

**ANCHORAGE METROPOLITAN AREA TRANSPORTATION SOLUTIONS
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING
Planning & Development Center
Main Conference Room, 1st Floor
4700 Elmore Road
Anchorage, Alaska**

**April 20, 2012
2:00 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 (DEC)
Steve Morris	MOA/Dept. of Health & Human Services
Stephanie Mormilo	MOA/Traffic Division (TD)
Jerry Weaver	MOA/ Community Development Department (CDD)
Jerry Hansen	MOA/Project Management & Engineering (PM&E)
Lance Wilber	MOA/Public Transportation Department
Bruce Carr	Alaska Railroad Corporation

Also in attendance

Name	Representing
Craig Lyon	MOA/CDD
Vivian Underwood	MOA/CDD
Jon Spring	MOA/CDD
Bart Rudolph	DOT&PF
Gary Katsion	Kittelsohn & Associates
Anne Brooks	Brooks & Associates
Judy Dougherty	Knik Arm Bridge & Toll Authority (KABATA)
Walt Parker	Anchorage Citizens Coalition (ACC)
Nancy Pease	Rabbit Creek Community Council
Joan Diamond	Rabbit Creek Community Council
Jamie Kenworthy	
Todd Logan	

1. CALL TO ORDER

CHAIR MORMILO called the meeting to order at 2:04 p.m. Stephen Ribuffo and Lois Epstein were absent. A quorum was established.

2. PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT ANNOUNCEMENT

MR. LYON encouraged public involvement in this meeting of the AMATS Technical Advisory Committee. He explained staff would first make their presentation, followed by any comments from Committee members, and the floor would then be open to public comment.

3. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

MR. CARR moved to adopt the agenda. MS. HEIL seconded. *Hearing no objections, the agenda was approved unanimously.*

4. BUSINESS ITEMS

a. 2035 Metropolitan Transportation Plan Carbon Monoxide and PM-10 Air Quality Conformity Analysis (recommendation for approval)

MR. MORRIS presented the report on the 2035 Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP) Carbon Monoxide and PM-10 Air Quality Conformity Analysis. He noted staff recommended the TAC be more formal about the adoption of the Conformity Determination. As such, he stated he was going to combine five findings of fact that he hopes the TAC can adopt to forward to the Policy Committee. His presentation comprised those findings of fact. For the purposes of these minutes, each individual finding of fact is in italics below with discussion in standard text.

- 1. As a Metropolitan Planning Organization (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 PM-10 nonattainment area under the Clean Air Act.*
- 2. The Air Quality Conformity Determination for the 2035 AMATS MTP has been prepared in accordance with state and federal regulations outlined in 40 CFR 93.*

MR. MORRIS noted AMATS has gone through process and had an interagency consultation as well. He thinks there is a general consensus that AMATS follows the regulations in preparing the Conformity Determination Analysis. He stated the third finding of fact has to do with the consequences of the analysis, and that finding is that:

- 3. Projected Regional CO emissions in the Anchorage bowl area are within the allotted motor vehicle emissions budget in the State Implementation Plan.*

He noted the main test for the carbon monoxide maintenance area is that AMATS established a maintenance budget, or motor vehicle emissions budget, which AMATS cannot exceed when the emissions expected to come from the 2035 MTP are analyzed. He noted they went through that procedure using the Transportation Model and the EPA MOVES Model test on carbon monoxide emissions and found AMATS was under the emissions budget in all three analysis years. As a side bar to that, MR. MORRIS also noted they identified what they think is an anomaly in the MOVES Model, which they want to continue to bring forward to EPA for resolution. He indicated it was possible this model may cause problems in future years for AMATS.

4. *Eagle River is designated as a PM-10 nonattainment area, but is subject to less stringent PM-10 conformity requirements for limited maintenance areas because the EPA has found that the Eagle River PM-10 Limited Maintenance Plan, submitted to EPA in 2010 and currently under review, has been found adequate by the EPA for conformity purposes. Using that Limited Maintenance Plan, analysis shows that the Eagle River area meets the conformity requirements that are outlined for PM-10 limited maintenance areas.*

MR. MORRIS explained there is a qualification level for PM-10 nonattainment areas, and Eagle River has had such low PM-10 concentrations over the past five years that it meets those qualifications. He stated that because of this, DEC submitted a Limited Maintenance Plan for Eagle River a couple of years ago, which is still under review. He further explained EPA has a process to consider the Limited Maintenance Plan, and then allow the Limited Maintenance Plan procedures to be used for conformity purposes. He stated EPA has done that and submitted a letter to the Commissioner of DEC. He also understands the Federal Register publication notifying DEC of that will be published in the first week of May.

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 their comments have been addressed in the draft MTP.*

MR. MORRIS briefly described the recommendations from the Air Quality Advisory Committee for the MTP Air Quality Conformity Analysis. He noted staff agrees with those recommendations, and they have been incorporated into the final draft document.

Socioeconomic data in Table 1.1, 1.2 and 1.3

The first recommendation was related to a table in the conformity analysis document, and he thinks there were just some errors in the socioeconomic data presented in the tables. He stated the tables were revised to agree with the MTP so there are no differences in the population, employment and household figures.

Appendix 1, Summary of Network Improvements by Analysis Year

MR. MORRIS explained this recommended change was essential to add public transportation projects to the list of projects in Appendix 1. He noted the draft plan just had road projects, and the advisory committee suggested adding transit projects. Staff concurred.

He noted there were a couple of minor modifications reflecting changes to the MTP recommended by the Assembly. He explained this was the elimination of the South Birchwood Loop Road project and substituting the two phase Hiland Road Project. He noted the appendix was updated to reflect those changes.

MR. MORRIS asked the TAC to recommend approval of the Conformity document and Conformity Determination, as well as the findings of fact.

MS. WITT asked what would actually be reflected in the appendix for the MTP itself, and whether it would be just the summary pages. MR. SPRING pointed out there was no appendix for the Conformity Determination in the previous plan. He noted the draft MTP had a blank appendix for the Conformity Determination. However, he stated their recommendation and plan is not to include it, but to make reference to and rely on Chapter 9 to discuss the air quality determination, as well as to reference the actual report. He indicated Mr. Morris would be updating the MTP based on the new Conformity output data.

MR. MORRIS confirmed the demographic information in the draft Conformity Determination is consistent with the MTP. He noted they substituted the MTP table for what was originally in the Conformity Determination.

There were no public comments.

MS. HEIL moved that the TAC recommend to the Policy Committee approval of the 2035 Metropolitan Transportation Plan Carbon Monoxide and PM-10 Air Quality Conformity Analysis and the five findings of fact. MS. WITT seconded.

Hearing no objections, the motion passed unanimously.

b. 2035 Metropolitan Transportation Plan (recommendation for approval)

MR. SPRING reviewed the Assembly amendments to the 2035 MTP passed by the Assembly at their April 10, 2012 meeting. He explained staff was asking the TAC to make a recommendation to the Policy Committee on whether to adopt the Assembly amendments as part of the MTP. He noted the Project Oversight Committee (POC) recommended adoption of all the amendments. He indicated there were a few minor changes recommended by the POC for clarification purposes.

MR. SPRING discussed how the action by the Assembly on the MTP public review draft and the amendments differs from action by the Policy Committee. He explained there are two parts to the Assembly approval of the transportation plan; and one part is adoption by the Assembly of the MTP as an element of the Comprehensive Plan, which the Assembly officially adopts, which does not change regardless of what the AMATS TAC or Policy Committee does. The second part of the Assembly's work is to recommend to the Policy Committee any changes, but that is incorporated in their amendments and action on the plan. He noted the difficulty is that if AMATS decides to make major changes to the Assembly's recommendations, then in essence there would be two separate plans, which is awkward. He indicated generally AMATS ends up being very similar, if not exactly the same plan adopted by the Assembly. He also noted the Policy Committee has two members from the Assembly, and generally there are not many contradictions between the Policy Committee and the Assembly. He hopes in this case to minimize the changes the TAC recommends to the Assembly's amendments and forwards to the Policy Committee. He asked the TAC to be as consistent as possible unless there is a major technical reason to make a negative recommendation on these amendments.

