

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

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

**November 20, 2014
2:00 P.M.**

Policy Committee Members Present:

Name	Representing
Robert Campbell	Alaska Dept. of Transportation & Public Facilities, Regional Director (DOT&PF)
Cindy Heil	Alaska Dept. of Environmental Conservation (ADEC), Air Quality
Dan Sullivan	Municipal Mayor
Patrick Flynn	MOA/Municipal Assembly
Tim Steele	MOA/Municipal Assembly
Pete Petersen**	MOA/Municipal Assembly

Also in attendance:

Name	Representing
Craig Lyon	MOA/Community Development/Transportation Planning (CDD)
Vivian Underwood	MOA/CDD
Teresa Brewer	MOA/CDD
Joni Wilm	MOA/CDD
Jamie Acton	MOA/CDD
James Boyle	DOT&PF
Van Le	R&M Consultants
Jess Smith	CRW Engineering
Bryce Ward	
Janice Golub	FNSB
Peter McClung	McDowell Group
Aaron Jongenelen	DOT&PF
Jennifer Witt*	DOT&PF
Sharen Walsh*	MOA/Port of Anchorage
Gary Katsion	Kittelson & Associates

**AMATS Technical Advisory Committee Members*

***Designated Assembly Alternate*

1. CALL TO ORDER

CHAIR CAMPBELL called the meeting to order at 2:00 p.m. All Policy Committee members were present. Cindy Heil represented the Alaska Department of Environmental Conservation in Alice Edwards' absence. A quorum was established.

2. PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT ANNOUNCEMENT

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

3. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

MS. HEIL moved to approve the agenda. MAYOR SULLIVAN seconded.

Hearing no objections, the agenda was approved.

4. APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES – October 23, 2014

MS. HEIL moved to approve the minutes. MR. STEELE seconded.

Hearing no objections, the minutes were approved.

5. BUSINESS ITEMS**a. 2014 Operating Agreement**

MR. LYON noted that this item was on the agenda at the previous meeting and the Policy Committee had requested clarification and/or a recommendation by the Technical Advisory Committee. The TAC voted to recommend to the Policy Committee for approval. He reminded the Committee that there are two major proposed revisions to the Operating Agreement. The first involves the name change, noting that AMATS is currently known as the "Anchorage Metropolitan Area Transportation Solutions" and the recommendation is to change Solutions to System to better reflect the idea of creating and maintaining a complete transportation system. The second proposed change relates to the Citizens Advisory Committee, noting that AMATS has utilized the Municipal Planning and Zoning Commission as its Citizens Advisory Committee for many years. During the last certification the Federal Highways Administration and the Federal Transit Administration strongly suggested that AMATS evaluate the makeup of the Planning and Zoning Commission to determine if it represents the diverse makeup of Anchorage

citizens and transportation stakeholders in the AMATS planning area. The Planning and Zoning Committee is not an AMATS committee, but a Municipal board of which the Mayor appoints the members and approved by the local Assembly. The suggestion is to create a Citizens Advisory Committee that is appointed by the AMATS Policy Committee and it is created to reflect the diverse makeup of Anchorage and Eagle River.

In response to Chair Campbell, MR. LYON noted this is before the Policy Committee to adopt it.

CHAIR CAMPBELL asked staff if this has been released for a 30-day public review. MS. HEIL noted that at the last meeting Mr. Vakalis had concerns that there weren't any details and the bylaws had not been identified, and it doesn't look like these concerns have been addressed. She's not sure this is ready to be released. CHAIR CAMPBELL asked what has the TAC recommended for this action. MR. LYON noted that Mr. Vakalis was comfortable with the makeup of this after a briefing was held this week. He also noted there is a set of bylaws for each of the AMATS advisory committees where the specific makeup and backgrounds of each member are listed so this would not be something that is normally included in the Operating Agreement. He also thought this would be an opportunity to approve the idea of the creation of a separate Citizens Advisory Committee, and follow-up by working on those bylaws to fine tune them at a later date.

There was no public comment.

ASSEMBLY MEMBER STEELE expressed he would be more comfortable knowing the background with a more detailed committee description. ASSEMBLY MEMBER FLYNN noted that AMATS normally has a prescribed process for public review, and he recognizes the Planning and Zoning Commission has a limited meeting schedule. He is interested in what the committee meeting schedule would look like, if it would be on an as needed basis, or a week after public review, or a certain day of the month and have this documented in the bylaws. He would also like to see this committee have more flexibility than the Planning and Zoning Commission.

