

**ANCHORAGE METROPOLITAN AREA TRANSPORTATION SOLUTIONS
POLICY COMMITTEE MEETING**

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

**May 3, 2012
9:00 a.m.**

Policy Committee members Present:

Name	Representing
Robert Campbell	Alaska Dept. of Transportation & Public Facilities, Regional Director (DOT&PF)
Alice Edwards	Alaska Dept. of Environmental Conservation (ADEC), Air Quality
Dan Sullivan	Municipal Mayor
Patrick Flynn	MOA/Municipal Assembly
Chris Birch	MOA/Municipal Assembly

Also in attendance

Name	Representing
Craig Lyon	MOA/Community Development/Transportation Planning (CCD)
Jon Spring	MOA/CDD
Lance Wilber *	MOA/Public Transportation Department
Steve Morris *	MOA /Dept. of Health & Human Services
Bart Rudolph	DOT&PF
Cathy Gleason	Turnagain Community Council
S.J. Klein	Fairview Community Council
Anne Brooks	Brooks & Associates
Gary Katsion	Kittelson & Associates
Jed Smith	PTAB
Michael Foster	Knik Arm Bridge and Toll Authority (KABATA)
Todd Logan	
James Kenworthy	

*AMATS Technical Advisory Committee members

1. CALL TO ORDER

CHAIR CAMPBELL called the meeting to order at 9:00 a.m. All Policy Committee members were present, and a quorum was established

2. PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT ANNOUNCEMENT

MR. LYON encouraged public involvement in this meeting of the AMATS Policy 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

Hearing no objections, the agenda was approved unanimously.

4. APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES – 12/15/2012

ASSEMBLY MEMBER FLYNN moved to approve the minutes of December 15, 2012. MAYOR SULLIVAN seconded. ASSEMBLY MEMBER BIRCH noted he was not in attendance at that meeting and would abstain from voting. *Hearing no objections, the minutes were approved as written with 4 in favor and one abstention.*

5. BUSINESS ITEMS

a. 2035 Metropolitan Transportation Plan Carbon Monoxide & PM₁₀ Air Quality Conformity Analysis Approval

MR. LYON and MR. MORRIS explained that before AMATS can adopt the 2035 Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP), federal regulation requires that it make a determination that the MTP is in conformance with the State Implementation Plan (SIP) for air quality. MR. LYON noted the consultation team met and determined the MTP conformed.

MR. MORRIS stated the Policy Committee was being asked to adopt or approve the conformity with the five findings of fact as follows:

1. As the MPO, AMATS must make an affirmative air quality conformity determination prior to adopting the 2035 MTP because the Anchorage bowl area is currently designated as a maintenance area for carbon monoxide and a portion of Eagle River is designated as a PM₁₀ nonattainment area under the Clean Air Act.
2. The Air Quality Conformity Determination for the 2035 AMATS MTP has been prepared according to state and federal regulations outlined in 40 CFR 93.
3. Projected regional CO emissions in the Anchorage bowl area are within the allotted motor vehicle emissions budget in the SIP.

4. Eagle River is designated as a PM₁₀ nonattainment area but is subject to less stringent PM₁₀ conformity requirements for limited maintenance areas because the EPA has found that the Eagle River PM₁₀ Limited Maintenance Plan, submitted to EPA in 2010 and currently under review, has been found adequate by the EPA for conformity purposes. Analysis shows that the Eagle River area meets conformity requirements for PM₁₀ limited maintenance areas.
5. The conformity determination report for the AMATS 2035 MTP has undergone interagency consultation with local, state and federal agencies and has gone through public review in accordance with the AMATS Public Participation Plan. The report has also been reviewed by the AMATS Air Quality Advisory Committee and comments received have been addressed.

MR. MORRIS clarified each finding of fact. He explained the first finding makes the point that because Anchorage is currently designated as a maintenance area for carbon monoxide and non-attainment for PM₁₀, AMATS is required to go through this conformity process. He noted this conformity process is essentially a way to ensure in AMATS' case that:

- AMATS does not backslide and start violating air quality standards;
- Air quality control measures in the SIP have been implemented, as required.
- The MTP does not interfere with the continued attainment of air quality standards.

MR. MORRIS discussed the second finding, which is the conformity determination was prepared in conformance with the federal regulations outlined in 40 CFR 93. He noted one of the tests to meet conformity for carbon monoxide is the SIP establishes an emission budget that Anchorage cannot exceed, and it is a rough guideline of how much carbon monoxide can be emitted in the Anchorage Bowl and still attain the standard. He explained that modeling demonstrated that the MTP is under the budget.

With regard to the fourth finding, MR. MORRIS noted Eagle River is technically still considered a PM₁₀ nonattainment area even though it has not violated air quality standards since the late 80's. He noted that a Limited Maintenance Plan has been submitted to EPA for approval through DEC. He explained EPA established a simplified process for communities with PM₁₀ levels well below the standard called Limited Maintenance Plan procedure. He indicated EPA has had this plan for approximately two years. However, he noted EPA has a process whereby they can find the Limited Maintenance Plan adequate for conformity purposes. He stated EPA has done that and just published the Federal Register notice, which becomes effective May 14, 2012. Under the limited maintenance plan process, he noted all AMATS needs to do is show that PM₁₀ levels are still well below the standard and show that the controls for maintaining the PM₁₀ standard are still in place. He indicated those controls entailed paving and surfacing the roads in and around that urban part of Eagle River and those roads are still paved or surfaced to control dust.

Referring to the fifth finding, MR. MORRIS stated there was an interagency consultation process, and that AMATS staff held a number of teleconferences with EPA, DOT&PF, FTA, FHWA, and DEC. He noted that the agencies have reviewed the report and are comfortable with it. He also noted they have made minor changes made in response to some of the comments from FHWA. He noted the Air Quality Advisory Committee reviewed this report in detail and made suggestions to the report, which staff concurred with, and minor modifications made to the public review draft. He explained the most significant change was to include transit projects in the list of projects that were considered as part of the conformity analysis. MR. MORRIS stated the Air Quality Advisory Committee recommended the adoption of the plan with their suggested amendments. He also noted the TAC reviewed this report and recommended adoption of the conformity determination by the Policy Committee with the Air Quality Committee's recommended changes.

CHAIR CAMPBELL noted he talked previously with Mr. Morris about Anchorage being a maintenance area for carbon monoxide. He asked Mr. Morris what the process is for getting out of that carbon monoxide label. MR. MORRIS explained it is a long process that takes 20 years, and Anchorage is only at year 8. He indicated what they would like to do is prepare a limited maintenance plan for carbon monoxide which would allow for a much simpler conformity analysis procedure much like the limited maintenance plan process used to address PM₁₀ conformity in Eagle River in this MTP.

In response to Chair Campbell, MR. MORRIS indicated that staff has just begun looking into what the preparation of a limited maintenance plan for carbon monoxide might entail. He does not know whether they will need additional funding or resources but if they do they will advise the Policy Committee. CHAIR CAMPBELL commented they would all be interested in simplifying anything they can to do with this air quality conformity and thinks the Committee will support it if a plan is brought forward.

MAYOR SULLIVAN moved to accept the 2035 Metropolitan Transportation Plan Carbon Monoxide & PM₁₀ Air Quality Conformity Analysis determination. ASSEMBLY MEMBER BIRCH seconded. *The motion passed unanimously.*

b. 2035 Metropolitan Transportation Plan Approval

CHAIR CAMPBELL asked for any substantive new issues from Committee members to be considered besides what has been forwarded by the TAC as he would like to have all of issues on the table before the Committee begins.

ASSEMBLY MEMBER FLYNN indicated Ms. Gleason, a member of the public, would be speaking about Project 119, which might require some consideration as to West Northern Lights Improvements.

ASSEMBLY MEMBER FLYNN also noted he had some neighborhood concerns raised about Projects 209, and he may want to discuss that project.

CHAIR CAMPBELL stated he would like to take forward the recommendations from the Municipality and the TAC, and then address the issues from Ms. Gleason and Mr. Flynn. He proposed working from the Municipal Assembly Amendments Matrix using the TAC recommendation column as a baseline, and the Committee concurred.