For clarification, MS. WITT thinks it is important to recognize that the Assembly in its role has already adopted the public hearing draft with their changes as part of the Comprehensive Plan. As a result, before the TAC is the public hearing draft with the Assembly's recommended changes that the TAC needs to take action on for the Policy Committee. She noted the TAC is primarily looking at the Assembly's recommended changes to the MTP.

MR. SPRING began the review of the Assembly's amendments. The TAC determined it would vote on each Assembly amendment individually.

For the purposes of these minutes, each Assembly amendment to the 2035 MTP with the Project Oversight Committee's recommendations regarding the amendments are boxed, noted in italics and referenced by page number. This is the information from the matrix of the Assembly Amendments provided to the TAC for this meeting. The TAC's discussion and action on each Assembly amendment follows in standard text.

Table 4-2 on page 4-5

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

POC recommends approval. The revision recognizes that the proposed OS&HP update makes a distinction between rural and urban collectors.

TAC Discussion/Action

MR. SPRING noted the Chair of the Assembly is from Chugiak-Eagle River and was concerned that maybe it did not address some of the uniqueness of her community particularly the rural parts of the community, and requested the TAC add under the category of collector in parenthesis "(rural and urban)". He further indicated the new Official Streets & Highway Plan

(OS&HP) was going to have optional categories included for rural collectors, and this change is consistent with the OS&HP.

As a point of order, it was noted the TAC should have a motion on the floor for the 2035 Metropolitan Transportation Plan in order to take action on amendments to that draft. The TAC determined it would proceed in the following manner: provide a motion to recommend approval of the draft MTP by the Policy Committee; provide amendments to the main motion related to the Assembly's amendments; and then act on the main motion as amended.

MS. WITT moved to recommend TAC adoption of the public hearing draft of the 2035 Metropolitan Transportation Plan. MR. MORRIS seconded.

MS. WITT moved to amend the main motion to approve the first Assembly amendment adding (rural and urban) under Collector. MS. HEIL seconded.

There were no comments from the public.

Hearing no objections, the motion passed unanimously.

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.”

POC recommends approval. This new paragraph is a continuation of the previous plan’s firewall provisions which were designed to ensure that there will be sufficient funds available to finance the rest of the transportation improvements contained in the Plan.

TAC Discussion/Action

MR. SPRING explained the second amendment is based on the actual Assembly ordinance, which requires a change in the text of the MTP. He stated this has been vetted by Assemblyman Flynn who created a substitute ordinance. He noted the recommendation is to add a new paragraph, which is designed to reinforce the firewall between the Knik Arm Crossing (KAC) project and the other MTP projects. He noted the reference to “long standing policy” is to the 2007 amendment to the previous LRTP, which added the KAC project and created the original firewall.

MS. WITT discussed a notice she saw that went out from the Alaska Center for the Environment last week, which she believes made reference to the Assembly’s action. She asked staff for clarification of the notice, which she read as follows:

We did it. Anchorage Assembly votes against bridge funding. A big thank you to everyone who came out and testified Tuesday. The Assembly heard our message loud and clear and voted to keep state and local money from going to the Knik Arm Bridge project in the Transportation Plan. Because of your help, transit and trail projects will have priority.

MS. WITT asked staff for clarification that the Assembly’s action is specific to what staff has provided to the TAC, which does not address State funds as opposed to what the Center for Environment notice stated, noting there is no reference in the Assembly’s final paragraph to State funds. In response, MR. SPRING noted it says “beyond that which is currently authorized.”

MR. SPRING thinks it is clear that Mr. Flynn’s intent was to create a firewall and not to divert any money AMATS expects that was analyzed through the spreadsheet, and the flow of money that would go to these projects. He noted it is important because the MTP financial constraints are based on that. He indicated this does not contradict what is already in other parts of the plan. He referred to Chapter 6 on Page 6-30 and 6-31 where it specifically mentions the bills that were before the State legislature regarding the \$150 million availability fund for the start-up years to make sure the bill that is intrinsically made was not to be considered to be part of AMATS’ allocation with respect to this plan. He noted this is seen in a number of places. He did not think adding this amendment takes away those other paragraphs, and it is clear the intent of the plan is that at least the \$150 million availability payments does not deter or take money away from the rest of the plan. He thinks that is consistent with language in this plan and other parts are consistent with this statement.

MS. WITT agreed. She thinks what the statement does is absolutely consistent with what has already been done in other parts of the plan. She indicated she wanted to bring this up to the TAC because she believes it may have been a little bit misleading for this notice (from the Center for the Environment) to go out to folks. The interpretation that the Anchorage Assembly voted against Bridge funding by taking action on the MTP, the MTP within its own financial constraints and putting in its own documenting all of its assumptions for both the KAC and for

the rest of the transportation system recognizes State funding for both. She thinks it was misleading to state the Assembly's vote, and she was there for the Assembly's final action, which approved an MTP that includes Knik Arm funding and recognizes the current financial plan that had been accepted by the Federal Highway Administration for the KAC. She thinks the Assembly adopted a plan that reflects this. She also wanted to make it clear to this group that if there is any confusion here it is that the Assembly action the TAC is asked to consider for amending the MTP does not say "keep State funding out of Knik Arm Crossing."

MR. SPRING agreed with Ms. Witt's interpretation that the plan does recognize there is already some state funding expected as part of the financial plan for the KAC that the Knik Arm Bridge and Toll Authority (KABATA) developed. He noted it is recognized that the \$150 million is State money.

MR. SPRING referred to Page 6-32 before the "Conclusion," which states "As a result, if annual appropriations are required," noting that is annual appropriations above the \$150 million availability payment, "then the MTP's financial plan will have to be reassessed to ensure that the MTP meets the FHWA financial constraint requirements." He noted this is also consistent with this too. He stated it was their intent to make a firewall saying not to breach that if you start getting appropriations every year and asking for additional appropriations, then it puts into question the financial constraint of the plan. He thinks this is also consistent with the wording too.

MR. CARR discussed a different approach. He noted AMATS has a MTP containing projects AMATS wants to do and some of the funding is funding expected from the State, and separate from that is the KAC project in the MTP with federal and state money. He indicated the way he interprets this is anything AMATS has identified in its plan for its projects, and he thinks this is all it says, is not going to the KAC. He stated KABATA does whatever they want with what it gets for its own funding, whether state, federal, or other sources, but what this language does is say AMATS is not going to spend any of its allocation on the KAC.

MR. SPRING agreed noting this language is also telling the State that if they spend money on the KAC, AMATS does not expect it to be taken out its allocation.

MR. MORTON expressed concern that if money is identified for KABATA, perhaps National Highway System (NHS) funding, and there is also money in the regular Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) for that same year, but for whatever reason we are unable to deliver that obligation it could be viewed as perhaps a shift in funds. His was concerned this could potentially limit AMATS' flexibility to balance its program just in a mechanical sense and not looking at any other part of this. He asked if this limits AMATS' flexibility.

MR. WILBER believes it does limit flexibility. He thinks this is the intent of the firewall, which is so that if AMATS needs to make sure its local NHS program is ready to obligate, and so AMATS can do everything it can to obligate those NHS funds because there is no reason

AMATS cannot redirect a certain percentage of NHS funds to non-NHS projects. He does think the lack of projects or inability to obligate could potentially be a problem, but he thinks the affect of the firewall is exactly what you would see. He indicated if for some reason projects such as the Seward Highway widening or a Glenn Highway widening could not obligate, then this would not allow those NHS funds to get redirected to the KAC if they are regular program funds. He indicated this was his interpretation.

MR. MORTON noted if that was identified early in the year there would be an opportunity to redirect. He noted there was not much of the federal fiscal year left, and there will be a substantial part of the program left to obligate. He reiterated his concern about losing the flexibility to balance the program within the region.

MR. CARR asked for clarification noting the State decides where to spend their NHS money, and the State comes to AMATS to say what they are going to do in the AMATS boundaries. He noted AMATS can recommend, suggest there might be different priorities, or if the State says they are going to spend money on the KAC and not on the Seward Highway, then AMATS cannot tell the State “no” because it is not AMATS money. He thinks it is possible that by the State perhaps having to give more money to the Knik Arm Bridge, for whatever reason, that there would be less money to execute the AMATS NHS program, but that is an issue with the State. He further noted it does affect us in the AMATS area, but AMATS does not have control of that. He asked if this was a correct interpretation of what the State can do with its own NHS money.

