

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

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

**December 6, 2012
2:30 p.m.**

Technical Advisory Committee members Present:

Name	Representing
Jennifer Witt	Alaska Dept. of Transportation & Public Facilities (DOT&PF), Central Region, Planning
Ken Morton	DOT&PF, Central Region
Cindy Heil	Alaska Dept. of Environmental Conservation (ADEC)
Steve Morris	MOA/Dept. of Health & Human Services (DHHS)
Stephen Ribuffo	MOA/Port of Anchorage
Jerry Weaver	MOA/Community Development
Jerry Hansen	MOA/Project Management & Engineering (PM&E)
Lance Wilber	MOA/Public Transportation Department (PTD)

Also in attendance

Name	Representing
Craig Lyon	MOA/CDD
Vivian Underwood	MOA/CDD
Jamie Acton	MOA/PTD
Matt Stichick	MOA/DHHS
Gary Katsion	Kittelson & Associates
Rachel Steer	DOWL HKM
Todd Logan	
Robert Shipley	

In the absence of Stephanie Mormilo, Jennifer Witt chaired the meeting.

1. CALL TO ORDER

CHAIR WITT called the meeting to order at 2:33 p.m. Stephanie Mormilo, Bruce Carr and Lois Epstein were excused. A quorum was established. Jerry Hansen arrived at 2:34 p.m.

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. Hansen arrived at 2:34 p.m.

The TAC concurred with MR. WILBER's request to hold the April 20, 2012 minutes over to the next meeting.

MS. HEIL moved to approve the agenda as modified. MR. WILBER seconded. *Hearing no objections, the modified agenda was approved.*

4. APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES – June 9, 2011; April 20, 2012; June 14, 2012

MR. WILBER moved to approve the minutes of June 9, 2011. MS. HEIL seconded. *Hearing no objections, the minutes were approved as written.*

The April 20, 2012 minutes were held over to the next TAC meeting.

MR. WILBER moved to approve the minutes of June 14, 2012. MS. HEIL seconded. *Hearing no objections, the minutes were approved as written.*

5. BUSINESS ITEMS

a. Transportation Improvement Program (TIP), Major Amendment 4, Air Quality Conformity Determination

Topic: Anchorage is a maintenance area for carbon monoxide (CO). As such, federal regulations require that AMATS make an air quality conformity determination on all transportation plans and programs to help ensure that they will not jeopardize compliance with the federal air quality standard for CO. These regulations require AMATS to determine that future emissions from the transportation network envisioned in these plans and programs are under the allowable emissions budget established in the State Implementation Plan for air quality. The transportation network envisioned in the proposed Amendment #4 to the 2010-2013 TIP is identical to that envisioned in the 2035 Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP) adopted by AMATS in May of this year. Because there has been no change in the transportation network or growth assumptions, the conformity analysis performed for the MTP is equally applicable to

the proposed Amendment #4 to the TIP. This analysis showed that Anchorage will be well under the allowable motor vehicle CO emission budget. As required by federal regulations, an interagency consultation was conducted to ensure conformity requirements were met. The consultation team concurred the conformity analysis prepared for the MTP also serves the Amendment #4 of the TIP. The TAC released the conformity report for 30 day review on September 27. No public comments were received. AMATS staff requests the AMATS TAC recommend approval of the conformity determination for Major Amendment #4 of the AMATS 2010-2013 TIP to the Policy Committee.

**b. 2010-2013 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP),
Major Amendment No. 4**

***Topic:** In order to keep project schedules on track and insure funding for needed improvements, several changes need to be incorporated into the 2010-13 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP). Currently, the TIP ranges from 2010 to 2013, and this amendment would add 2014 and drop off 2010. The main driving factor for this addition is to ensure funding is available for major construction projects, like Dowling Road Phase II, which will be ready to obligate in 2013, but will need to advance construct funds from 2014 in order to do so. Advance constructing funds allows for flexibility in our program and earlier project delivery. This amendment is also needed to reflect the anticipated program allocation reduction as a result of MAP-21 (Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21st Century). The overall allocation is expected to decrease from approximately \$36 million to \$25 million in 2013 and 2014. The AMATS Technical Advisory Committee released this amendment for a 30 day public review period on September 13, 2012 with the addition of changes made at that meeting. After those changes were incorporated, the Policy Committee re-released the updated version and formally started the public comment period on September 28, 2012. AMATS received over 125 comments expressing either general support or requesting an increase in bicycle/pedestrian infrastructure funding in the Transportation Alternatives (TA) category. In response to these comments, the TAC approved a revision that shifted \$1.3 million from 2 projects in the CMAQ table (Transit Center/Facilities and Bus Stop & Facility Improvements) to the Bicycle Plan Project Implementation in the TA table. The amendment went to the Planning & Zoning Commission and the Assembly during public comment, and there were no changes by either group. Staff is requesting the TAC recommended forwarding Major Amendment #4 to the TIP to the Policy Committee for approval.*