CHAIR CAMPBELL advised the public that the Committee will be working from the document labeled "Public Hearing Draft 2035 MTP" at the top and includes columns for the Assembly amendments, TAC recommendations and a comment column

In terms of process, ASSEMBLY MEMBER FLYNN recommended allowing the public the opportunity to speak on each amendment.

In response to the secretary, the Committee confirmed their intent is to put a motion on the floor for approval of 2035 MTP. The Committee will then work on each proposed amendment listed in the matrix.

CHAIR CAMPBELL explained before the Committee is a proposed action to adopt this 2035 Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP).

MAYOR SULLIVAN moved to approve the 2035 Metropolitan Transportation Plan.
ASSEMBLY MEMBER BIRCH seconded.

From this point forward, the Committee worked on each proposed amendment to the MTP with the intent of final adoption of the main motion as amended at the end of the review.

For the purposes of these minutes, each proposed Assembly amendment with the TAC recommendation is boxed and noted in italics with proposed additions underlined and deletions in brackets.

Amendment No. 1, Table 4-2 on Page 4-5

Assembly Amendment - Add (rural and urban) under Collector.

TAC recommended Approval.

MAYOR SULLIVAN moved the amendment to add (rural and urban) under Collector.
ASSEMBLY MEMBER FLYNN seconded.

There was no discussion by the Committee, and there were no comments from the public.

Hearing no objections, the amendment passed unanimously.

Amendment No. 2, Page 6-32

Assembly amendment: *Add new paragraph under Conclusions as follows: “In the Anchorage Assembly’s ordinance (AO No. 2012-30S) adopting this Plan, the body specifically expressed the intent to protect against the degradation of other Anchorage road construction and maintenance programs contained in the Plan, by maintaining consistent priorities and preserving local road funding from diversion to the Knik Arm Crossing project. Towards that end, the Anchorage Assembly required that the Plan include the following long-standing policy: “No funding currently planned for implementation of the existing Long-Range Transportation Plan shall be used to support construction of any element of the Knik Arm Crossing, beyond that which is currently authorized. In addition, no local funds will be used for construction or maintenance of this project.”*

TAC Recommendation: *TAC recommended approval with the following revisions: “No funding currently planned for AMATS project implementation of the existing Metropolitan Transportation Plan (Tables 6-5 & 6-6) shall be used to support construction of any element of the Knik Arm Crossing, [beyond that which is currently authorized]. In addition, no local funds will be used for construction or maintenance of this project.”*

CHAIR CAMPBELL explained the Committee has before it an Assembly Ordinance and summary on Page 6-32, which is the closing section of the Knik Arm Bridge and Toll Authority (KABATA) Chapter. He noted the TAC recommended approval of the Assembly’s amendment with changes consisting of adding “for AMATS project” in the funding sentence, and referencing two tables as well.

CHAIR CAMPBELL asked for comments on the overall Assembly recommendation. MAYOR SULLIVAN commented that on the surface it seems fairly innocuous; there is no funding currently in the Plan and it has its own separate funding, but he is not sure as body the Committee would want to say never to any possible funding allocation tying the hands of future committees. He expressed concern about using absolutes in the language. He noted people never thought the Municipality would own a gas field, but the purchase of that gas field has been a huge boon to our Municipal Light and Power. For example, he suggested the Municipality might want to buy this bridge some day as a revenue source, and in general concept he feels somewhat constrained by saying the Committee should never designate any other funds for this project because things can change.

ASSEMBLY MEMBER BIRCH indicated he was a “no” vote on this ordinance coming out of the Assembly, and one of the concerns the Mayor voiced was about the level of constraint it offered down the road. He thinks the projects still have to come back through this body and this

process. He thinks some of those concerns are mitigated somewhat in reviewing the TAC recommendations and subsequent discussion.

ASSEMBLY MEMBER FLYNN indicated what the Assembly approved with nine votes was consistent with the standards set by the Assembly 5 years ago. He noted the MTP will be updated in 4 or 5 years, and he does not think it causes any harm to say the funds designated in the TIP for AMATS projects is problematic. He noted the AMATS Policy Committee lacks the power to prevent the federal and state government from putting dollars towards the bridge. He thinks this amendment is an appropriate addition and indicated he researched and brought a definition in response to a comment from the TAC about clarifying what local funds are and enumerated them for the body as follows: AMATS TIP money received through our allocation; the project list, which subsequently becomes part of the STIP; ARDSA bond monies; and operating and maintenance funds, which are funded through the Street Maintenance Department. He thinks enumerating those would give clarity to the TAC, it is appropriate to add those, and it would make people more comfortable.

MAYOR SULLIVAN called point of order noting this amendment was not yet on the floor.

ASSEMBLY MEMBER FLYNN moved for adoption of Amendment No. 2. MS. EDWARDS seconded.

ASSEMBLY MEMBER FLYNN noted the Assembly's approval of the MTP and incorporated it into the Comprehensive Plan is predicated on some sort of adoption of this language into the MTP.

MS. EDWARDS indicated there might be an issue with the table references, and if the Committee were to move forward with the language they might want to consider whether or not to include those tables. She was not sure this was critical to the language.

CHAIR CAMPBELL would like to strike the reference to the Tables as recommended by the TAC. He think the tables referenced include a lot of funding sources that are not germane to this body, and it would further confuse some of the Mayor's concerns about trying to dictate policy to bodies and people at times that are not germane to this committee.

MAYOR SULLIVAN moved to delete Tables 6-5 and 6-6 from Amendment No. 2.
ASSEMBLY MEMBER BIRCH seconded.

CHAIR CAMPBELL stated there are two motions before the Committee, one to adopt the amendment and one striking the reference to Tables 6-5 and 6-6 from the amendment.

MR. SPRING explained in writing the TAC recommendation he neglected to add a change the TAC made regarding the last sentence in the first paragraph. He quoted that "towards that end the Anchorage Assembly required that the Plan include the following long standing policy..."

noting that during their deliberations, the TAC recommended deleting that sentence. However, due to a clerical error Mr. Spring had not correctly transposed this TAC recommendation into the matrix where it should be shown as a deletion.

CHAIR CAMPBELL believes the recommendations from the TAC are to add two phrases and to delete one phrase, and should include a fourth recommendation as described by Mr. Spring to bracket for deletion the sentence that begins “Towards that end ...” and include it under the TAC recommendation column.

MR. LYON confirmed the intent of the TAC was to delete the sentence that begins “Towards that end...”

The Committee agreed to accept for discussion as part of the TAC recommendation the fourth change to delete the sentence “Towards that end, the Anchorage Assembly required that the Plan include the following long-standing policy.”

CHAIR CAMPBELL asked the Committee for any comments or concerns with regard to the phrase “beyond that which is currently authorized” as recommended by the TAC.

ASSEMBLY MEMBER BIRCH asked for clarification on the TAC recommendation. MR. CAMPBELL explained the rest of the Assembly text in the left hand column is the baseline with the modifications as proposed by the TAC.

ASSEMBLY MEMBER BIRCH indicated there are 3 deletion items, which include the question of deleting “towards that end...,” deleting the tables, and deleting “beyond that which...”

CHAIR CAMPBELL stated the Assembly amendment is before the Committee, which has been moved and seconded for consideration. The Committee has a secondary motion to delete the tables from that amendment. He suggested continuing the discussion on the tables and vote to settle that issue. There was no further discussion by the Committee on this issue.

There was no public comment with regard to striking the tables from the TAC recommendation.

Secondary motion to strike the reference to the tables

This motion passed 4 to 1 with ASSEMBLY MEMBER FLYNN opposed.

MAYOR SULLIVAN moved to approve inserting “AMATS project” into Amendment No. 2. ASSEMBLY MEMBER FLYNN seconded.

ASSEMBLY MEMBER FLYNN thinks this is an appropriate interpretation of what used to be the reference to the LRTP in the previous LRTP. He thinks it is a good interpretation and

appreciates the TAC's work on it. There was no further discussion by the Committee on this issue.

There were no public comments.

Secondary motion to insert "AMATS project"

Hearing no objections, the motion passed unanimously.

MAYOR SULLIVAN moved to delete "beyond that which is currently authorized" from Amendment No. 2. ASSEMBLY MEMBER BIRCH seconded.

MAYOR SULLIVAN thinks the TAC had this right. There was no further discussion from the Committee.

There were no public comments.

Secondary motion to delete "beyond that which is currently authorized."