MS. WITT, for clarification, thinks this is being taken from the MTP level down to a TIP implementation and that is not what this document is intended to do. She noted, for example, and this is one of the questions she had because of this language and some of the issues that have been raised, that when you look at what has changed and what has been the primary difference for the KAC between 2007 and now is that it is a full update reflecting KABATA’S most recent financial plan. She further noted this is reflected in the MTP as a picture in time, which may change, but a change in that financial plan in itself does not require an MTP amendment.

She noted when this was originally adopted in 2007 the firewall was a big discussion, but one of the biggest changes since then has been that the KAC has gone from being a totally revenue backed bond project to recognition it will need some availability payments, and so it is a different financial plan. She further noted this MTP reflects that it is a combination of all of these funding sources that will not really be known until there is a contractor. She thinks it is important for the TAC to understand and be clear as to what this means. She noted it is good to talk about the “what if” scenarios, which would come up on the TIP and STIP side because it is true and the MTP does acknowledge that it is the State that sets the relative priorities on the NHS. She indicated the State currently has in its STIP 49% of the original earmarks that were slated for the KAC that carry forward with the project, and there is still approximately \$40 to \$45 million left.

MS. WITT explained that what the TAC has now is an MTP that fully reflects the KAC pro forma financial plan and clarifies where needed some of the questions that came up during that plan's development. She indicated the question is whether this language proposed by the Assembly is inconsistent with what is already documented in the plan, and she thinks the documentation is \$150 million, and if it needs more then they need to take another look at the plan, but she does not see any inconsistency. She further noted this whole process will start in another 6 months. She thinks it is intended to be able to be modified and reflected.

MS. WITT wants the TAC to be clear as a committee in moving forward with this language because it was important enough to the Assembly last time and with the Policy Committee that they actually adopted the language. She thinks the TAC needs to be respectful of that because of the importance of this plan to this community, as well as the concerns already expressed about the KAC. She noted that argument has happened a number of times, and it comes down to being litigated through the courts as to who is the boss of whom when it comes to NHS. She indicated there is deference given to MPO's, and typically the State is not going to be funding an expensive, high impact project in an MPO without that MPO's support. She noted this is part of the cooperative relationship required between the state and the city as part of the MPO.

With regard to the last whereas in Assembly ordinance, 2012-30(S), MR. WILBER thinks the Assembly's intent was for the same intent and language that is in the existing LRTP. He thinks what Assembly Member Flynn and the voting majority of the Assembly want is that same intent and direction in the existing LRTP, and he agrees with Ms. Witt as well. However, he noted there was some language in the first two "whereas," and the last sentence in the first is one of them, which says "in addition, no local funds will be used for construction." He thinks what Mr. Flynn was thinking about when he said "local funds" is not bond funds, not local municipal dollars, but what he was thinking about and his intentions were the local program funds; the AMATS allocation and the KAC funding program. Although this ordinance says "local funds", MR. WILBER indicated Mr. Flynn's intention was not Municipal dollars or property taxes, but that local funds meant the AMATS program, STP, NHS, state projections, the AMATS projected financial plan. He did not think Mr. Flynn was talking about bond funds, although it also includes bond funds, but he is not specific to the bond funds. Mr. Flynn's words "no local funds" meant the entire AMATS program as MR. WILBER understood his intention, which is basically what the last "whereas" in the ordinance encapsulizes, which is two separate accounts. He explained that when he read that he understood what Mr. Flynn meant, but someone else who was not in the discussion might see "local funds" and read central MOA funds because he knows the discussion from the Assembly was why they cannot spend municipal bonds, if we want to spend local tax dollars on the bridge why shouldn't they be able to, and the Assembly had said even if they had the ability to, we should not, and he noted they would not have the ability because we do not own it, and it would not be a Municipal facility. He stated this was his interpretation of "no local funds"; it means keep them separate. He suggested that Mr. Flynn may need to clarify that when he sees it at the Policy Committee.

MS. WITT indicated she had the same interpretation as Mr. Wilber, which she would apply to the first sentence. She also noted she interpreted the last one that says it is a guidance as a Municipal Assembly themselves that they do not intend to use any local bond funds.

MR. WILBER thinks the issue is whether the TAC supports a firewall or not, and that then Mr. Flynn can argue his point.

MR. HANSEN asked if the TAC can make a recommendation to the Policy Committee to define the meaning of local funds. He thinks it would best to have a recommendation that a better definition be made. MS. WITT suggested the TAC could also provide that definition.

MR. WEAVER thinks the TAC needs to define what “beyond that which is currently authorized” means as well. He asked if it was the \$40 million plus the \$150 million, and it would be helpful to know because the State may go back for additional authorizations under Page 6-32, but then AMATS would have to come back and say the MTP is not fiscally constrained, which is what would need to be done. However, he noted no one has defined what is currently authorized either, which he thinks is confusing.

MS. WITT noted this is the same language that was adopted last time with these same questions.

MR. SPRING stated he thinks it is slightly different. He explained the old plan on Page 13 of Chapter 12 of the amended part of the plan talks about the financial tables for the KAC project at the time it was adopted, and it included the list of federal, state, earmarks, but did not include any local funds because no local funds were part of that financial package. He indicated it is not referring to the revenues calculated for the implementation of the MTP, and the original statement was only referring to the KAC. He thinks Mr. Flynn has substantially changed the language in that instead of just referring to the tables of the KAC, he is referring to the AMATS financial estimates and projections for the entire plan because he does not reference any tables related to the KAC financial plan like what was done previously. Although it does not look like it is exactly the same, he thinks Mr. Flynn tried to make it the same. He noted Assembly Member Flynn stated in the Assembly hearing that it was his intent to replicate that, but he does not think it turned out exactly that way.

MS. HEIL moved to amend the motion to recommend approval of the recommendation by the Assembly. MR. CARR seconded. ***This motion was WITHDRAWN.***

CHAIR MORMILO opened the discussion to public comments.

JAMIE KENWORTHY testified. He thinks it is clear from the discussion at the Assembly and in talking to Assembly members, both the seven people who voted for this and the two that did not vote for this amendment made clear the State could spend money on the Knik Bridge, and they had no power to tell the State what they could do. However, he noted the Assembly members were concerned about the toll deficits so this ordinance was directed to the State funds

going to AMATS as Mr. Wilber said. He further noted the Assembly was concerned about the effect of the toll shortfall on the State-expected funding for AMATS, and it was directed at those funds. He indicated with regard to the \$150 million that HB158 did not pass in this session of the legislature so there is no \$150 million, and there is no State guarantee.

JUDY DOUGHERTY with KABATA testified. She stated she appreciated the discussion noting it was a good discussion, and she thinks Mr. Wilber is right that it is the program funds that everyone is concerned about. She recommended that in the final paragraph of the amendment where it currently says “no funding currently planned for implementation” be modified to state “no AMATS program funds currently planned.” She indicated she did not know the procedure, but asked the TAC to ask the Policy Committee to make that clarification. She noted elsewhere in the plan it is specific on Pages 6-30 and 6-31 that the KAC as planned does not jeopardize federal program funds or state general funds directed by the legislature for projects, which is appropriate. She stated she is really pleased with being able to work with the plan organizing committee to work out this language and to give everyone a better understanding of how the KAC financing is intended to work. That being said, she noted she hears Mr. Morton’s concern in that the State has the priority over State NHS funds and that is not clear in that final sentence, which says the Assembly has presented it. She noted with that in there she is sure KABATA will be confronted time and time again with having broken its promises, or not being in compliance with the plan. She encouraged through this process that this particular paragraph be a little more specific and more aligned with the intent of the Assembly.

MS. WITT thanked Ms. Dougherty for the recommendation for modifying what is before the TAC. She asked that since this language, with one exception of referring to two specific tables, was in the adopted 2007 LRTP whether this language had impeded KABATA’S ability to develop and get approval for its pro forma financial plan through FHWA. She clarified her question noting the language before the TAC is very similar, if not almost identical without reference to two tables, to what was already in the 2007 adopted plan, and whether the way the language in the 2007 LRTP impeded KABATA from successfully getting approval of its pro forma agreement through FHWA, which it apparently did not. MS. DOUGHERTY confirmed it did not. MS. WITT indicated it has not really come up because elsewhere in the plan it does recognize the State controls the NHS funds in cooperation with AMATS through the MPO.