Note for the record: Agenda Items 5(a) and 5(b) were discussed together by the TAC.

Since the last time the TAC saw this amendment, MR. LYON reported the changes the TAC approved were added, including the bike and pedestrian modifications, and in addition the numbers in the amendment have been updated by Headquarters with newer numbers.

MR. LYON reported a Conformity Determination was done for this amendment. He noted there were no projects added requiring a conformity analysis. The Consultation Team met

electronically by email and determined there were no problems with the conformity analysis. MR. MORRIS noted the Conformity Report went out for 30 day public review, and there were no comments received.

MR. LYON confirmed information was received from the Alaska Railroad and has been included in Table 7.

CHAIR WITT advised the TAC that DOT out of Juneau released the draft STIP major amendment. She indicated a quick review of that amendment shows \$27.2 million for 2013 and 2014, which is a little more than AMATS planned for. With the AMATS program heavily dependent on advance construct (A/C), she suggested the TAC may want to allow staff to make changes to the TIP amendment to balance the A/C's in those two years to reflect the DOT amount to ease the TIP's adoption into the STIP, or the TAC can wait to address this as a minor adjustment to the first obligation report.

MS. HEIL indicated she would be in favor of giving staff some leeway to balance the budget to address the A/C's. She thinks if this is done as part of the obligation report there would be issues with wanting to put money into other places. In her opinion, she thinks this money needs to be moved into A/C's.

CHAIR WITT noted the total amount would probably impact the percentage allocations, but that staff can look at those again, and the TAC can decide this when it takes action.

MR. MORTON noted the STIP amendment is still a draft, and there is potential for change. He asked how much faith the TAC wants to have in that process recognizing the amount of volatility that has had over the last few months.

CHAIR WITT asked for public comments.

TODD LOGAN thanked the TAC for being so responsive to public comments and finding a way to increase the funding for Bike Plan Implementation noting it was appreciated by him and lots of others.

CHAIR WITT noted Mr. Morton had a good point that even while the Statewide TIP (STIP) is out for public those numbers could be further refined. She thinks if the TIP amendment is adopted the way it is now, she thinks a minor adjustment could accommodate any STIP changes as well.

Air Quality Conformity Determination Motion

MS. HEIL moved to approve recommending the Air Quality Conformity Determination for the 2010-2013 AMATS Transportation Improvement Program Major Amendment No. 4 for final adoption by the Policy Committee. MR. HANSEN seconded.

Hearing no objections, the motion was approved.

TIP Major Amendment No. 4 Motion

MR. WILBER moved the TAC recommend approval of Major Amendment No. 4 creating the 2011-2014 Transportation Improvement Program. MS. HEIL seconded.

MR. WILBER thinks staff caught most of the updates that occurred since the amendment was released including passage of a statewide bond. With regard to TIP Table 5, MR. WILBER does not think there are CMAQ funds planned in the TIP for the Alaska Regional Architecture ITS Update, which is shown in the Work Program under studies and plans. He asked whether consultant services would be used.

In response, MR. LYON noted there is some previous money and some PL money. MS. UNDERWOOD indicated there was \$100,000 in the TIP before, but she was not sure if those funds have been obligated. She noted there was \$20,000 on board for the conversion to turbo architecture.

MR. WILBER reiterated his concern about where our dollars would come from for the ITS update.

CHAIR WITT thinks this may be one that was previously obligated, and if it was in 2010 it would not show in this TIP amendment for 2011-2014. She indicated if that is the case it could be picked up as part of the next adjustment, but it is something that should be looked into.