The motion passed 4 to 1 with Assembly Member Flynn opposed.

MAYOR SULLIVAN moved to approve striking the sentence "Towards that end, the Anchorage Assembly required that the Plan include the following long-standing policy:" from the TAC recommendation on Amendment No. 2. ASSEMBLY MEMBER BIRCH seconded.

MAYOR SULLIVAN'S understanding is the bracketed phrase would go into the second column before the "no funding."

CHAIR CHAMBPELL confirmed it would have been in the second column.

ASSEMBLY MEMBER FLYNN asked Mr. Rudolph to walk the Committee through how the TAC arrived at this recommendation.

MR. RUDOLPH'S understanding was because the TAC changed the wording of the exact ordinance Assembly Member Flynn wrote, they did not want it to say it was exactly what the Assembly had adopted due to those slight changes.

ASSEMBLY MEMBER FLYNN thinks it would be clearer if the phrase "long-standing" was only deleted because the Committee is changing the policy somewhat in that the previous policy referenced the LRTP and the existing LRTP, and now AMATS is looking forward at the new MTP. He noted it is a policy call.

CHAIR CAMPBELL indicated if the Committee wanted to wordsmith this, then he takes exception to the word “required” because he does not think the Assembly can technically require this body to do anything. MAYOR SULLIVAN suggested “advised” but not “required.” This was briefly discussed, but no action was taken by the Committee.

CHAIR CAMPBELL asked for public comment on the proposal to strike the sentence beginning “towards that end...”

TODD LOGAN noted he attended the TAC meeting where most of this wording was worked on. He noted if the Committee strikes that sentence it cues up the subsequent paragraph. He expressed confusion about fully striking the sentence because if that sentence vanishes there would be a paragraph standing there with no explanation.

ASSEMBLY MEMBER FLYNN moved to amend the proposed change to Amendment No. 2 and rather than striking the sentence in its entirety to replace it with the following sentence: “Towards that end the Assembly predicated incorporation of the MTP into the Comprehensive Plan on inclusion of the following policy:” MS. EDWARDS seconded.

ASSEMBLY MEMBER FLYNN noted Section 4 of the ordinance gets to the heart of what he was trying to explain, which is the effective date of the effective action of the incorporation into the Comprehensive Plan is in fact only upon this Committee doing something to protect the integrity of local projects and local project funding. He indicated that is what they did.

At MAYOR SULLIVAN’S request, ASSEMBLY MEMBER FLYNN repeated his proposed language, which would read “Towards that end the Assembly predicated incorporation of the MTP into the Comprehensive Plan on inclusion of the following policy:”

CHAIR CAMPBELL felt this was beginning to read like a news report in that it is just documenting what somebody else did. He thought that was fine, but he was not sure it was relevant to this document per se, and he thinks it might add, and already has added a level of confusion. He is not sure it is going to be helpful.

ASSEMBLY MEMBER BIRCH noted it is the circular nature of the issue and thinks it is kind of a tangle.

CHAIR CAMPBELL noted this is AMATS’ language, and he wants to be sure the Committee gets the language right.

MAYOR SULLIVAN thinks the TAC actually simplified it, which in adopting it like this is exactly what you want for clarity. As to the public comment, he does not think the paragraph needs a preface. He thinks it stands alone if the recommendation in the conclusion section is simply as it reads that “no funding currently planned shall be used to support ...” and does not think that is unclear.

MS. EDWARDS indicated the comments stated most of what she was thinking with regard to this issue.

There were no further comments from the public.

CHAIR CAMPBELL stated before the Commission is Assembly Member Flynn's secondary motion to adopt his language, as well a motion to strike the entire sentence. There were no additional comments from the Committee.

Secondary motion to substitute Assembly Member Flynn's language.
The motion failed 1 to 4 with Assembly Member Flynn voting in favor.

Secondary motion to strike the sentence "Towards that end..." from the TAC Recommendation.

MAYOR SULLIVAN urged approval of this change.

The motion passed 4 to 1 with Assembly Member Flynn opposed.

MAYOR SULLIVAN moved to amend the proposed change to Amendment No. 2 by deleting the last sentence, which reads "in addition no local funds will be used for construction or maintenance of this project." ASSEMBLY MEMBER BIRCH seconded.

Speaking to his motion, MAYOR SULLIVAN stated he does not think it is the AMATS Policy Committee's job to tell the Municipality how to spend other local funds. He noted there are any number of sources of funds as mentioned during discussion of the tables that are not under the purview of AMATS. He indicated he would not like to see AMATS make a recommendation beyond its scope.

ASSEMBLY MEMBER BIRCH thinks the proposed change is reasonable.

ASSEMBLY MEMBER FLYNN thinks it would be contrary to Assembly's conditions for incorporation of the Comprehensive Plan. He thought if someone were to challenge approval of the MTP and its incorporation into the Comprehensive Plan that removing that sentence would give them cause.

MAYOR SULLIVAN understands the Assembly passed the ordinance indicating this language, but he noted once it comes to AMATS, the Committee has to look at what its scope of responsibility is, and he does not think it includes telling the local government body how to spend any and all dollars they might receive. He indicated the Municipality could get a private grant from an individual saying they want the money to be used for this project; then, he does not

think it is within AMATS' purview to say that the Municipality cannot spend it on any particular project.

CHAIR CAMPBELL agreed conceptually and thinks this type of language is not constructive in what the Committee is trying to accomplish. He believes what the Committee is trying to accomplish is to identify things within their jurisdiction, primarily the AMATS funds, which were identified earlier in this motion as being the primary target for this language. He concurs with Mayor Sullivan's assessment.

JAMIE KENWORTHY commented the mayor is free to veto what the Assembly did, but since the MTP is fiscally constrained, and there has been a thorough job documenting what revenues are necessary to do what construction projects, he thinks it is the Committee's responsibility to look at all the projects they want to do and what revenue they have, and if the Assembly looks at that plan and was concerned about the toll shortfall on the bridge and decided there was not enough revenue to do all the other projects, if the plan was going to responsible for any toll shortfalls then he thinks this basically brings up the issue of fiscal constraint. He thinks the plan to date has done a good job balancing those issues and taking out "no local funds" is inviting FHWA back into our business.

There were no further public comments.

Secondary motion to delete the last sentence regarding local funds

The motion passed 4 to 1 with Assembly Member Flynn opposed.

Main Motion to adopt the TAC recommendation on Amendment No. 2 with modifications

The motion passed 3 to 2 with Mayor Sullivan and Assembly Member Flynn opposed.

Amendment No. 3, Table 7-1 on page 7-5

Assembly Amendment: Assembly requested that the AMATS TAC review and potentially amend the initial scoring criteria contained in Table 7-1

TAC Recommendation: TAC recommended clarification of last criteria (Cost/Benefit). Recommend changing the criteria to $\text{Cost}/(\text{length} \times \text{AADT})$. Also, the first quartile (5 points) is the lowest score since the project with the lowest cost per benefit (number of trips times length) would be the most cost effective.

CHAIR CAMPBELL noted this change clarifies the cost/benefit with a change to the formula as recommended by the TAC to read " $\text{Cost}/(\text{length} \times \text{AADT})$ ".

MR. SPRING noted the change in formula would not change the result. He indicated it was unclear to the Assembly what this formula does, which is trying to estimate what the cost/benefit is.

MAYOR SULLIVAN moved to approve the TAC Recommendation on Amendment No. 3. ASSEMBLY MEMBER FLYNN seconded.

There were no public comments on this proposed change.

The motion passed unanimously.

Amendment No. 4, Table 7-3 on page 714

Assembly Amendment: Revise description of Project 112 (Spenard Road Rehabilitation – Hillcrest Dr. to Benson as follows: “[Rehabilitate from 4 to 2 lanes with center turn lane] Rehabilitate to improve traffic flow.

TAC recommended approval.

CHAIR CAMPBELL explained this change deletes the reference to “rehabilitate from 4 to 2 lanes with center lane” and inserting “rehabilitate to improve traffic flow.”

MAYOR SULLIVAN moved to approve Amendment No. 4. ASSEMBLY MEMBER FLYNN seconded.