In response, MS. DOUGHERTY stated KABATA’S concern is more with the public perception of what that means. She referred to the announcement from the Alaska Center for the Environment that the firewall is back in place and no State money will go to the bridge and indicated that is how the ordinance is perceived.

MS. WITT noted she had not been able to track the announcement all the way back to how it really happened because when she reads that announcement it is incorrect. MS. DOUGHERTY agreed, but stated that is how the Assembly’s action was perceived and that is KABATA’S concern.

MR. WILBER moved to amend the main motion to approve for recommendation the second Assembly amendment adding two new paragraphs under “conclusion” as recommended by the POC with an edit to the last paragraph to read “No AMATS program funding currently planned for...” as proposed by staff. MS. HEIL seconded.

This motion refers to the “second item,” which is to add a new paragraph under Conclusions on Page 6-32, and with Mr. Wilber’s edit would be changed to read 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 **AMATS program** 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.

Discussion on the motion by the TAC followed.

With regard to AMATS program funds, MS. WITT asked whether that is the only money AMATS has control over, which is \$22 to \$24 million per year. In response, MR. WILBER stated his intention was to incorporate it all, AMATS programmed or planned funds.

MR. SPRING suggested referring to the revenue projection table in Chapter 6, which identifies the projected future revenues. He identified those revenue sources as state, federal and local.

MR. RUDOLPH referred the TAC to the tables on Pages 6-13, 6-14 and 6-5 of the draft MTP.

MR. CARR noted it includes our estimation of State funding, and if the State, for whatever reason, decides the priority is the KAC, then AMATS may get less State money, and AMATS has no control over that. He further noted people need to be aware that AMATS cannot tell the State what to do.

MS. WITT thinks the MTP acknowledges AMATS did the best it could with what they had to work with, the number they developed was conservative, and it was based on an average in which one year the amount was zero. She also noted with this 20-year plan there will be five more new plans before reaching 2035.

MR. CARR, addressing Ms. Dougherty’s comment, noted there is going to have to be a leap of logic to some extent to say “oh, AMATS had planned \$25 million this year in State funding, and

they only got \$15 million and you are out spending money, and oh that must be why AMATS only got \$15.” He indicated there could be any number of reasons why AMATS did not get what was projected, and first of all because it is a projection. He stated AMATS is not going to program any funds for the KAC, and whatever is in the MTP table, whatever AMATS gets from whatever source they get, he thinks what AMATS is saying is we are not going to spend money on the KAC.

MS. DOUGHERTY questioned to what degree the State is comfortable with allowing AMATS to make that determination.

In that case, MR. CARR thinks the State should be very comfortable because once it does come into the AMATS, it is AMATS’ control with the exception of the NHS.

MS. HEIL noted it would still have to get on the TIP and found to conform. She indicated if it is in the Municipality air quality conformity area, then AMATS still has in those areas control of their money.

MS. DOUGHERTY stated she is not challenging that in any way.

MR. WILBER suggested a minor change to his recommendation. Instead of saying “no AMATS program funding currently planned,” he suggested “no funding currently planned for AMATS project implementation of the existing Metropolitan Transportation Plan shall be used to support ... and reference Tables 6-5 and 6-6.”

With this change, MR. WILBER indicating he was trying to get to the point. He thinks Ms. Dougherty had a good point, and that is to be as clear as possible whenever possible so people do not read one paragraph and get it confused with another. Mr. Wilber’s point is the program funds or the funds currently planned for implementation of the AMATS projects will not be used for the Knik Arm Bridge. He thinks that is the intention of the direction of the plan, and whether it is a State decision later, or a TIP or STIP decision that is moot. He thinks what we are trying to get is the intentions of MPO’s MTP.

MR. MORTON was concerned about whether there is exposure from some type of legal challenge if State allocations come in differently than what AMATS is saying, or creating the potential for any consistency when we do not have to. He thinks AMATS can express the intent, but asked if AMATS is doing more than that.

MR. WILBER indicated he is just trying to meet the intent that is the MPO’s policy and their intention that there should be no redirection of funds to the bridge that might otherwise planned for the rest of the network. He thinks that is the intention the plan is setting forward as he understands for the purpose of the firewall and as AMATS set the program and the financial plan. He thinks there will be a lot of healthy discussion about it in the future as well.

MS. DOUGHERTY does not think Mr. Weaver's concern has been addressed regarding the term "authorized funds." In response, MR. WEAVER indicated it was addressed to clarify to some degree as he was not aware that the \$150 million failed, and it looks like there is approximately \$40 plus million left of what has been currently authorized.

MS. DOUGHERTY did not think the plan is an authorizing document, and it does not authorize funds. MR. WEAVER indicated it just recognizes what happened historically, currently authorized and that is all it says.

MS. WITT asked whether Mr. Wilber would keep the language "beyond that which is currently authorized" in the plan as stated. MR. WILBER confirmed he would keep the rest of the language the same and that would be his motion.

MS. WITT asked if this is his interpretation of what it means to be that which is currently authorized.

MR. WILBER indicated that was what Mr. Flynn intended.

MR. WILBER thinks what it means is that if they have money already authorized they should not get any more.

MR. WILBER called for the question.

MR. WILBER was asked to read his motion with his modified language. In response, MR. WILBER restated his motion clarifying the recommended language would remain the same with the exception of the last paragraph, which would state:

No funding currently planned for AMATS project implementation of the existing Metropolitan 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.

MR. CARR called for a point of order noting Mr. Wilber had not added Table 6-5 and 6-6. This omission was corrected, and the proposed amended language was again restated to read as follows:

No funding currently planned for AMATS project implementation of the existing Metropolitan Transportation Plan shown in Tables 6-5 and 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."

The TAC voted on the modified motion to amend, which now reads in its entirety as follows:

Move amend the main motion to approve for recommendation the second Assembly amendment adding two new paragraphs under “conclusion” as recommended by the POC with an edit to the last paragraph to read “No funding currently planned for AMATS project implementation of the existing Metropolitan Transportation Plan shown in Tables 6-5 and 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.”

The motion with the modified language passed 8 to 1 with Mr. Morris opposed.

MS. WITT moved to amend the last paragraph to remove the words “beyond that which is currently authorized.” MS. HEIL seconded.

MS. WITT thinks the motion passed by AMATS clarified the language well by saying “no funding currently planned for AMATS project implementation of the existing Metropolitan Transportation Plan shown in Tables 6-5 and 6-6 shall be used to support...” She thinks the word “authorized” is confusing and can mean different things depending on what kind of funds you are typically using such as a legislative authority. MS. WITT stated because she is that conflicted, she would like to delete it.

MR. CARR supports the motion because he thinks you can get further confused when you say “currently authorized,” and whether that is 2012, 2013, and he thinks it is not necessary.

MR. WILBER does not disagree with the points made by Ms. Witt or Mr. Carr, but he is opposed to removing the language.

The motion passed 8 to 1 with Mr. Wilber opposed.

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.

*POC does not recommend wholesale changes to the initial scoring criteria at this time (see comment-response for Table 8-1 on page 8-2). However, clarification of last criteria (Cost/Benefit) is needed. Recommend changing the criteria to Cost/(length*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 produce the most benefits per dollar cost.*

TAC Discussion/Action

MR. SPRING explained there was some concern at the Assembly with regard to the initial screening criteria for roadways, the impact this would have on the projects in rural areas, and that it might be biased against projects with low traffic volumes without multi-modal type amenities. As a result, he noted the Assembly recommended the TAC review the template method probably with an expectation that might happen at some future date. He indicated there was one clarification the Assembly specifically pointed out, which involved the cost/benefit criteria. He thinks the way it is written in the MTP is confusing because it has “Cost/length/AADT,” and it would be hard for the general public to calculate it and understand what it really means. MR. SPRING suggested staff change the formula to be more easily recognized as a cost divided by the benefits and would read “cost/(length*AADT).” He also noted a change to clarify the first quartile (5 points) is the lowest score because the more benefits you have per cost the lower the score and the higher the points.

MR. SPRING confirmed the Assembly had no expectation the projects would be rescored.

MS. HEIL asked if it would be helpful to include something that the criteria will be looked at as part of the next update to the MTP. MR. KATSION stated this is mentioned in “see comments response for Table 8-1 on Page 8-2” and that it will be discussed later. Although this was not included in the TAC’s version, MR. SPRING stated this would be reviewed at a later date.