Referring to the "Consolidated MOA LRTP" listed in Table, MR. WILBER noted this money is actually not to consolidate the two, but is to start working on the modeling. He knows the TAC has talked about the intent of that and had a couple work sessions, and he asked to change the text for the purpose because the money is not being used as it is described in the TIP.

CHAIR WITT indicated the text should be modified to also reflect the intent in the Work Program and for those consultant services.

MR. WILBER noted the Public Transportation Department had received a couple of competitive grants in the past, and as a result the TAC had to go through a major amendment process to include those grants in the TIP so the TAC could advance the projects. MR. WILBER explained that FMATS recognizes those types of projects in their TIP, but show the money in the illustrative years so a balanced program is maintained.

MR. WILBER indicated Public Transportation has plans to put in a grant request for two projects, which he would like to have added to Table 8 as projects 27 and 28. He distributed a description of those projects. In general, he noted the first project is a competitive program progress they will be applying for to help support workforce development. The second is a pilot project targeted towards Transit Oriented Development to help meet a lot of needs in north Anchorage, and if they are successful in the application process, he stated Public Transportation would be asking for \$3 million to do that. He noted if the projects are placed in Table 8 it would not affect the TIP's financial constraint or conformity, but if they are successful then a TIP amendment would not be needed only the money would need to be added.

CHAIR WITT suggested showing the money in 2013 as illustrative to make it clear that if they are successful in getting the grants in 2013, then a minor adjustment could be made to make it real.

MS. ACTON explained that these programs will be released in the spring and will also be in the process of role-making and releasing items, and she does not anticipate an award anytime before November or December. She thinks it would be easiest to program it in 2014.

CHAIR WITT clarified the projects would be shown in illustrative for 2014.

Amendment to add 2 illustrative projects

MR. WILBER moved to amend the motion to add the following two projects to Table 8 as illustrative in 2014:

Table 8		Project Phasing	Source	2014
27	People Mover Human Resources Grant – project will create an innovative public transportation workforce development program (Federal Share Only)	2014 Programming	FTA 5323	\$300
28	People Mover Transit Oriented Development Pilot – project will assist in the planning and development of mixed use transit oriented development within the Municipality of Anchorage (Federal Share Only)	2014 Programming	FTA 20005(b) of MAP-21	\$3,000

MS. HEIL seconded.

MR. MORRIS asked what the advantages were to adding these projects to the illustrative in terms of planning.

MR WILBER explained the rules under the last years of SAFETEA-LU that carried over in MAP-21, unlike ISTEA and SAFETEA-LU where AMATS had the ability to do minor and major amendments, it came to a point that if any project was added to or deleted from the TIP it required a major amendment even if the money was a grant won for a specific thing and have to go through a 6 months process just to put the grant in the TIP.

MR. LYON explained these projects would be added in Table 8, not the fiscally constrained portion of the TIP in Tables 3, 4 and 5, and showing it as illustrative under Table 8 does not hamper AMATS in any way.

Hearing no objections, the amendment to the motion was approved.

Amendment to Table 5, Project 2, Consolidate MOA LRTP

MR. WILBER moved to amend the motion to have staff edit the text under Table 5, Studies and Plans, Project 2, where it says “Consolidate MOA LRTP” to make it “MTP” and illustrate the text discussed in the past, which is that the \$800,000 is for beginning the initial update of the 2035 MTP to do household survey modeling and those other items. MS. HEIL Seconded.

Hearing no objections, the amendment to the motion was approved.

With regard to the release of the draft STIP discussed earlier, which may affect the TIP, the TAC concurred with waiting on the STIP changes before reflecting any changes in the TIP.

Main Motion to approve TIP Amendment No. 4 (as amended)

Hearing no objections, the main motion as amended was approved.

b. 2010-2013 Unified Planning Work Program – 2013 Financial Plan

Topic: Staff requests the TAC to review and approve a major adjustment to the 2012-13 Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP) to incorporate a 2013 budget. This amendment incorporates a new Table 2 as an attachment to the existing two-year program. The Year 2013 Financial budget constitutes this adjustment. The overall Program and intent of work to be undertaken remains as approved by the AMATS Policy Committee on November 17, 2011 with some minor adjustments.