MAYOR SULLIVAN noted this is his old Assembly district, and he is very familiar with this project. He indicated there is not consensus between the stakeholders in this particular area about what the road design should be, but everybody does agree and there is consensus that the road does need to be rehabilitated and traffic flow improved. He also noted because in the section from Hillcrest to Benson there are concepts now that include both four lane and three lane, being prescriptive and saying rehabilitate from four to two would be overstating what might end up happening at this stage. He thinks the TAC recommendation is good.

There were no comments from the public.

The motion passed unanimously.

Amendment No. 5, Table 7-3 on page 716

Assembly Amendment: *Revise description of Project 121 (Spenard Road Rehabilitation (Benson to Minnesota) as follows: [Rehabilitate from 4 to 2 lanes with center turn lane] Rehabilitate to improve traffic flow from Benson Blvd to Minnesota Dr. , including the feasibility and impact analysis on local properties of the proposed Spenard Rd./36th Ave. couplet.*

TAC recommended approval.

CHAIR CAMPBELL noted this change is similar to the previous recommendation, but is for a different section of road and also adds a secondary comment which is “including the feasibility and impact analysis on local properties...”

MAYOR SULLIVAN moved to approve Amendment No. 5. ASSEMBLY MEMBER FLYNN seconded.

MAYOR SULLIVAN thinks the amendment makes sense noting there is a proposal now at 36th Avenue and Spenard for a couplet, and it would be quite a change in that area including taking quite a bit of property in order to construct it. He indicated they wanted to make sure they knew what that impact would be.

CHAIR CAMPBELL believes this is an inherent step in any project, and he dislikes identifying a specific project for a singular action that should be undertaken on every project. He thinks it is the old “special example” where almost all project development that involves significance would have impact on the proper analysis done. He was unsure how he would vote on this issue.

JUDD SMITH indicated he should have spoken up on the last change as well. He indicated he understands the reason for not constraining it from the four lane to the two lane project, but as a resident of the area and as a pedestrian, bicyclist and motorist just the impression that improving traffic flow gives him a little angst for some of the bicyclists and pedestrians that he does see. As a member of the public, he wanted to let the Committee know what the impression “improve traffic flow” leaves, and asked if they could just include their thoughts of pedestrians and bicyclists.

Speaking more generally to this amendment, ASSEMBLY MEMBER FLYNN noted Mr. Birch was not physically present at the Assembly meeting where this was considered, and he took it upon himself to try and shepherd this document through the Assembly process. In many cases, and in this case specifically he stated he spoke against getting too specific about a project in the process that would go forward, and that is why most of these amendments are relatively general. With regard to the addition regarding the “feasibility and impact analysis on local properties,” he

indicated the reason it was included was because Cook Inlet Housing owns a property on the northwest corner of the intersection and apparently recently purchased the old PJ's facility across the street on the southwest corner. He indicated Cook Inlet Housing is investing a lot of funds and is basically building a campus, and the couplet concept challenged Cook Inlet's ability to move forward, and so this amendment was brought forth by Mr. Hall and Ms. Drummond who represent the area now. Because the couplet concept would substantially change the character of the area, ASSEMBLY MEMBER FLYNN stated he was comfortable letting this change come forward to the TAC and then the Policy Committee. He noted in general he tries to keep the higher level specificity out of these amendments.

CHAIR CAMPBELL indicated he would probably vote against this motion. He stated he did not have a problem with most of the change in general, but thinks, as Mr. Flynn illuminated, this gets into a very specific individual process step that he does not think is appropriate for this planning document.

The motion passed 4 to 1 with Chair Campbell opposed.

Amendment No. 6, Table 7-3 on page 719

*Assembly Amendment: Add new project (140) to short term list as follows: **Project Name:** Hiland Rd. Improvements – MP 2.2 to MP 3.4 (Eagle River) **Project Location:** MP 2.2 to MP 3.4 **2010 Cost Estimate:** \$6.8 **Project Purpose:** Rehabilitate 1.2 miles of existing two lane Hiland Road to current standards. Improvements may include widening roadway, adding shoulders, improving visibility, reducing grades, and possibly trails, where practical and feasible. Recommend paved shoulder bikeway. Purpose: Safety. Facility class: Collector. Length of project: 1.2 miles. Length on new sidewalk: None. Length of new pathway: None. Linked projects: None*

TAC recommended approval.

MAYOR SULLIVAN moved to approve Amendment No. 6. ASSEMBLY MEMBER BIRCH seconded.

MR. SPRING stated this recommendation is a multi-part issue. He noted there is a movement by the Assembly to move Hiland Road Project, which was formerly in the illustrative list and unfunded, into two parts; one short-term and one long-term project. The short-term project is Recommendation 6, which is Hiland Road, Mile 2.2 to 3.4, and Recommendation 7 puts the rest of the Hiland Road Project into the long-term. He further noted Recommendation 8 takes Project 308, South Birchwood Loop and moves it from the long-term to the illustrative thereby balancing the financial constraint of the Plan.

CHAIR CAMPBELL clarified there was one project in the illustrative program that is being divided into two parts with one part in short-term and one part in long-term, and as a continuation Recommendation 8, South Birchwood Loop, is being switched out to maintain financial constraints intact. MR. SPRING confirmed this interpretation.

ASSEMBLY MEMBER FLYNN noted because of the fiscal constraint issue, he would be more comfortable voting on amendments for Recommendations 6-8 as a block. He thinks what the recommendations as a group do is take a long-term project and put it in the illustrative, and take an illustrative project and split it into the short and the long-term. He noted he had no objection to the motion before the Committee.

There were no comments from the public.

This motion passed unanimously.

Amendment No. 7, Table 7-3 on page 721

*Assembly Amendment: Replace existing project 208 (South Birchwood Loop Rd) with new project 208 in the long term list as follows: **Project Name:** Hiland Rd. Improvements – MP 1.0 to MP 2.2 and MP 3.4 to 8.3 (Eagle River) **Project Location:** MP 1.0 to MP 2.2 and MP 3.4 to 8.3 **2010 Cost Estimate:** \$24.9 **Project Purpose:** Rehabilitate 6.1 miles of existing two lane Hiland Road to current standards. Improvements may include widening roadway, adding shoulders, improving visibility, reducing grades, and possibly trails, where practical and feasible. Recommend paved shoulder bikeway. Purpose: Safety. Facility class: Collector. Length of project: 6.1 miles. Length on new sidewalk: None. Length of new pathway: None. Linked projects: None*

TAC recommended approval.

ASSEMBLY MEMBER FLYNN moved to approve Amendment No. 7. MAYOR SULLIVAN seconded.

There was no discussion by the Committee, and there were no comments from the public.

This motion passed unanimously.

Amendment No. 8, Table 7-5 on page 736

Assembly Amendment: *Delete Project 308 (Hiland Rd. Improvement Project) and replace it with the South Birchwood Loop Improvement Project on page 7-21 (formerly project 208).*

TAC recommended approval.

ASSEMBLY MEMBER FLYNN moved to approve Amendment No. 8. MAYOR SULLIVAN seconded.

There was no discussion by the Committee, and there were no comments from the public.

This motion passed unanimously.

Amendment No. 9, Table 7-5 on page 738

Assembly Amendment: *Add sentence under the 2010 Cost Estimate column for Project 321 Knik Arm Ferry as follows: “ Assumes Matanuska-Susitna Borough funding”*

TAC recommended approval.

ASSEMBLY MEMBER FLYNN moved to approve Amendment No. 9. MAYOR SULLIVAN seconded.

Although there was not actually an amendment passed on this issue, ASSEMBLY MEMBER FLYNN noted some members of the Assembly did not seem to understand this piece and were concerned there was not any funding proposed in the MTP. As such, he thinks this change clarifies the funding stream source.

MAYOR SULLIVAN indicated they have been working with the Mat-Su Borough for a number of years on this, and he thinks it is a little bit misunderstood that it is the Mat-Su's obligation to build the ferry landing on Anchorage's side and would have to come from their funds. He indicated a lot of folks wonder why Anchorage has not built a ferry landing yet. He noted Anchorage does not plan to build the ferry landing, but they have been working cooperatively with the Mat-Su to find a spot for it.

There were no comments from the public.

This motion passed unanimously.

Amendment No. 10, Table 7-7 on page 744

Assembly Amendment: Add new transit project 825 to the long-term list as follows: **Project No.:** 825 **Project Name:** Chugiak-Eagle River local service **Cost Estimate:** \$0 **Project Purpose and Description:** Restore local bus service for Chugiak-Eagle River to 30 minute headways. No additional buses will be needed.