MS. HEIL moved to amend the main motion to approve the POC recommendation on Amendment 3 changing the last criteria to Cost/(length*AADT) and clarifying that the first quartile (5 points) is the lowest score because the more benefits you have per cost the lower the score and the higher the points. MR. MORRIS seconded.

MS. WITT clarified and it was confirmed the TAC is voting to accept the POC’s recommendation.

Hearing no objections, this motion passed unanimously.

Table 7-3 on page 7-19

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:*** Capacity and safety. ***Facility class:*** Collector. ***Length of project:*** 1.2 miles. ***Length on new sidewalk:*** None. ***Length of new pathway:*** None. ***Linked projects:*** None

POC recommends approval. The 2006 Chugiak-Eagle River Transportation Plan recommended breaking out the Hiland Road Improvement project into two phases with the first phase (MP 2.2 to MP 3.4) recommended for the short-term list.

TAC Discussion/Action

MR. SPRING noted this amendment for a project addition is balanced later by a deletion of projects, and as such, the financial plan remained intact. He explained Hiland Road from Mile 1 to the end of the road was previously one project in the illustrative, and in the existing Chugiak-Eagle River Plan, which adopted 4 years ago, actually divided Hiland Road into two projects, short-range and long-range. The short-range project in the existing plan is from Mile 2.2 to 3.4, which is the more heavily traveled part of the road and has an estimated cost of \$6.8 million. He noted this is a rehab project that does not expand the capacity with shoulders, and it does not affect the air quality conformity.

MS. WITT noted the description states the purpose for this addition is capacity and safety. She indicated Hiland is such a low volume road that she wondered if it was an error to include the word “capacity.” MR. SPRING recommended changing the purpose to “safety” only.

MR. WILBER thinks this project addition is a good idea because the lower section does need support.

CHAIR MORMILO asked for public comments.

JOAN DIAMOND and NANCY PEASE, members of the board of Rabbit Creek Community Council, testified on the community council’s behalf.

MS. PEASE noted the Rabbit Creek Community Council’s comments were submitted previously in October, and they also asked their assembly members to bring them up at the April 10 Assembly meeting. She indicated the response she received was the Assembly has repeated several times that the MTP is advisory, and details of local specific projects would be addressed in the public process once funding was available. She stated they were not comfortable with that

as it is a printed document, and as they understand it the document that gets the funding. They wanted to make sure their concerns are heard before the document is finalized.

MS. PEASE referred to Table 7-3, Project 131, Mountain Air Drive. She noted it targets \$7.9 million to put in a new connection for Rabbit Creek Road south to 164th Avenue. She explained their concern is this project is in the design stage, its cost has gone up already, and the project has already shrunk to the point that it really does not offer the public benefits it is supposed to. She noted it does not connect to 164th Avenue any more; it crosses a creek, goes right to the edge of a large private subdivision tract and stops. As such, she stated it does not provide connectivity and egress from Golden View Drive, which is about a two mile long cul de sac. She indicated it was suppose to take pressure off Golden View Road, but instead what it does is put more subdivision homes and traffic onto Rabbit Creek Road putting more burden on the intersection. She stated it has public funding now, and the only benefits is it is kind of a bridge to nowhere across the creek to the private subdivision. She thinks if it is going to be funded with public funds, and the public funds have been appropriated, it really needs to be a complete project; otherwise it is only a private benefit and some public congestion. As such, she stated their request is that the funding be appropriate to the original project, and right now the design shows the funding will only go part way.

MS. PEASE noted Mr. Wilber is familiar with this project and did a subarea transportation study on it. She encouraged his input. She stated this is the position of Rabbit Creek Community Council, which is to fund this project so that it provides community benefits; it is public funding.

MS. WITT was not clear on the recommendation noting the MTP shows this project in the short-term, but noted the recognition is that ultimately the entire project would be constructed, and it would not be just a stub to a private development. She asked what they would ask to be changed on the project line.

In response, MS. PEASE stated it would be the amount of funding because it says \$7.9 million to extend the road to 164th Avenue, but the design is already far enough along that \$8 million only takes it partway to 152nd Avenue. She indicated they already know from the design work that has been done that the funding amount does not fund the project. She stated half the project is not a public benefit, and it actually adds to congestion on the existing roads. MS. PEASE thinks if it is going to be a publicly funded road, it needs to be funded completely so it provides public benefits.

In response to MS. WITT, MS. PEASE confirmed the issue is the estimate shown is inadequate based on current issues.

MR. WILBER noted the \$7.9 million in the MTP for that terminus is based on a cost and estimate when the plan was developed for this project and all of the projects in 2010. He thinks the information for \$7.9 million is accurate because the number was generated for an estimate in 2010 dollars. He noted there are many projects in the MTP where there may be more up-to-date

costs in 2012 that could be adjusted, but then all the projects would not be in constant dollars for future inflation. As such, he would not recommend AMATS change it. He still thinks the project has merit, and he hopes Ms. Pease agrees that there is merit to a roadway connection between Rabbit Creek Road and 164th Avenue even if the dollar numbers are slightly low as of the information they would have today. He noted even though the current scope may go to 152nd, he does not think AMATS should make a change. He thinks AMATS should recognize there are new cost estimates for this project, and as the project gets developed it is planned to be supported with State funds, but he does not think AMATS should change the plans because the 2010 cost estimate was \$7.9 million; it is just the terminus is a little bit different.

MS. PEASE stated it is important to Rabbit Creek Community Council that the project be recognized that it needs to go to 164th Avenue in order for any public benefits to accrue from this investment.

MR. WILBER thinks the plan is consistent with that and says 164th Avenue.

MS. PEASE stated the reality is the money will not get you there.

MR. WILBER clarified that the money AMATS has today will not get us there, but the plan is to get to 164th Avenue, which would be consistent with what AMATS wants to do.

MR. HANSEN noted currently there is a legislative grant of \$4.5 million, which gets the project part way there. He thinks the preferred alignment they have now will get the project down to that subdivision, and he noted the developer is required to construct that road to tie in there. However, he stated they do need money for the intersection at Rabbit Creek Road because it is in bad shape.

MS. PEASE discussed Project 317 in Table 7-5, a proposed extension of Elmore Road from DeArmoun Road to Rabbit Creek Road. She indicated earlier Mr. Spring told them the project was removed, but their latest information is the project is on the illustrative list, the list for after 2035. She explained their concern as a community council is that if it is anywhere on any list it needs to be presented as it was proposed in the Hillside District Plan, which is as a study area. She indicated what appears in the MTP is a specific length of roadway with specific amenities. She stated the community has spoken out definitively that this is an area of complexity, and a study area is the place to begin. She noted it may only be on the illustrative, but if it is still on the illustrative list the Council would like it put in as a study area, not a one mile collector with this pedestrian path for the future.

In response, MR. SPRING confirmed their intent was to designate it as a study area. He noted they have a figure that includes all the study areas, and it shows that particular project. He indicated it does not hurt to have a placeholder in the MTP for when the project is done, which can be moved into the long-range or short-range plan. However, he reiterated the intent was to

make it a study area consistent with the Hillside District Plan. He had no objections to removing it from the illustrative until the study is done.

MS. WITT asked about the impact of this to other maps and tables in the plan. MR. KATSION indicated they would have to look at that noting if it comes off the current document it will change the numbering and other things. MR. SPRING noted it is not on the recommended roadway map as it is illustrative, and the only renumbering that would have to be done would be in the illustrative table.

MS. HEIL asked if it could be changed to “study area,” and refer back to where it is in the study and leave it blank. MR. SPRING noted there are 12 study areas, and he was not sure he would put just one specific study area in it. MS. HEIL clarified she would change it to refer to what study area it is included in instead of giving a project implicit description replacing the description with “refer to study area blank” and leave it in there so the tables number are not changed.

MS. WITT commented it could be left in as written, and adding a sentence to “refer to study area” so it is clear that it is a study area.

MS. HEIL noted it could change, and thinks the point Ms. Pease was making is AMATS should not have a scope, description or purpose for the project until the study is done. She is suggesting replacing the language with a reference to whichever study the particular area that is going to be studied, and wherever else it is listed in the plan.