MR. LYON reported on the UPWP 2013 Financial Plan noting there were two TAC work sessions on the plan, and the spreadsheet provided was the result of recommendations from the work sessions, as well as meetings with Mr. Rudolph and staff. Changes included:

- New Table 2 added
- Taking some of the funds from the ITS and Congestion Management and moving those funds to the MTP
- Adding a little more funds in the TIP
- Updating the column showing PL funds to DOT
- Adding more STP funds, which were mostly 440 (Household Travel)

MR. LYON noted the changes included those provided by Mr. Rudolph with the exception of changes to reflect adjustments in math calculations.

CHAIR WITT asked about the Government Hill Neighborhood Plan (GHNP) and the East Anchorage District Plan (EADP). MR. LYON stated the GHNP has been approved by the Planning and Zoning Commission, but not the Assembly. MR. WEAVER stated the EADP is in process.

MR. LYON suggested moving the GHNP funds to the MTP, and CHAIR WITT concurred.

MR. LYON explained the efforts by Transportation Planning on the GHNP project are done.

MR. LYON explained Long Range Planning staff just began the EADP project this year, it is included in the Work Program, and Transportation Planning has not had much interaction on this project yet, but expect to next year,

Noting the quarterly obligation reports for the TIP, MS. HEIL asked if there should be quarterly reports for the UPWP on work related to this budget. She indicated an adjustment may need to add a new element in the Financial Plan for staff efforts related to providing this type of report. She noted AMATS only sees this at the end of the calendar year, and thinks AMATS should track all the tasks more closely on a quarterly basis.

MR. LYON explained staff is required to produce a quarterly report. He gets information from his staff, Mr. Morris's group and Ms. Schanche, and a document is created. He stated he can provide that report to the TAC.

MS. HEIL thinks the TAC needs to know this information on a continuing basis. With regard to timing, she stated she is hopeful the TAC will get a combined schedule at some point to look at. She thinks quarterly reports for the UPWP financial plan would also make it easier to deal with the financial plan each year.

MR. LYON noted quarterly reports on the financial plan is something AMATS should probably add to the Public Involvement Plan to show what is required and when, and should be at the same time the report is due now. He further explained FHWA requires an annual report, and the AMATS Operating Agreements requires quarterly reports on the UPWP financial plan.

MS. HEIL thinks it should be in the AMATS policies and procedures.

MR. MORRIS thinks it would be a good idea to try quarterly reports for a little while to see if it works, and then consider putting these policies.

MR. WILBER concurred with Mr. Lyon that AMATS is required to do it, but that report has just never been shared with the TAC, and based on Ms. Heil's request, it is just a matter of making sure it is done.

MR. LYON noted he goes over the quarterly report with his staff to determine if tasks are on track, and a report to the TAC could be similar showing where staff is on the task and on the budget.

MS. HEIL stated from the work sessions that AMATS is very interested in how the Household Survey and the modeling update are going to do, and all these important precursors to the MTP update. She thinks if AMATS is watching this on a quarterly basis surprises would not happen, and AMATS would be more in tune with what is happening. She also noted if it is looking like there could be issues then adjustments could be made earlier rather than later.

In response to Mr. Morris, MR. LYON noted the report contains a level of detail that would provide the TAC with a status on those work products.

MS. HEIL moved to instruct staff to share their UPWP Report on a quarterly basis to the TAC.
MR. WILBER seconded.

There were no public comments.

MR. LYON stated the quarterly report is done the 55th day after the end of the quarter. He explained this is because of the level of detail required to create the report. He noted in the course of a previous audit done by the State, staff provided a certain level of detail the State liked, but which takes more work and a longer time for the MOA's Admin group to create the report. He noted this is information that is not originally required in the Operating Agreement.

In response to Mr. Morris, MR. LYON indicated the TAC would probably receive the first quarterly report in May. MR. LYON explained the makeup of the report. He asked that the motion state each quarterly report will be shared the TAC when the report is done instead of a specific time. MS. HEIL concurred.

The TAC returned to discussing the UPWP financial plan.

In response to Chair Witt, MR. LYON explained the two spreadsheets provided to the TAC. The second sheet is the allocation of staff time and is people who can charge to the PL funds. This is based on an eleven month year, plus two weeks paid vacation and two weeks of paid holidays per year. He stated this does not include match funds, including no TIP STP funds or EPA funds.

There were no public comments.

Motion to provide TAC quarterly UPWP Reports

Hearing no objections, the motion was approved.