TAC recommended approval.

ASSEMBLY MEMBER FLYNN moved to approve Amendment No. 10. ASSEMBLY MEMBER BIRCH seconded.

ASSEMBLY MEMBER FLYNN explained that several years ago in an austerity measure the Municipality eliminated local service within the Chugiak-Eagle River area for People Mover. He noted the long-term plan for People Mover is to have it reinstated, but it would be funded by Anchorage operating general fund dollars as opposed to MTP dollars. However, he stated they wanted the project included in the MTP so it was part of the long-range Transit plan.

There were no comments from the public.

This motion passed unanimously.

Amendment No. 11, Table 8-1 on page 8-2

Assembly Amendment: Add new action item CP-E as follows: “Update and refine the initial screening criteria used to rank the short-term and long-term projects in the MTP to take into consideration differences in subarea needs and priorities.”

TAC recommended approval.

ASSEMBLY MEMBER FLYNN moved to approve Amendment No. 11. ASSEMBLY MEMBER BIRCH seconded.

ASSEMBLY MEMBER FLYNN noted this amendment and the next 3 amendments were brought forward by his colleagues who represent the Chugiak-Eagle River areas. He indicated they noted some parts of those areas tend to be more rural, and therefore the scoring criteria may not take into account, for example, the less necessary pedestrian amenities such as lighting. As such, he noted his colleagues were concerned that the criteria as presented in the MTP might unfairly bias against AMATS moving those projects forward, and therefore they asked for this amendment.

ASSEMBLY MEMBER BIRCH indicated they have similar issues in South Anchorage in the more rural areas. He thinks everything tends to be pushed towards the traffic demand, and he thinks this amendment recognizes there are other issues and considerations to be made and taken into account. He confirmed he agrees with the concept of this amendment.

There were no comments from the public.

This motion passed unanimously.

Amendment No. 12, Page 8-3

Assembly Amendment: Add new bullet at bottom on third column as follows: “Projects planned in Chugiak-Eagle River require written agreement and cost estimates for maintenance with concurrence from the bodies performing the maintenance prior to implementation.”

TAC Recommendation: TAC recommended approval with the following clarification, “Projects planned in Chugiak-Eagle River require written agreement and cost estimates for maintenance with concurrence from the bodies performing the maintenance prior to [implementation] project initiation.”

ASSEMBLY MEMBER FLYNN moved to approve Amendment No. 12. ASSEMBLY MEMBER BIRCH seconded.

CHAIR CAMPBELL explained the Assembly action proposed wording ended with “prior to implementation,” and the TAC has recommended “prior to project initiation.”

ASSEMBLY MEMBER FLYNN agrees with the TAC recommendation.

There were no comments from the public.

This motion passed unanimously.

Amendment No. 13, Page 8-3

Assembly Amendment: Add new bullet at bottom of third column as follows: “Significant sections of the CER still require subarea transportation plans.”

TAC Recommendation: TAC recommended approval with the following modifications: Move bullet to page 8-6 under Transportation System Policy Recommendations and revise as follows: “Conduct subarea transportation planning in Chugiak-Eagle River in areas without a designated collector system.”

ASSEMBLY MEMBER FLYNN moved to approve Amendment No. 13. MAYOR SULLIVAN seconded.

MR. SPRING stated the TAC recommendation recommends approval of the Assembly language, but rather than putting it in Page 8-3 to move it to Page 8-6. He noted the original language under Page 8-3 explains about the priorities within the Chugiak-Eagle River area, and this particular bullet does not refer to priorities. He indicated the TAC felt it was better to put the bullet into the Transportation System Policy recommendations on Page 8-6.

There was no discussion by the Committee, and there were no comments from the public.

This motion passed unanimously.

Amendment No. 14, Page 8-3

Assembly Amendment: Add new bullet at bottom of third column as follows: “CER contains rural neighborhoods that may not desire amenities such as lighting, landscaping and pedestrian pathways on both sides of roadways.”

TAC Recommendation: TAC recommended approval with the following modifications: Move bullet to page 812 under Non-Motorized System Policy Recommendations and revise as follows: “Recognize rural neighborhoods in Chugiak-Eagle River and the Hillside that may not desire amenities such as lighting, landscaping, and non-motorized pathways on both sides of roadways.”

ASSEMBLY MEMBER FLYNN moved to approve Amendment No. 14. MAYOR SULLIVAN seconded.

There was no discussion by the Committee, and there were no comments from the public.

This motion passed unanimously.

Amendment No. 15, Table 8-4 on page 8-6

Assembly Amendment: Add sentence to end of action item TS-A as follows: “Different LOS standards may be adopted for different areas of the Municipality of Anchorage.”

TAC recommended approval.

ASSEMBLY MEMBER FLYNN moved to approve Amendment No. 15. MAYOR SULLIVAN seconded.

CHAIR CAMPBELL noted this recommendation is that “different LOS standards may be adopted for different areas of the Municipality of Anchorage,” and he assumed this was a continuation of the previous discussion about subareas and different rural and urban characteristics. ASSEMBLY MEMBER FLYNN confirmed Chair Campbell’s assumption.

There were no comments from the public.

This motion passed unanimously.

Amendment No. 16, Page 8-7, first bullet

Assembly Amendment: Revise first road policy recommendation as follows: “Promote the integration of appropriate non-motorized, public transportation facilities and landscaping within [all] new and major roadway construction projects through intra-departmental coordination and public input during the project scoping phase.”

TAC recommended approval.

ASSEMBLY MEMBER FLYNN moved to approve Amendment No. 16. MAYOR SULLIVAN seconded.

ASSEMBLY MEMBER FLYNN indicated this recommendation was essentially a continuation of the previous conversation.

MAYOR SULLIVAN indicated there was an exception, which is that he does not think this recommendation speaks or infers particularly to rural areas of the City noting there are even areas within the Bowl that have appropriate non-motorized public transportation facilities and landscaping, etc., and we tend to have a one-size fits all, and we have collector and arterial

standards, and there are some areas that are quite frankly do not have that need. As such, he thinks the word “appropriate” was well used, as well as eliminating the word “all” which would imply that certain things have to happen on every single road construction project. He thinks this change will give some leeway.

CHAIR CAMPBELL noted it gives more flexibility depending on the setting for the project.

There were no comments from the public.

The motion passed unanimously.

CHAIR CAMPBELL asked for additional public comments on recommendations for the MTP.

CATHY. GLEASON, President of the Turnagain Community Council, spoke on behalf of the Community Council. She noted that yesterday she had sent the Committee their Council’s comment letter to the Assembly. She stated the Community Council has requested for many years that any major upgrades to West Northern Lights between Postmark Drive and Nathaniel Court be deleted from the transportation plans of Anchorage. She described that stretch of road as rural in that the residential ends and it is just a secondary route to the airport. She noted there is park land, the coastal trail, airport land, the sewage treatment plant, and Clitheroe Center, and it is rural for all practical purposes. She thinks the Mayor put it perfectly in the last amendment the Committee approved, which is one size does not fit all in terms of the roads in this area. She stated that ideally the Council would like to see Project 119 completely deleted from the Plan, but indicated if the Committee chooses to keep any kind of road upgrade in the plan, they specifically request deletion of any kind of turn pockets, new sidewalk or new bike path as part of the project. She noted this was discussed when the Long Range Transportation Plan was being updated in mid-2000’s, and appropriately the AMATS Policy Committee deleted a sidewalk and bike path from that plan. She stated if you refer to that plan now it says under new trail “non-applicable, sidewalk non-applicable.” She thinks that is the most appropriate decision for this body to make as well. She noted there is an existing bike trail; it serves the public well, serves their neighborhood well, and is a good access point from their residential area through Earthquake Park and to Postmark Drive. She indicated in most cases it is much farther separated from the road than any new bike path conforming to arterial standards would have to conform to, and the public is much safer. She described this a much more scenic rural kind of route to take in terms of a bike path, and stated there is no need for a sidewalk on the south side where the public would walk around fenced-in airport property and a little of Earthquake Park. She asked the Committee to delete those amenities that are part of this Plan at a cost of \$14.9 million. She thinks that kind of money could be much better spent on other transportation needs and non-motorized transportation facilities in the City.