MR. SPRING noted whether or not the project is in the illustrative, it will not get funded until the study area is done.

MS. PEASE testified on Project 311 in Table 7-5, Seward Highway, Rabbit Creek Road to the Potter Weigh Station. She indicated there were two issues. The first one is the project is on the illustrative list and will not be addressed in 2035. She noted this section of roadway is two lanes along Potter March and because of the traffic loads and the hazards from all the vehicles stopping, the Community Council feels it should be addressed sooner rather than later. She stated they are hopeful that it can be pulled into the long-term before 2035. She indicated the second concern the Community Council had with Project 311 is it is unclear whether the Old Seward Highway on the east side of Potter Marsh is included in that project, but they would definitely like it to be addressed in the near term because of the safety hazards of that stretch of road. She referred to frost heaves and sometimes flooding from snow melt, and commented that it is basically a road built in 1950's with drop-offs on the sides that go down about 30 or 40 feet, the white lines for the shoulders are sometimes in the weeds because there is not enough pavement, and walkers and pedestrians are in the traffic lanes. She indicated as the hillside above develops, and there are 160 to 200 acres tracts that are being platted and brought on line, there will be more traffic on that road. She stated the Community Council requests Old Seward Highway east of Potter Marsh be put into the near or mid-term list before 2035.

MS. WITT noted this is a National Highway System route, and she suggested AMATS take another look at that project as part of the next MTP update because it is currently not funded. She noted the MTP process will start again in another 6 months, and she thinks it would be appropriate to look at it again. She indicated this project fell out because of the other NHS priorities. She noted with the Old Seward Highway being a State route it is not in the MTP specifically, but she thinks it needs to be looked at.

MR. SPRING clarified Project 311 does not include the Old Seward Highway; it is simply the Seward Highway, and also that the Old Seward Highway is not in this plan at all. He noted the reason it is not listed is that similar to other collectors in Anchorage, particularly those collectors in ARDSA, a lot of bond money is spent for collectors and to upgrade collectors. He indicated this is similar to other collectors in the Anchorage service not in the MTP. He noted it is a minor collector, which should probably be funded through bonds, but that cannot be done outside ARDSA.

MR. KATSION clarified on Table 7-5 that Project 317 is wrong. He stated Project 317 was changed previously through the comments. He indicated Ms. Pease was correct in that Elmore Road was moved to a study area and should be removed from the illustrative list. He noted Project 317 is actually the Minnesota Drive Frontage Road from Dimond Boulevard to Raspberry Road, and the description needs to be changed. He also noted this change was previously approved by AMATS.

MR. WILBER moved to amend the main motion to approve Item 4, Table 7-3 regarding dividing the Hiland Road Project (by adding Project 140 to the short-term list), to edit as staff recommended and as supported by the POC, and amended under purpose to strike “capacity” and leave “safety.” MS. HEIL seconded.

Hearing no objections, the motion passed unanimously.

Table 7-3 on page 7-21

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: Capacity and safety. Facility class: Collector. Length of project: 6.1 miles. Length on new sidewalk: None. Length of new pathway: None. Linked projects: None

POC recommends approval. The 2027 Chugiak-Eagle River Long-Range Transportation Plan recommended breaking out the Hiland Road Improvement project into two phases with the second phase (MP 1.0 to MP2.2 and MP 3.4 to MP 8.3) recommended for the long-term list. In order to maintain financial constraint a project of equal cost needs to be moved to the illustrative list (see comment below).

TAC Discussion/Action

MR. SPRING noted this change adds the second phase of Hiland Road, Mile 1.0 to 2.2 and Mile 3.4 to 8.3, to the long-term project list at a cost of \$24.9 million. For consistency, he recommended striking “capacity” under purpose since it is a safety project.

There were no public comments.

MR. WEAVER moved to approve amending the main motion with this change (replacing existing Project 208, South Birchwood Loop with new Project 208, Hiland Road Improvements in the long-term list) to include eliminating the word “capacity.” MR. CARR seconded.

Hearing no objections, the motion passed unanimously.

Table 7-5 on page 7-36

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).

POC recommends approval. In order to maintain financial constraint, the South Birchwood Loop Improvement project needs to be moved to the illustrative list. The Assembly felt that there wasn’t public support for a reconstruction of South Birchwood Loop Road and that a simple repaving was all that is necessary.

TAC Discussion/Action

MR. SPRING explained this amendment is a housekeeping issue to resort the project list deleting the Hiland Road Improvement Project from the illustrative because it is now on the short-term list, and replacing it with South Birchwood Loop Improvement Project, which was deleted from the long-term.

There were no public comments.

MR. HANSEN moved to approve amending the main motion with this amendment deleting Project 308, Hiland Road Improvement and replacing with South Birchwood Loop Improvement (formerly Project 208). MR. CARR seconded.

Hearing no objections, the motion passed unanimously.

Table 7-5 on page 7-38

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

POC Comment. While the Assembly did not pass an actual amendment regarding this issue, the lack of information regarding the funding of the Knik Arm Ferry appeared to create some confusion among the Assembly members and the public.

TAC Discussion/Action

MR. SPRING explained this amendment is the addition of language under funding sources in Table 7-5 on Page 7-38. He noted originally there was no funding source for the Knik Arm Ferry as it was not part of the AMATS allocation. He noted the clarification from the Assembly requests adding the wording “assumes Matanuska-Susitna Borough funding,” which is our understanding of where the source of the money will come from.

MR. CARR asked if this was related to the ferry landing, or the ferry operations and maintenance. The consensus was that it was the landing, and more specifically just the terminal. MR. SPRING noted it is a capital project.

There were no public comments.

MS. HEIL moved to amend the main motion to approve this amendment to add a sentence under the 2010 cost estimate column for Project 321, Knik Arm Ferry) to read “Assumes Matanuska-Susitna Borough funding.” MR. HANSEN seconded.

Hearing no objections, the motion passed unanimously.

Table 7-3 on page 7-14

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

POC recommends approval. Public testimony was divided on need for conversion of Spenard Road from 4 lanes to 3 lanes. Revision to project description is designed to give designers more flexibility.

Table 7-3 on page 7-16

Assembly Amendment – Revise description of Project 121 (Spenard Road Rehabilitation (Benson to Minnesota) as follows: [Rehabilitate from 4 to 2 lanes] 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.

POC recommends approval. Public testimony pointed out problems with access to businesses that could potentially occur as a result of the conversion of Spenard and 36th to a couplet.

TAC Discussion/Action

At the TAC’s request, MR. SPRING jointly addressed Project 112 on Page 7-14 and Project 121 on Page 7-16 in Table 7-3 as both projects relate to Spenard Road. He indicated there was considerable discussion on whether or not Spenard Road should be converted from a four lane to a three lane road, and discussion regarding the feasibility and desirability of making a couplet out of 36th Avenue and Spenard Road. He explained in order to give more flexibility to the designers the recommendation was to delete “Rehabilitate from four to two lanes” and replace with “Rehabilitate to improve traffic flows,” and this change would apply to both projects. He noted Project 121 involves the couplet with an additional motion asking for more study of feasibility and impact to local properties with respect to the one-way couplet including adequate access for property owners onto the couplet. Cook Inlet Housing would like to redevelop the old PJ’s site, which is on the couplet, and MR. SPRING indicated they foresee major access problems with entering or exiting onto a one-way street. He noted the Assembly did not change it much, but just requested that the impacts of the couplet on those properties be considered.

MS. WITT indicated one of the things that was not clear or understood by the Assembly when they had this discussion was the couplet is to relieve congestion on Minnesota, and it has a big impact on that facility and the signal timing. With regard to feasibility and impact analysis on local projects, she noted this is done for every project. She asked why it should be done for this project and not others and suggested the Committee should discuss it.

MR. WEAVER thinks the Assembly intent was they did not want to presuppose what the conclusion would be and just tried to put in some language that would say this process would be gone through consistently for each project.

MR. MORTON indicated we do that for every project.

MR. SPRING thinks the Assembly's inclination was to eliminate the couplet, but they realized it might cause some problems with such things as the conformity analysis, and this is their compromise, which was not to eliminate the couplet and just ask that the impacts be looked at before anything is done.

MR. HANSEN noted and Mr. Spring concurred we already do this, but thinks the Assembly just wants to make sure it is done.