UPWP Work Program Motion

MS. HEIL moved to approve the Unified Planning Work Program as edited to the Policy Committee for approval. MR. MORRIS seconded.

MR. WILBER moved to amend the motion to add the following:

Page 18, Task 157, Other Projects. After “Performance Plan” add a paragraph to read: “Initiate the development of performance measures reflective of national goals in MAP-21 related to public transportation.”

MS. HEIL seconded.

MR. WILBER noted Transit will be spending some of their time working on those goals, and he will provide the text for this additional paragraph to Mr. Lyon.

Hearing no objections, the motion to amend was approved.

MS. HEIL moved to amend the motion as follows:

Page 37, Task 470, Computer Modeling in Support of Air Quality Tasks, Background. Change “LRTP” to “MTP.”

Page 37, Task 480, MOA Transportation Demand Model, Background. Update “validated to a 2002 base year” to the most recent information.

MR. WILBER seconded.

Hearing no objections, the motion to amend was approved.

Main Motion (as amended)

In her original motion MS. HEIL noted she stated “edits,” and clarified she was referring to the chart and the edit for Mr. Rudolph’s time.

CHAIR WITT stated that before the TAC is to adopt the annual budget for the UPWP as amended with the edits as proposed, the change to Table 2 to move \$1,000 from Task 241 to the MTP, Task 130.

Hearing no objections, the main motion as amended approved.

c. AMATS Policies & Procedures Amendment

TOPIC: The AMATS Policy Committee adopted their Policies and Procedures on 2-10-05. The AMATS Policy Committee directed staff to clarify the relationship of all AMATS advisory committees in the Policies and Procedures and to delineate the use of Standardized Socioeconomic Data for Transportation Modeling. The AMATS Technical Advisory Committee held a work session on October 15, 2012 to discuss revisions to the AMATS P&P. The proposed changes to the Policies and Procedures are recommendations that came out of the work session, which add new subsections J and K to P&P No. 1, and a New Policy & Procedure No. 6, Use of Standardized Socioeconomic Data for Transportation Modeling. AMATS staff recommends the TAC review and recommend approval of these changes to the Policy Committee.

MR. LYON provided a brief review of the proposed changes to the Policies and Procedures with the TAC.

There were no public comments.

Policy & Procedure Adding Subsections J & K

MR. WILBER moved add Subsections J and K to AMATS Policies and Procedures No. 1 as follows:

- J. All AMATS advisory committees, including but not limited to the Technical Advisory Committee, the Bicycle and Pedestrian Committee, the AMATS Citizens Advisory Committee, the AMATS Air Quality Advisory Committee, and the Freight Advisory Committee shall be public forums and provide advisory comments and recommendations to other AMATS bodies on transportation related issues relevant to the AMATS MTP,

TIP, UPWP and other related plans and programs as needed. The AMATS Policy Committee is the final decision making body for AMATS.

K. The AMATS Policy Committee shall approve all Advisory Committee by-laws.

MS. HEIL seconded.

In response to MS. HEIL, MR. LYON confirmed the Operating Agreement identifies the Air Quality Advisory Committee as a member of the TAC. She noted with Air Quality becoming limited maintenance during the second ten years of the CO Plan if adopted then Air Quality though important may not be as critical as it has been in the past. She suggested it might be time to start rotating that chair with the two other committees, Bicycle and Pedestrian Committee and the Freight Advisory Committee. She indicated this would get more information out on AMATS processes. She noted how many people from the community came out to testify on the bicycle and pedestrian funding, but did not realize how AMATS, the funding and processes work. She thought if they had somebody from their committee who had more familiarity with the AMATS processes, the federal money and the restrictions it might have helped them better understand this at their committee level. She thinks this experience is valuable, and freight is important as well. She suggested rotating who sits on the TAC once a year between those three committees might be a more useful way of getting valuable information and providing people with more of an understanding of the process works.

In response to CHAIR WITT, MR. MORRIS clarified that the air quality representative on the TAC is relatively recent, and it is the Air Quality representation on Policy Committee that is imbedded in the AMATS Operating Agreement and was part of the designation of the MPO as the air quality planners.

MS. HEIL thinks a change in the Air Quality seat to rotate through the committees as she proposed could be an administrative amendment. MR. LYON was certain it would not be a re-designation, and a change would have to be adjusted with the previous amendment.