In response, MAYOR SULLIVAN stated he does not support the deletion of the project, but he does support the second portion of Ms. Gleason’s comments.

MAYOR SULLIVAN moved to amend on Project 119 that the proposed construction of turning pockets, a new sidewalk and a new pathway as part of the project be deleted from the project description. ASSEMBLY MEMBER BIRCH seconded.

MAYOR SULLIVAN commented that he lives in that area as well, and Ms. Gleason is correct that there is absolutely no need for a sidewalk on the south side of that stretch of road from Nathaniel to Postmark. He noted the existing Coastal Trail gives tremendous access for bike riders. He does think the road needs upgrading because it was getting to a point where, like with any surface, after a while the wear and tear gets to be a bit dangerous for motor traffic. However, he thinks the rest of the amenities are overkill on this section.

ASSEMBLY MEMBER FLYNN noted the project as written in the Plan includes rehabilitation of pavement, adding shoulders and then goes on to the other facilities Ms. Gleason recommended for removal. He asked if she had any objection to the shoulders. In response, MS. GLEASON representing the Council stated they did vote to completely delete the project from the Plan. She was not sure the Council specifically talked about shoulders because it was the other amenities they really noticed, and she could not be definitive on that issue. She thinks the road works well the way it is at the traffic levels the way it is, and the document itself says the road is at a level of service of A without any upgrades through 2035, which is the span of this plan, and she thinks that speaks for itself.

MAYOR SULLIVAN noted his amendment did not delete shoulders.

To clarify, CHAIR CAMPBELL read the description for Project 119 on Page 7-16 of the public hearing draft as follows:

Rehabilitate pavement, add shoulders and turning pockets where needed. Recommend pedestrian facilities. Wetland impacts anticipated. Purpose: Circulation, access, and safety ... new sidewalk: 1.2 miles ... new pathway: 1.2 miles.

He noted the actual project scope says pedestrian facilities, but down in the next line it says length of new sidewalk 1.2 and length of pathway 1.2, which are the items proposed to be stricken.

ASSEMBLY MEMBER FLYNN believes the way this description would read if the amendment were adopted is:

Rehabilitate pavement, add shoulders where needed. Wetland impacts anticipated. Purpose: Circulation, access, and safety. Facilities class: minor arterial. Length of project: 1.2 miles. Linked project(s): None.

To recap, CHAIR CAMPBELL noted in looking under the project purpose and description in the right-hand column, the Committee is proposing to strike the words “and turning pockets” from the first sentence, strike the phrase “recommend pedestrian facilities,” and essentially strike everything with regard to “the length of new sidewalk: 1.2” and “length of new pathway: 1.2.” CHAIR CAMPBELL clarified there were four sentences or phrases from that description that would be deleted. MAYOR SULLIVAN confirmed.

MR. LYON noted other projects in the Plan without sidewalks refer to “length of new sidewalk: none, length of new pathway: none.” He recommended maintaining a consistent format by taking out the mileage and replacing it with the word “none” in the description.

CHAIR CAMPBELL concurred. MAYOR SULLIVAN as the maker of the motion *confirmed Mr. Lyon’s recommended change was fine in the context of his amendment and was acceptable.*

ASSEMBLY MEMBER BIRCH having worked out at the airport and spent a lot of time in town and at the airport noted this was his primary means of access from downtown to the airport when he was at the airport. He indicated the only trepidation he had would be any constraints, particularly in the area of turn pockets, design considerations that would be driven by the traffic levels. From the bike standpoint, he sees a lot of bikes on the road or on the shoulders, and he thinks the shoulders are absolutely necessary because even if there is a bike path it seems like a lot of the active bikers want to be more with the flow of traffic up on the roadway. He thinks as long as the shoulder considerations are kept it would be fine. He asked whether the design placement of the turn pockets was more of a function of the level of use and intensity, and what drives that.

CHAIR CAMPBELL responded to Assembly Member Birch as a transportation person. He thinks turning pockets are a very effective way of reducing safety conflicts on most arterial roadways in urban areas. He indicated it is a first step to take when you start seeing accidents where what happens is people try to dodge around the shoulder when someone stops in the lanes, or someone gets rear-ended. He noted those are the symptoms turning pockets cure. He does not know personally if this area has an issue with that or not. He thinks what the intent here is, and was not sure if he agreed or disagreed, but it does not look like this project was intended originally to add lanes to this concept, but he thinks turning pockets are a good flexible option for most roads. He echoed Assembly Member Birch’s sentiments that he thinks deleting them might be shortsighted. He does not think it adds a whole lot of width to most projects because a turning pocket is usually a fairly busy location anyway, and he does not think it would be a tremendous encroachment into the neighborhood to add a turning pocket.

ASSEMBLY MEMBER BIRCH deferred to the folks that live in the neighborhood.

CHAIR CAMPBELL knows there is quite an issue there about the local traffic versus the through traffic, and he understands this is a continuation of that discussion.

MS. GLEASON addressed turn pockets and indicated if you know that section of road the only places where you could turn off that section of road because of airport, chain link fencing and parkland are the two entrances into Earthquake Park. She thinks that would be overkill. She also noted the document points out this road through 2035 without any upgrades is Level Service A; there are no traffic problems their Council has ever heard about with regard to that kind of level of need on that road.

Motion amending Project 119

The motion passed unanimously.

CHAIR CAMPBELL asked for additional public comments on the Plan.

MS. GLEASON referred to Turnagain Boulevard and Turnagain Street. She noted those roads are currently classified as local roads, but in the Official Streets and Highways Plan (OS&HP) that has gone through the process up to the Assembly level, but she does not know when this will go before the Anchorage Assembly. She stated the OS&HP recommends, and it is supported by the Turnagain Community Council, that those roads be classified as neighborhood collectors. She indicated the reason for that classification is those roads actually serve and function currently as neighborhood collectors. From their perspective with regard to the upgrade to those projects, and initial steps have already started with a design study report, she indicated their concern is funding for those projects if they are not included in this document under the short-term project list. Ideally she was hoping the OS&HP would have gone through the process, and the roads would now be classified as neighborhood collectors, and then could be inserted into this Plan under short-term projects because the upgrade of those two projects in Turnagain have been at the top of the Council's CIP priority list for some time now and are in desperate need of shoulders, drainage, pedestrian facilities and lighting. She noted these projects are not in this Plan, which goes through 2035, and if they are not included she does not know if that could hinder any kind of funding that could potentially be put forward for those projects. Ms. Gleason indicated if the answer is "yes," the Council would definitely like to see those projects inserted into this document.

In response to Chair Campbell, MS. GLEASON indicated she would restrict her comments to what is within Turnagain.

Responding to Ms. Gleason, ASSEMBLY MEMBER FLYNN indicated this is the type of project that is most likely going to be funding by a combination of State grant dollars and local bond funds, and as such, it is not necessary for it to be in this document. He noted projects are in this plan because they want federal dollars for the projects. He thinks if those projects are ever going to get upgraded that it would be extremely difficult if they had to go through the federal

process to get it. Although he appreciated Ms. Gleason's comments, he suggested this body bypass this amendment.

The Committee took no action on Ms. Gleason's proposal.

MS. GLEASON noted a typo on Page 7-60 of the Plan and referred to on Page 7 of the Turnagain Council letter to AMATS that La Honda Drive is now "Captain Cook Estates Circle" (Project 503).

MS. GLEASON noted another correction on Page 9 of the letter where it refers to Aero Avenue as an existing link between 36th and Lakeshore Drive and that road does not exist. With regard to a missing link in the same spot, she noted the Council would like that deleted.

CHAIR CAMPBELL asked Mr. Spring and Mr. Katsion for a brief rundown on how many public meetings AMATS has had on this project, how long has been spent developing this MTP, and whether these comments have been made, and if so, whether the TAC or their team have some thoughts on why these comments have not been incorporated, or why they should not be.