MR. MORTON noted they should discuss the feasibility of reducing travel or delay of the 30,000 people who travel Minnesota every day.

With regard to the feasibility and impact analysis, CHAIR MORMILO noted the change does say "impact analysis on local properties," and she thinks it means you have to look at the impact on local properties and the impact on the overall traffic system.

MR. LYON noted the key was not what the Assembly added it, but what they took out. He indicated the Assembly understands this is done to improve traffic flow, and impact analyses are done, but they were suggesting that what is in the MTP now says "four lanes to two lanes," and they were not wanting to presuppose what the designer should do, to have the flexibility to come up with whatever is the best solution, and not say the MTP requires it to be from four to two.

CHAIR MORMILO agreed for that part of the discussion, but not for the couplet.

With regard to the description, MR. MORRIS thought AMATS might want to add "rehabilitate to improve traffic flow and pedestrian facilities." He thinks it seems like the intent of the project is more than just to improve traffic flow.

MR. SPRING clarified the rest of the language does include pedestrian amenities.

ANNE BROOKS commented there have been a number of projects she has been working on where the economic cost of the safety improvement is not identified, and she was not sure that was part of their analysis. She noted she has some history with this project that there is an economic cost of continually degrading safety in the corridor. She indicated she did not want to muddy things up, but she wanted to mention they do look at economic feasibility when they do their documentation. She thinks some of what they asked was to look at the business impacts, and it maybe a different way than they typically do. She thinks it might behoove us on some of these projects for safety as the real driver to look at the economic impacts of safety as well. She

indicated she is not sure it is important to change that in the tables, but in general we need to think about the economic impacts of safety.

MR. HANSEN moved to approve the amendment for Project 112 and Project 121 as recommended. MR. WILBER seconded.

MR. WILBER suggested an additional edit to Project 121 to delete “with a center turn lane.” He believes the Assembly’s intention was to “rehabilitate to improve traffic flow” by striking out “rehabilitate from 2 to 4 lanes,” but including a center turn lane would increase the project to five lanes. MR. HANSEN concurred.

MR. HANSEN withdrew his motion and substituted a motion to amend the main motion to approve the recommendation for Project 112 changing “Rehabilitate from 4 to 2 lanes” to “Rehabilitate to improve traffic flow.” MR. MORRIS seconded.

Hearing no objections, the motion passed unanimously.

MR. HANSEN moved to amend the main motion to recommend approval of Project 121 changing “Rehabilitate from 4 to 2 lanes” to “Rehabilitate to improve traffic flow” and removal of “with a center turn lane.” MR. WILBER seconded.

The motion passed 7 to 2 with Mr. Morton and Ms. Witt opposed.

Table 7-7 on page 7-44

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.

POC recommends approval. Restoration of former Chugiak-Eagle River routes 77/78 is recommended in the most recently adopted People Mover Blueprint Plan.

TAC Discussion/Action

MR. SPRING explained this change is for the addition of a new transit project, Project 825 to the long-term project list. He indicated this was an attempt to restore local bus service to Chugiak-Eagle River. He noted a couple years ago Route 77 and 78 were eliminated in project cuts, and the feeling by at least by the Assembly Chair was the fact Eagle River is growing so fast that eventually bus service is going to need to be restored out there to accommodate the increase in

travel demand. He noted the cost estimate for this project is zero because according to the Transit Director the existing bus fleet is capable of handling the original route.

Mr. Weaver left at 3:48 p.m.

There were no public comments.

MS. WITT moved amend the main motion to approve this change adding a new transit project 825 to restore Chugiak-Eagle River local bus service to the long-term list as recommended. MS. HANSEN seconded.

Hearing no objection, the motion passed unanimously.

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.”

POC recommends approval. Assembly feels that more work is needed on the initial scoring criteria if it is going to be used in future Transportation Plans.

TAC Discussion/Action

MR. SPRING explained this amendment is for the addition of an action item on Page 8-2. He noted AMATS had previously discussed the dissatisfaction with the initial screening criteria, and there would be an additional action item to study those screening criteria at a later date, refine them, and to take into considerations some of the biases that were pointed out regarding the impacts on rural road priorities. He stated this proposed change is intended to do this.

There were no public comments.

MR. HANSEN moved to amend the main motion to approve this change adding a new action item CP-E to update and refine initial screening criteria as recommended. MS. HEIL seconded.

Hearing no objection, the motion passed unanimously.

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.”

POC recommends approval. The CBERRRSA Board is responsible for maintaining MOA roads in this subarea of the community. As a result, the Assembly felt that it was appropriate for the Board to agree to any increase in maintenance cost resulting from MOA roadway reconstruction project.

TAC Discussion/Action

MR. SPRING noted this relates to a section of the plan implementation which refers to priorities in Chugiak-Eagle River and the financing. MR. SPRING explained the concern in Chugiak-Eagle River is they have their own local road service area, and the local service area is responsible for setting priorities for maintenance and spending money on maintenance. He noted they would like some influence or input into the road design, as well as some upfront agreement as to what the cost estimates for the maintenance would be (probably involving landscaping on rural roads for sidewalks and trails) so they can agree upon it before the design is implemented.

MS. BROOKS thinks “implementation” is broad and that AMATS should specify what “implementation” is such as prior to construction. She also asked when it would be appropriate in the process to have that agreement in place.

MS. WITT explained “implementation” is prior to opening a design phase. MR. MORTON noted it could be years before construction because otherwise once all the money is spent in design development the impetus is the building regardless.

MS. BROOKS suggested “prior to project initiation.”

MS. WITT indicated it would not be known at that phase what the maintenance costs would be because it would not be know what the facilities would be.

MR. MORTON noted if the question were a pathway, for example, and the question is who will maintain it, then it ought to be determined upfront.

MR. WILBER asked if in the current Municipal/ADOT&PF agreement on design review there is a step that seeks comment and commitment on the maintenance prior to 65% noting the entity responsible for maintenance will know at that point what it will look like. He thinks there is an agreement or some conversation about the maintenance before a project gets to right-of-way, utilities and construction, and it is in the design phase. MR. MORTON indicated this varies on the type of project.

MR. HANSEN noted this was the agreement between the State and the Municipality. He noted this change specifically refers to CBERRRSA having a say in whether they want that project out there because if it is a Municipal road they will be responsible for maintenance. He indicated Ms. Brooks was probably correct, and if AMATS just changes the language to something to the effect of “prior to project initiation.” He noted they do not want to spend money on design, and then have CBERRRSA say not to.

CHAIR MORMILO suggested “prior to design development,” and MR. HANSEN concurred.

MR. MORTON noted it is “prior to the environmental document” for the State and suggested “project initiation.” MR. HANSEN concurred with “prior to project initiation.”

MS. DOUGHERTY commented that it should be a planning activity.

MS. WITT noted it is part of the scoping of the TIP.

MR. HANSEN moved to amend the main motion to send the recommendation forward to add a new bullet that “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” and changing “prior to implementation” to “prior to project initiation.” MS. HEIL seconded.

Hearing no objection, the motion passed unanimously.

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.”

POC recommends 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.”

TAC Discussion/Action

MR. SPRING discussed this proposed amendment, which would add a new bullet to Page 8-3, but the POC recommended a bullet under Page 8-6 under Transportation System Policy. He explained there has been a long-standing concern that large tracts of undeveloped land need to have subarea transportation plans done. He noted this can be found in a number of places in the plan, but a specific action item was requested.

MR. WILBER moved to amend the main motion approving this change to add a new bullet to “Conduct subarea transportation planning in Chugiak-Eagle River in areas without a designated

collector system,” and moving it to Page 8-6 under Transportation System Policy Recommendations as recommended by staff. MR. HANSEN seconded.

MS. UNDERWOOD noted this issue has come up before, and she asked if this was an assumption that AMATS would fund those studies because they would have problems funding those special studies.

MR. SPRING noted there is a project in both the short- and long-term, which has a list of different miscellaneous types of projects, and this was included in that list. He further noted there is \$6 million in short-term and \$6 million in long-term, and a number of projects could be funded doing that, and it could be funded through TIP.

Hearing no objections, this motion passed unanimously.

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.”

POC recommends approval with the following modifications: Move bullet to page 8-12 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.”