MR. WILBER thinks the notion of getting the committees more educated into the workings of AMATS as Ms. Heil mentioned so they can be more effective in the AMATS process is good. He indicated that whether or not the committees serve on a rotating basis is something the TAC should discuss, and if the TAC decides to do this it would need to be done in the Operating Agreement.

Hearing no objections, the motion to approve adding Subsections J and K was approved.

CHAIR WITT clarified this change would be recommended to the Policy Committee.

AMATS Policy & Procedure No. 6

MR. LYON noted Section A should be renumbered to (1)(a) and (b) and (2) and Section B to (1), (2) and (3) to be consistent with the rest of the policies and procedures.

MR. WILBER moved to approve Policy & Procedure No. 6, Use of Standardized Socioeconomic Data for Transportation Modeling with the numbering changes. MR. RIBUFFO seconded.

MR. WILBER noted in this modeling it talks about, as an example, “AMATS TAC shall standardize household/employment forecasts and sub-area allocations.” He noted when it is talking about modeling and sub-area allocations; it is talking about sub-area allocations for a region, not allocations for a study area like in the OS&HP where there are sub-areas that are being studied. He stated that is not the intent; it is for sub allocations.

CHAIR WITT suggested an amendment would make it clear. MR. WILBER clarified the regional sub allocations are between Anchorage and the Mat-Su and between Anchorage and Eagle River because that is how it is done for the modeling.

MR. MORRIS clarified when he first drafted this he meant TAZ (traffic analysis zones) subarea allocations, and it is defined in Section A(a).

CHAIR WITT noted the issue AMATS ran into last time was the allocation to Anchorage and the Mat-Su using ISER’S information. She indicated she misunderstood the first section because she thought that was the intent, which was to come to an agreement on that regional allocation of employment and population so as not to double-count a good portion of our growth.

MR. WILBER thinks the proposed language does that because even in the Mat-Su their region has TAZ’S though they may be bigger. Point MacKenzie has its own TAZ different than Palmer. As such, he indicated that allocation of a region we may need the TAZ’S and that is what this is all about. He thinks it meets that intent.

MR. MORRIS concurred with Mr. Wilber. He thinks the assumption is that AMATS is going to be using the same TAZ system as Mat-Su in Anchorage and if each TAZ lines up then each sub-area or larger regional area is going to line up its own.

CHAIR WITT commented this was fine as long as we are not producing new jobs and people.

MS. HEIL thought that at the work session AMATS added in 144 days, and if anybody wanted to seek an amendment for a change it needed to be provided 144 days in advance of when it was actually needed.

MR. MORRIS thought it was a different version, but was not sure it was 144 days, but there was some timeframe.

He did not think the proposed language provided for P&P 6 was the latest version.

CHAIR WITT suggested tabling Item 6 and only forwarding the first change to the Policy Committee.

MR. WILBER moved to postpone P&P No. 6 until the next AMATS meeting. MS. HEIL seconded.

Hearing no objections, the motion to postpone was approved.

d. Anchorage CO Limited Maintenance Plan (Proposed Revisions)

Topic: The Anchorage Limited CO Maintenance Plan (LMP) update takes advantage of EPA guidance that allows areas that have “design value” concentrations 15% or more below the 9 ppm federal standard (≤ 7.65 ppm) to prepare their updates using a simplified Limited Maintenance Plan procedure. Anchorage’s current design value is 6.0 ppm. The LMP must be approved by AMATS, adopted by the Anchorage Assembly and forwarded to ADEC for incorporation in the State Implementation Plan (SIP). The State will begin its own review and public comment process, and once completed will include the document as a revision to the SIP for air quality. The State then forwards the revisions to EPA for approval. Once received, the EPA has 90 days to make an adequacy determination for conformity purposes. Once this occurs, the emission budget analysis and associated transportation and air quality modeling will no longer be required. The Department of Health and Human Services (DHHS) is requesting that the AMATS Technical Advisory Committee recommend approval of proposed technical revisions to the Anchorage CO Limited Maintenance Plan to the Policy Committee.