MR. SPRING discussed the public involvement for the MTP. He explained the Plan development was initiated back in January 2011 beginning with the review with all the boards and commissions and developed a public review draft, which was released October 1, 2011. They held three general public meetings, as well as meetings with other entities and interested stakeholders. He indicated there were more than 30 comments with over 200 specific individual recommendations for changes, which includes the recommendations and changes from the Turnagain Community Council. He noted the TAC responded to each individual comment, which was then forwarded to the TAC as well as the Planning and Zoning Commission (PZC). He stated the TAC made recommendations as to what changes should be made, which were then incorporated into the public hearing draft dated January 2012, and the Committee has that copy before them. He stated specific comments of this typo, for instance, were not identified, and if it was they had neglected to make that change. With regard to the other comments from Turnagain, he indicated they either made a recommendation for a change or to stay with the original language. From that point, MR. SPRING noted the public hearing draft was released at the end of 2011, and they went through the formal adoption process through the PZC, the Municipal Assembly, the TAC and now before the Policy Committee.

With respect to the specific comment on the grid map by Ms. Gleason, MR. SPRING noted the recommendation from the TAC was that this was just an illustrative conceptual map showing what would happen if all the connections were made, and it is not intended to be a recommendation for individual link connections. He indicated it does not necessarily mean that it corresponds to the collector system as adopted by the Municipality, and they realize there is some controversy regarding this particular connection. He reiterated it was not intended to make a recommendation.

To follow-up, MR. KATSION noted changes were actually made on Page 5-20 adding the statement “these missing grid maps are used to identify missing system links but do not constitute a recommendations to construct them.” He thinks they were clear in addressing this type of issue; that it is a guideline, and it was one of the things to look at for adding projects to the list, but it does not mean it is only thing you use to add to the list. He noted those are things you look at as you are looking to complete the whole system, and very similar to the process that you have been going through with the Connect Anchorage process. He reiterated it does not mean that all of those links are to be built.

ASSEMBLY MEMBER FLYNN echoed some of those remarks, and he noted for example, there are roads going through Merrill Field going south, east and west, and he does not think that is going to done any time soon. He referred to the general reminder he made to the Assembly, which is that just because something is in this Plan does not mean it is going to happen, and if does happen, it does not necessarily mean it is going to happen the way it is in the Plan, it just means it can happen. While he agrees with the typographical change, he thinks he probably ought to let them go.

CHAIR CAMPBELL’S intent was to note that AMATS has spent a very long amount of time on this project, and he would hate to go in with too many changes at this point. He thinks the team and the TAC, the Assembly and the PZC to some extent, have spent a lot of time and effort on this project, and he knows there is always one last thing, one more good idea, but at some point he would like to finish this and get it sent off so AMATS can continue to receive federal funds for this community.

MAYOR SULLIVAN moved to amend Page 7-60, Project 503 to correct “La Honda Drive” to read “Captain Cook Estates Circle.” ASSEMBLY MEMBER FLYNN seconded.

There was no discussion by the Committee, and there were no comments from the public on this motion.

The motion passed unanimously.

S. J. KLEIN, Chair of Fairview Community Council, addressed the Committee. He noted they had been speaking with the Mayor and Assemblyman Flynn about their disappointment specifically in Projects 201 and 213 being shifted to the long-term plan. He noted these projects were what was formerly known as Highway to Highway. He indicated this plan proposes to bring 36,000 additional vehicles into the Fairview neighborhood, as well as streamline traffic from both ends into the neighborhood, but does not deal with this until 2025 at the earliest. He noted they are working with the Governor’s Office to get a special appropriation to do some independent transportation studies that could identify achievable projects that are not necessarily big cut and over things, but maybe things that will help deal with the pressure that is coming through. He indicated he was hoping they could perhaps get a little language in Project 201 and

213 that would allow for the possibility of moving smaller, implementable projects forward before that time period.

In response, ASSEMBLY MEMBER FLYNN stated there is not any specific language at this point. He noted he has spoken to this topic several times. He noted Project 201 was split into 3 phases based on his recommendation, and Project 201-A was moved into the short-term list with the acquiescence of this body in order to identify some path forward in the nearer term future. He would like to move B, C and D up, but was sure he did not have the votes to do so.

Speaking more specifically to Mr. Klein's comments, which he thought were good, ASSEMBLY MEMBER FLYNN thinks adding language to Projects 201 or 213 would actually hinder the Committee, and again noted that tying it to the federal process can sometimes slow projects down. He thinks seeking State dollars to identify more incremental steps to come up with some shorter term solutions would be preferable. He wants to keep this out of the Plan, and then to the extent federal dollars are needed to help some of the implementation phases, come back with amendments to the MTP. He thinks this would be a better course.

MR. KLEIN indicated Fairview is amenable to that as long as this body understands they may be coming forward with amendments in the future.

Noting neighborhood concerns, ASSEMBLY MEMBER FLYNN moved to move Project 209, A/C St Couplet Restripe, Tudor Road to 9th Avenue, from the long-term into the illustrative list.

This motion failed for lack of a second.

There were no further comments from the public.

Main motion as amended (further discussion)

ASSEMBLY MEMBER FLYNN thanked the Chair, the consultant team, staff and teams for yeoman's work. He noted it has been a long road, and we have not always agreed, but he thinks the Committee has a relatively solid plan before them. He briefly noted the work this Committee has done over the past 10 or 15 years has really moved Anchorage forward in a lot of ways. He indicated if you look at the level of service analysis, Anchorage is better off today than we were 10 years ago, which is impressive given the way other communities are going. He thinks as AMATS moves forward with this, and we are judicious in how it is implemented, we will continue to make those improvements, and he looks forward to working with all of you.

MAYOR SULLIVAN echoed those comments. He thanked staff, the consultants, and the public for their input; it really is a cooperative process. He noted it never works out to anybody's perfect satisfaction, but he thinks AMATS has a good solid plan going forward. He noted the Connect Anchorage concept makes a lot of sense; it is not easy to do, and as we develop more as

a city it becomes even harder to do. He noted his predecessor once said that there are no easy road projects anymore in Anchorage, and he is absolutely right; it is very challenging to make the connections you need. Overall he thinks we are making good progress and improving the quality of transportation in our city of all modes of transportation. He noted a Bike Plan was passed a couple years ago that changes how roads are built, and we are recognizing every community has transportation needs whether it is pedestrians, bicyclists or motorized vehicles. He appreciates all the good work noting we are making good progress.

MS. EDWARDS thanked everybody for the hard work and reminded everyone these are updated on a fairly regularly basis, and while not everything may have gotten addressed today there will be other opportunities to do so. She noted there was a lot of great hard work putting this together.

CHAIR CHAMPBELL stated it has been longer than we thought it was going to be, but the deadline was still made. He noted Jon Spring, Gary Katsion and Anne Brooks did a good job of shepherding this plan through, and thinks we can all be proud of the result. As other people have mentioned, he noted it is not a case of perfection, but he thinks it is a case of a good workable plan that will take AMATS forward, and gives a good foundation and builds good things for this community. He thinks as we change and grow as a community this is a reflection of how we change and grow, and he thinks it is a good document to do that. He looks forward to this Committee adopting it, moving it forward, getting it approved and implementing it.

As a member of the project team, MR. KATSION thanked the Policy Committee, the TAC and the TAC+ that has helped guide them throughout this process. He noted there was a lot of cooperation between the groups, the general public in showing up and becoming engaged in the process. He thinks that is a reflection of the plan itself. He thanked everyone for making their job move fairly smoothly during this last 15 months, and for all the cooperation between the agency staff that was involved as well.

MR. SPRING thanked the public for their comments. He noted he has been involved in a number of these things, and he thinks the comments received were exceptionally good this time around and well thought it. He complemented the project team and the TAC and the fact they incorporated quite a few of the comments in the plan, and it helped add value to the Plan.

Main Motion to approve the 2035 MTP as amended.

CHAIR CAMPBELL stated this is a motion before the Committee to adopt the 2035 MTP as modified by their lengthy discussion at this meeting.

The motion passed unanimously.

c. Obligation Report – 2nd Quarter

BART RUDOLPH reviewed the AMATS 2nd Quarter Obligation Report. This is a report of all the projects in the TIP. The numbers reflected are in the TIP amendment currently undergoing the public review process. It also shows the dollars obligated to date, as well as dollars anticipated for obligation in 2012.

