move 608 and 612 to the illustrative list, that would free up enough funding to accommodate the other recommendations for Maplewood. MR SPRING confirmed that, after adding the Glenn Highway project back in, the budget would be fairly balanced.

There was no further discussion on comment 28, so CHAIR MORMILO moved to comment 29.

Comment 29: This comment was already addressed by the discussion and action in comment 27.

Comment 30: The recommendation is to add a new project to the illustrative so it doesn't have an effect on the balance. MS EPSTEIN was unclear if the recommendation was responsive to the comment and stated she would add an illustrative all the way to Potter's Marsh if there weren't any cost impacts. MR SPRING stated there was a discrepancy between the comment recommendation and the table for non-motorized. It appears that the phase of the Coastal Trail between Kincaid and Jodphur is in the table on the long term list. The comment should be changed to long term. The reason the whole project wasn't put in there was because the POC recommended that the section be put into the long term. There was also concern about the Environmental Impact Statement because this part of the Coastal Trail goes through public park, and while controversial does not have the same concerns as the part that could impact private homeowners. The correct statement should read: The POC recommends adding a non-motorized project from Kincaid Park to Jodphur to the long term project list, not the illustrative list.

MS EPSTEIN stated that it made sense to include the Coastal Trail from Kincaid to Potter on the illustrative list, or from Jodphur to Potter if that was more appropriate.

MR MORRIS moved to accept the POC recommendation that the portion of the Coastal Trail that runs from Kincaid to Jodphur be put into the long term project list. MS HEIL seconded. MR MORRIS asked if there was a distinction about the transportation use of the trails, saying that he viewed them both as recreational trails. MR. SPRING responded that there might be some parts of the trail that are more utilitarian than others, but overall the Coastal Trail from Kincaid to Potter is more recreational.

CHAIR MORMILO opened the floor to public comments.

ERIKA MCCONNELL stated that a utilitarian trail doesn't just cover transportation from home to work; people use the Coastal Trail to get to friends' houses and some do use the trail to get to work, just as people use the Chester and Campbell Creek trails, even though those trails don't go by major employment centers. In light of this definition of utilitarian, people in the Driftwood Bay subdivision in Eagle River would use the Greenbelt Trail to get into town and go to work, visit friends, go shopping, and so on. The trails are recreational and utilitarian.

CHAIR MORMILO stated that one of the struggles with the Eagle River trail is that federal highway funds cannot be used to construct the project; is that the case for the Coastal Trail project as well? Would that project require a footnote as well? To be consistent, equal treatment of the two trail projects needs to occur. MS HEIL stated that, for the sake of consistency, the Coastal Trail project should be added to the illustrative. MS WITT suggested it would be consistent if the entire Coastal Trail was shown to be illustrative.

After much discussion, attention was returned to the motion at hand: to accept the POC recommendation that the portion of the Coastal Trail that runs from Kincaid to Jodphur be put into the long term project list.

***Hearing objection a vote voice was taken where it was defeated 8:1.***

MS. HEIL moved to approve adding the non-motorized project (from Kincaid Park to Jodphur Road project) to the illustrative list. MS WITT seconded. ***Hearing no objections, this motion was approved.***

MS. EPSTEIN moved to add a non-motorized project (Coastal Trail from Jodphur Road to Potter Marsh) to the illustrative list. MR MORRIS seconded. ***Hearing objection a vote voice was taken where it was approved 7:2.***

[Recess called; MS HEIL and MR CARR left the meeting. A quorum was still established. ]

CHAIR MORMILO asked for consideration/comments on the 88 comments. MS. EPSTEIN asked for discussion about 88-113, a comment suggesting that "impact on neighborhoods be added as a negative score to balance out transportation efficiency with neighborhoods." MR. SPRING stated that positive criteria is addressed rather than negative criteria, and explained that calculating the impact on neighborhoods would take a great deal of effort. Though it would be good to do, MR. SPRING felt it would be too much for staff to take on at present. MS EPSTEIN asked that this comment be looked at in the future. MS EPSTEIN also looked at 88-137, 88-134, and 2562, stating they are similar comments that express a concern that the municipality is not spending enough money on non-motorized projects. MS EPSTEIN stated she is sympathetic to these feelings and worries that there has been a lack of funding in the past that may be precedent for future funding. She also drew attention to comment 2562, which includes recommendations about increasing funding for non-motorized projects. MS WITT pointed out that doing so would necessitate changing assumptions that are based on historical trends and adopted policies, making it hard to add more money unless it was assumed that the municipality would pass laws.

There were no further comments from the committee or the public.

MS WITT moved to accept the recommendation of no changes as reflected in the 88s of chapter 7, with the exception of projects 104, 114, and 201. MR RIBUFFO seconded. ***Hearing no objections, this motion was approved.***

The committee moved on to discuss projects 104, 114, and 201 in chapter 7. These projects make up the Seward Highway to Glenn Highway connection. The recommendation for the three projects was to keep the project in three separate phases as shown. MS BROOKS highlighted comment 5, which recommended the creation of an additional study area (under the short term, non-motorized projects) to address pedestrian safety in Fairview. MR KATSION stated the cost estimate was \$200,000.

MR MORRIS suggested adding text that talks about the problems at the Seward Highway through Midtown (comment 4). MR SPRING stated that this section of road has intersections with the highest delays in Anchorage/the state.

MR MORRIS moved to accept the recommendations of the POC, including discussion of the problems at 36th and the Seward Highway and the pedestrian safety study in Fairview. MS WITT seconded.

MS WITT recommended minor grammatical changes to comment 4. MR RIBUFFO made a friendly amendment suggesting that, if the committee members had no objections to the recommendations raised in the 88s, the committee address these comments in one motion. MS WITT seconded. In summary, the motion was for the committee to accept the POC recommendations with the amendments made by MS Witt. ***Hearing no objections, this motion was approved.***

The committee moved on to chapter 8, where MS BROOKS pointed out that the agenda had tables with potential changes; through the discussion, the information in the tables had been changed. All changes had been based on POC recommendations and amendments to them, necessitating revision of the tables.

MR MORRIS moved that a staffing consultant modify the tables to reflect amendments made as a result of the committee's discussion. It was noted that a continuance would be necessary. MS WITT seconded. ***Hearing no objections, this motion was approved.***

Comment 1: Add a sentence under the first bullet under comprehensive plans to honor the differences.

MS WITT moved to approve the recommendation. MR MORRIS seconded. ***Hearing no objections, this motion was approved.***

MR WILBER stated that the staff and the POC had done a good job with the comments on chapter 8; there were no content changes, rather there was a focus on clarity and agreement. There were no suggestions that necessitated the committee consider any differences to the plan

that hadn't already been approved, with the exception of comment number 4. This comment stated that a regional transit authority is needed as the plan does not specifically recommend an authority. It suggested creation of a regional transit authority.

MR WILBER moved to adopt the POC/Staff recommendations for chapter 8 (on pages 1-9) as they are listed. MS WITT seconded. ***Hearing no objections, this motion was approved.***

MR MORRIS presented a friendly amendment suggesting a change in language delete the second sentence and editing the last sentence to read: "to achieve this level of access controlled by encouraging consolidation...." MR WILBER and MS WITT accepted the friendly amendment. ***Hearing no objections, this motion was approved and chapter 8 was approved as recommended by the POC with committee amendments.***

MR WILBER moved that the committee meet for a continuance at a later date to be determined by the coordinator. MR RIBUFFO seconded. ***Hearing no objections, this motion was approved.***

The meeting was adjourned at 4:49 pm.