MATT STICHICK with the Anchorage Air Quality Program provided a brief presentation. He noted that on October 11, 2012 the TAC was asked to recommend the CO Limited Maintenance Plan to the Policy Committee. He explained that subsequent to that meeting it was found that the final paragraph needed to be revised to allow modification of the Carbon Monoxide monitoring network system with federal regulations. The modification was made, it was re-released for public review on October 14, 2012, and no comments were received from the public. He noted he also brought the plan before the Anchorage Air Quality Advisory Committee on Tuesday and that committee provided a recommendation to add a minor sentence under Section 3 on Page III.B.12-3 as follows:

“...Additionally, because the Turnagain monitor consistently measures the highest CO concentrations in the network, the Municipality of Anchorage supports ongoing continuation of a monitoring site in the Turnagain neighborhood...”

MR. STICHICK believes this is a minor change that does not require going out to public review again, and staff supports the proposed addition.

MR. MORRIS expressed concern that this additional sentence may be misinterpreted and proposed adding a footnote to that sentence as follows:

** The Municipality recognizes the importance of assessing CO concentrations in high impact neighborhoods and intends to continue monitoring at the Turnagain site. It should be noted, however, that it cannot provide a blanket, on-going commitment to monitoring at any particular site because of unforeseen future logistical and/or budgetary constraints.*

MR. MORRIS noted if their budget is cut again there could be problems, and the logistical concern is the possibility of losing the monitoring site at the Unitarian Church, which is up for sale. He wanted to make it clear with this footnote that there is no specific limit to any particular monitoring site.

MS. HEIL noted the reason the plan went back out to public comment was because they changed a sentence on the last page of the plan to read as follows:

“... MOA is committed to the continued CO monitoring as required by Title II, Section 319 of the Clean Air Act...”

She explained that ultimately that is what is required, and the Clean Air Act only requires one monitor. The siting requirements have to be followed, but it does not say a commitment is required that says where that monitor will be; it just says you have to have the minimum. She noted they tried to keep it flexible. It was passed by EPA, and EPA was happy with the wording because EPA wants their planning to have the best flexibility too, and to get two committed into the SIP and have something change, we do not want to have to come back for another SIP amendment. This is what the sentence attempts to try and do, which is not to have to do a SIP amendment if there are changes in the Municipality in the future as long as the federal requirements are met. MS. HEIL is in favor of adding the footnote. MS. HEIL noted it is their SIP, but as long as they have the commitment to the federal rules then EPA is okay with that. However, she noted this is going into the gray area because it is almost like you want to commit to it, but she thinks Mr. Morris' footnote clarifies that it is not a commitment; it is just an editorial recognition that the site has been important.

In response to Chair Witt, MR. MORRIS confirmed this site consistently measures the highest concentrations.

There were no public comments.

MR. MORTON asked if it makes sense to monitor a site that represents the average, or does it make sense to monitor the extreme, and which would be the most relevant. MR. MORRIS responded that both are important. He noted that EPA has siting criteria that has both objectives depending on what you are looking for, and it matters if you are monitoring for the highest

location. He noted DHHS thinks this particular site is representative of many neighborhoods around town that may be very similar to Spenard.

MR. MORRIS moved that the TAC recommend that the Policy Committee recommend to the Assembly that they adopt the Limited Maintenance Plan as amended with the additional comment suggested by the Air Quality Advisory Committee and the footnote that has been suggested as well. MS. HEIL seconded.

CHAIR WITT stated the TAC is recommending forwarding to the Policy Committee to the Assembly Version B with the footnote.

Hearing no objections, the motion was approved.

MS. HEIL thinks DHHS staff did a great job, and this will really streamline the air quality conformity for all the TIP'S and MTP'S in the future with no modeling being required.

CHAIR WITT noted it does not affect spot analysis for projects.

e. Other Business Items - None

6. INFORMATION ITEMS - None

7. COMMITTEE COMMENTS

CHAIR WITT noted the announcement came out today that the Statewide Transportation Improvement Program has now been released for public review.

MR. WILBER noted Mr. Carr did a presentation for the Public Transit Advisory Board on what is going on with the Alaska Railroad, which was very informative. CHAIR WITT suggested he should provide this presentation for the TAC.

MR. WILBER stated it has been a good year for the bus business noting they got a new roof and new fare boxes.

MR. MORRIS has been appointed Deputy Director at the Health Department.

8. SCHEDULED AMATS MEETINGS
Policy Committee, December 20, 2012

9. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 3:43 p.m.