He noted they have already sought approval for the Huffman Road Project, which is the only major difference on Page 1. Under Transportation Enhancements on Page 2, he noted the amount for Project G-2, the Glenn Highway Trail Rehab was increased to \$5.1 million in the TIP amendment. He explained this project has gone through an engineer's estimate and was certified through DOT, and the TAC was asked for approval of \$6,006,000 million. He noted the certification process has been finalized, and the engineer's estimate is now \$6.4 million. The Committee was asked to approve this obligation change from \$5.1 million to \$6.4 million in order to advertise this project and move it forward.

He noted there were no other major changes on Page 2. Page 3 is mainly the CMAQ category, and he noted the projects listed are matching up with the TIP amendment with no changes. With regard to the totals on Page 4, he explained the total AMATS allocation in the TIP amendment is approximately \$36.3 million. AMATS anticipates obligating approximately \$33.9 million at this time leaving approximately \$2.3 million. AMATS is required to be within 10% of its allocation, and with this report are at 6.5%. MR. RUDOLPH reported the general funded projects have been obligated and are moving forward.

With this report, the Committee is being asked to approve the Glenn Highway Trail Rehab obligation change from \$5.1 to \$6,340,000 million.

MAYOR SULLIVAN moved to approve the Glenn Highway Trail Rehab obligation change from \$5.1 to \$6,340,000 million. ASSEMBLY MEMBER BIRCH seconded.

ASSEMBLY MEMBER BIRCH asked about completed projects, deobligations and whether construction awards have been competitive.

In response, CHAIR CAMPBELL indicated from his perspective he is seeing a competitive construction bidding environment, and quite often there are change orders or claims during the project that bring the amount back up remarkably close to the original engineer's estimate before it settles.

There were no comments from the public.

The motion passed unanimously.

MAYOR SULLIVAN advised the Committee that he provided copies of a resolution regarding the Port of Anchorage Intermodal Expansion Project and the funding that came through SAFETE-LU that has not been remitted to the Port. He stated he would like to bring the resolution forward as an action item at next month's meeting.

Mayor Sullivan left at 10:46 a.m.

d. Other Business Items - None

6. INFORMATION ITEMS

a. Annual Summary of Air Quality

MR. MORRIS gave an update on air quality and provided a status report on the pollutants of concern in Anchorage, which are carbon monoxide (CO), particulate matter (PM₁₀ and PM_{2.5}), ozone, airborne lead, and air toxics (benzene). He did not discuss sulfur dioxide or nitrogen dioxide noting they were not issues in Anchorage. Highlights of his presentation are outlined below.

Carbon Monoxide

- Primarily from motor vehicle emissions (Est. 79% in Anchorage).
- Highest concentrations occur in mid-winter with strong temperature inversions.
- Residential areas tend to have highest concentrations.
- Plugging in block heaters at 20 degrees reduces CO emissions by approximately 60% in motor vehicles.
- CO concentrations have dropped dramatically in Anchorage over the last 30 years.
- No CO violations since 1996.
- Nevertheless, Anchorage has some of the highest CO concentration in the country mostly because of our climate.

Particulate Matters (PM₁₀ and PM_{2.5})

- PM₁₀ linked with asthma and other respiratory problems.
- Local studies show rise in doctor visits during high PM₁₀ levels.
- Studies show death rates in hospitals increase with high PM_{2.5} levels.
- PM₁₀ sources primarily geological (road dust, volcanic ash, glacial silt).
- Occasional violations of national ambient air quality standard (NAAQS) for PM₁₀ along major roads.
- Municipality applying magnesium chloride as a dust suppressant along major roads in Anchorage and Eagle River during late March through end of April (Tudor Road, Muldoon Road).

- Eagle River is a still technically PM₁₀ non-attainment area even though there has not been a violation since the late 1980's. The PM₁₀ problem was eliminated when roads were paved or surfaced with recycled asphalt asphalt.
- No upward or downward trend in PM₁₀ or PM_{2.5} during the past 10 years.

MR. MORRIS discussed the EPA provision allowing exceptional events or natural events to be excluded from consideration in violations of the PM₁₀ air quality standard. He noted there were a number of events in the last few years resulting in wind-blown dust primarily from the Matanuska River blowing into Anchorage and Eagle River causing the standard to be exceeded. He noted there is a great deal of effort required to prepare the documentation that EPA requires to prove the violations are natural and not anthropogenic emissions.

MR. MORRIS reported Anchorage has some of the lowest PM_{2.5} concentrations in the country. He indicated Fairbanks has serious problems meeting the PM_{2.5} standard which he understands are primarily related to wood burning. He said that we don't see significant wood burning PM_{2.5} in Anchorage because we are fortunate to have relatively cheap natural gas. Annual telephone surveys are conducted in Anchorage to track whether there are any tendencies for people to heat with wood more often, but he noted that has not been seen. Although PM_{2.5} concentrations in Anchorage are low, Carbon 14 analysis suggests that most PM_{2.5} comes from wood smoke. He discussed the wood boiler ordinance passed by the Anchorage assembly limiting the installation of wood boilers to EPA-certified Phase 2 standards.

MR. MORRIS explained ozone is not an issue in Anchorage, but is monitored because EPA mandates it for large metropolitan areas. Ozone levels in Anchorage and Eagle River are low, and virtually all of it appears to be natural ozone. Ozone levels in Denali National Park are higher than here.

Airborne Lead

- Project began last fall to monitor airborne lead concentrations at Merrill Field for EPA.
- EPA is monitoring 14 other airports around the country.
- Monitoring location is highest probable location for airborne lead and because aviation fuel for piston aircraft still contains a considerable amount of lead.
- Monitoring for 6 months has shown lead concentrations about 1/3 of the air quality standard.

Benzene

- No air quality standard for benzene, but it has been a concern in Anchorage.
- Phase 1 study completed for monitoring benzene in east Anchorage residential area.
- When benzene content of Anchorage's gasoline was about 5%, it was found that even in a residential area Anchorage has some of the highest benzene levels in the country.
- Anchorage is in the top 2% of the country in terms of benzene concentrations.
- Phase 2 planned to repeat monitoring for another year, and funding for this is expected.

- Tesoro invested \$150 million to remove a lot of the benzene out of the gasoline to meet a new EPA mandated limit of less than 1.3%.
- Hope to see big reduction in Phase 2 in ambient benzene concentration as a result of the removal of benzene from the gasoline.

Air Quality Summary

- CO has fallen dramatically and is expected to continue to decline, but more slowly than the past.
- PM₁₀ is a problem during spring break up. Magnesium chloride is used to control dust on major roads. Unpaved road problem in Eagle River has been resolved.
- PM_{2.5} is fairly low but could pose a problem if wood burning increases.
- Ozone levels are among lowest in the U.S.
- Benzene concentrations were among highest in U.S. in 2008-09. The impact of lowering the gasoline benzene content from 5% to 1.3% or lower will be evaluated this coming year.

CHAIR CAMPBELL asked if there was a way to determine what the ambient background PM₁₀ is versus the “man-made PM₁₀” is in a community like Anchorage. MR. MORRIS stated it is very difficult to distinguish. For example the chemical make-up of the natural glacial silt and the traction sand used on roads in Anchorage is virtually identical chemically. When arguments are made to EPA that it is a naturally caused event, he indicated they look at meteorological data, examine wind speeds and trajectories and show that under these conditions it is likely that natural dust transport from the Matanuska River Valley or the Susitna River Valley was the predominant cause of the PM₁₀ exceedance. He noted most of the evidence to support that these are natural events is circumstantial, and the events are very rare. He indicated EPA has rejected similar requests from California, for example, so it is incumbent on them to develop good arguments. He said they have been working with the State Climatologist to prepare more convincing justification with sophisticated meteorological modeling.

CHAIR CAMPBELL discussed how some of the EPA regulations do not recognize the high turbidities of some Alaska waters. He also noted the amount of material blowing around on a windy day that does not come off the highway.

There were no comments from the public.

CHAIR CAMPBELL deferred the remaining agenda items to the next meeting on May 24, 2012.

- b. **Public Transportation / People Mover Update**
Deferred to the next meeting.
- c. **Standardized Socioeconomic Assumptions**

Deferred to the next meeting.

d. Other Informational Items - None

7. SCHEDULED AMATS MEETINGS

Technical Advisory Committee, May 10, 2012

Policy Committee, May 24, 2012

8. ADJOURNMENT

ASSEMBLY MEMBER FLYNN moved to adjourn.

Hearing no objections, the meeting adjourned at 11:00 a.m.