TAC Discussion/Action

MR. SPRING noted this proposed amendment would add a new bullet related to Chugiak-Eagle River. He explained the original recommendation was to put this bullet under Page 8-3, and the POC recommends putting it under Page 8-12. He clarified the POC was recommending slightly different language in this bullet and in the last bullet discussed. He indicated the feeling is rural areas cannot be subject to urban standards.

MR. HANSEN commented Anchorage Municipal Code Title 21 dictates what the amenities are on roadways, and asked how this change would interrelate with it. He did not know if this would have any standing.

CHAIR MORMILO noted this change is a policy recommendation that says to “recognize that rural neighborhoods.” She also noted a change in the requirements would require a change in Title 21, but there are processes required.

MR. HANSEN noted this is just to recognize those areas may not want those amenities.

MS. MORMILO noted they are talking about their neighborhood roads, which are not in the MTP.

MS. UNDERWOOD thinks it would be good to clarify it is in Title 21 because right now they are reviewing a plat where people are talking about the “rural feel” of an area, and they have to keep going back to Title 21 to remind people it is zoning that is important not just the rural character or nature of the road, but the adjacent zoning. She thinks this change might mislead people leading them to feel like they have more clout.

MS. WITT asked if there was any harm done by adding the language. MS. MORMILO did not think so noting you cannot exempt people from code.

MS. WITT noted it addresses mostly neighborhood issues, and what is addressed in the MTP are mostly arterial roads and some collectors.

MS. MORMILO did not think adding anything about zoning would add anything to this statement.

MR. HANSEN noted this says “recognize,” and someone may desire these, but that is all it says.

MS. HEIL moved to amend the main motion with the POC recommendation to add a new bullet revised to read “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” and moving it to Page 8-12 under Non-Motorized System Policy recommendations. MR. HANSEN seconded.

Hearing no objections, this motion passed unanimously.

MS. WITT moved to extend the termination of this meeting for an additional 15 minutes to finish the MTP. MS. HEIL seconded.

Hearing no objection, the motion passed unanimously.

Table 8-4 on page 8-6

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

POC recommends approval. Sentence clarifies the use of the multi-modal standards and the intent to develop different standards for different geographic areas such as rural Chugiak-Eagle River and the Hillside.

TAC Discussion/Action

MR. SPRING discussed this proposed change to add a sentence to the end of action item TS-A. He noted this change would clarify how the multi-modal standards in the Highway Capacity Manual are applied to make sure it is clear there will be different LOS standards adopted for different areas of the Municipality of Anchorage. He further noted this would clarify the intent, which was to recognize differences in AARDSA communities.

MS. WITT noted congestion is more acceptable in certain areas.

There were no public comments.

MR. HANSEN moved to amend the main motion to recommend the recommendation to add a sentence to the end of action item TS-A to read “Different LOS standards will be adopted for different areas of the Municipality of Anchorage.” MS. HEIL seconded.

Hearing no objections, the motion passed unanimously.

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.”

POC recommends approval. New language emphasizes the context sensitive approach to roadway design and the fact that not all roadways require full urban standards.

TAC Discussion/Action

MR. SPRING explained the change to the first bullet is a revision to clarify design will take into consideration where appropriate non-motorized and public transportation facilities, and it will not be applied uniformly across the board in areas where it may not be appropriate. He noted the word “appropriate” was added, the word “all” deleted, and “public input” added. He indicated people in Chugiak-Eagle River would have some input, as well as the designers and Municipal agencies.

There were no public comments.

MS. WITT moved to amend the main motion to amend the MTP to accept POC’s recommendation revising the first road policy recommendation to read “Promote the integration of appropriate non-motorized, public transportation facilities and landscaping within new and major roadway construction projects through intra-departmental coordination and public input during the project scoping phase.” MS. HEIL seconded.

Hearing no objections, the motion passed unanimously.

MAIN MOTION

The TAC considered the main motion recommending approval of the MTP as amended with all the amendments approved at this meeting.

MR. MORRIS discussed the process the TAC went through, and how much time was spent reconciling KABATA'S socioeconomic data with AMATS' data, and the problems it caused throughout this process. He indicated at least a quarter of their time was spent on that particular subject. He thinks it would be good for the TAC to make some recommendations about how that process should occur the next time so it does not get bottled up in that issue. He emailed the TAC a draft resolution he thinks takes a step in that direction. He indicated the idea is to establish standardized socioeconomic assumptions that are used in transportation modeling in the region and ideally including the Mat-Su area that we can all use and agree upon. He noted if there are better ways of this, and KABATA or some other entity says they have better data, then AMATS should consider that, and there should be a process they can go through to convince or persuade people their numbers are better than the standardized numbers AMATS might be using at the time. However, he does not think AMATS should be in a position in future transportation planning where there is one set of assumptions being used here and another set being used there. He thinks AMATS saw how that worked through the whole MTP process. His personal view is the best time to make that recommendation to the Policy Committee is now to accompany a recommendation on the MTP itself. He asked for the TAC's thoughts on this.

MR. WILBER thinks as a matter of process the TAC should take action on the plan itself and forward the plan, and then make a separate motion with the resolution from Mr. Morris rather than combining it into the motion on the table.

MR. WILBER thinks Mr. Morris' idea is a good idea and looks forward to talking about it further.

MAIN MOTION

Hearing no objections, the motion as amended passed unanimously.

As a point of clarification for staff, MS. WITT stated the intent would be to present these comments with the Assembly recommendations and the TAC recommendation for the Policy Committee to choose from and approve with the understanding the Assembly has already taken action in terms of their Comprehensive Plan.

MS. WITT extended thanks to the project team with Gary Katsion, Anne Brooks, Bart Rudolph and Craig Lyon, and recognizing the work the POC did because it has not been an easy process. She stated the TAC is getting the MTP through to the Policy Committee and everyone should feel good about that, noting it has been difficult, and yet it has been handled professionally, and she appreciates the work they did.

MR. WILBER appreciated being able to work with Ms. Dougherty, Kevin Hemenway and others. Even if they do not always agree on everything or even the total method the fact of the matter is AMATS was able to present both sides of the issues. He suggested staff send out a thank you letter to the TAC+ members because they put a lot of time into this as well. He complimented Mr. Katsion, Ms. Brooks and Mr. Spring in putting together a professional looking document with a lot of good information that presents itself well.

MS. WITT also thanked Ms. Dougherty for her assistance. Ms. Dougherty appreciated being included noting she thinks it was really productive.

MR. WILBER thanked Mr. Kenworthy for hanging in there and providing a lot comments to AMATS.

Resolution

With regard to the resolution, MS. WITT suggested holding a work session because there is a lot of information for discussion in this. She also thinks Mr. Morris is right in that the Committee needs to come up with a way to better direct the next effort and find a way make it smoother.

MS. HEIL stated this needed to be done expeditiously while everyone is remembering everything.

MS. WITT recommended staff do a “doodle poll” and determine a time to hold the work session.

In terms of whether or not this issue is time sensitive, MR. MORRIS thinks it will lose its value after the MTP is approved by the Policy Committee. He thinks it would be nice if they could at least get this recommendation along with the AMATS MTP recommendation, and there is not much time to do that. He feels it will be lost if it is done later.

MS. HEIL suggested this could be put on the Policy Committee’s agenda as informational with draft on the document, and then at least they can see what TAC is working on.

MS. HEIL’S recommendation would be to send this as informational to the Policy Committee as what the TAC is working on as a preparation for the next MTP update because there were so many problems, and with “draft” clearly marked. She noted all it says is that the TAC is going to work on this and let the Policy Committee know about it. MR. HANSEN concurred.

MR. LYON noted informational items can be laid on the table, and the TAC can dress this document up at the work session.

MS. WITT noted she has issues and questions and would like the TAC to talk about this in a work session. She noted she appreciated Mr. Morris' taking the initiative to try and nail down some of the issues.

6. INFORMATION REPORTS - None

7. COMMITTEE COMMENTS

MR. CARR reported Train Day is on May 5th.

MR. HANSEN reported the annual Construction Coordination Meeting to lay out all the DOT, MOA and utility projects scheduled for this summer and the impacts is scheduled for May 3rd at 1:30 p.m. at the BP Energy Center.

8. SCHEDULED AMATS MEETINGS

Policy Committee, May 3, 2012

Technical Advisory Committee, May 10, 2012

9. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 4:13 p.m.