MAYOR SULLIVAN suggested that since the Committee is not sure if this has gone out for the 30-day public review he feels the Policy Committee shouldn't take any action until that has been clarified, and postpone this until the next meeting ensuring it has been noticed for thirty days. He asked staff if this is a required committee. MR. LYON replied there is no requirement to have a Citizens Advisory Committee, and after having done research on approximately fifty MPOs around the country, less than five of them have Citizens Advisory Committees. MAYOR SULLIVAN commented that this is the exception rather than the rule to have these types of committees and he is concerned about adding an additional layer of time. The TAC does its best to make sure it is a diverse group of interested parties, and he prefers not to add an extra layer of bureaucracy to the bureaucracy. MR. LYON added that this idea came up at the last certification, and he feels that if AMATS decided to resolve that suggestion in the certification by saying AMATS is not going to have this committee any longer since it is not required, that might create a giant spotlight on AMATS. He also thinks if a Citizens Advisory Committee is created with a

little more control over the makeup of it that USDOT would look at it favorably, as opposed to taking it out altogether since it is not required. CHAIR CAMPBELL indicated this needs to be remanded back to the TAC for discussion, and the Mayor's suggestion is a valid one, and he's not sure he supports it 100%, but he thinks the question worth asking is whether AMATS needs a Citizens Advisory Committee, and if it requires a 30-day notice to change these items.

MAYOR SULLIVAN moved to postpone this item until the next meeting contingent upon A) the 30-day notice requirement and B) Mr. Lyon providing more information on how this committee potentially works in other jurisdictions, and more statistical information.

ASSEMBLY MEMBER STEELE seconded.

MS. HEIL indicated that if the decision is to have this committee it will still delay AMATS because the details of the bylaws have not been resolved. She suggested modifying and add a pros and cons of whether or not to have this committee, and include all of the legal ratifications, and a draft of what the potential bylaws of the committee would look like.

MAYOR SULLIVAN accepted Ms. Heil's suggestion as a friendly amendment.

Hearing no objections, this motion as amended passed.

MAYOR SULLIVAN questioned that if, by the next meeting, the Policy Committee receives the data that has been requested as well as a proposed set of bylaws, would those bylaws need to be noticed for thirty days. CHAIR CAMPBELL replied that the standard was not to make the bylaws public, but modify the bylaws internally. MR. LYON pointed out that the last Bike/Ped and the Freight bylaws were given a 30-day public review.

CHAIR CAMPBELL clarified that should these require public notice, Mr. Lyon will post them and reach a conclusion with the Technical Advisory Committee, and this body can then take action at the completion of the 30-day notice relying on any comments that may be received.

b. 2040 MTP Update

BACKGROUND:

The next MTP update must have an Air Quality Conformity Analysis approved by FHWA no later than May 25, 2016, four years after the last approved MTP, per federal planning regulations. The revised 2040 MTP Update schedule anticipates an approved MTP no earlier than November 30, 2016. AMATS staff is currently working on an RFP which includes provisions to produce an interim MTP update to be approved no later than May 25, 2016.

MR. LYON noted the MTP schedule presented to the TAC in the 2nd quarter of 2014 showed June 30, 2015 for final TDM deliverables, and final FHWA approval of an Air Quality Conformity Report by May 25, 2016, assuming anticipated NTP of March 30, 2014, and contract negotiations for an earlier delivery date of an approved model by December 31, 2015.

Subsequent procurement delays shifted the TDM Model Update NTP to July 3, 2014, and the Model Update contract indicates a delivery date of a usable, approved model by June 30, 2015, resulting in anticipated approved AQ no earlier than November 30, 2016. He also noted that this is just reflecting the idea of an interim update to prevent a non-conformity lapse.

The critical tasks and their anticipated completion dates are listed below:

Household Travel Survey Data delivery	November 17, 2014
Travel Demand Model Update delivery of usable model	June 30, 2015
Interim MTP approved by the PC	April 23, 2016
FHWA Approval of AQ Conformity for interim MTP	May 25, 2016
MTO Model Execution	July 1, 2015
MTP approved by PC	September 30, 2016
FHWA Approval of AQ Conformity	November 30, 2016

MR. LYON informed the Committee that the TAC agreed to confirm the idea of doing an interim MTP at the same time as they were doing the regular MTP allowing them to reset the clock, and not be concerned with going into a conformity lapse while in the process of the full MTP Update. This is just information showing how the schedules line up, and he reiterated that the TAC did confirm the idea of doing an Interim MTP. He noted that the Interim MTP would be before the PC for approval at a future date, and the normal process for creating a new MTP will not allow AMATS to complete it by the required date of May 25, 2016 so by doing an Interim MTP it will allow AMATS to restart the clock and not worry about a conformity lapse.

There was no public comment.

ASSEMBLY MEMBER PETERSEN feels that if it is possible to do the interim then it is possible to do the complete MTP, but he agreed to doing an interim allowing the extra time just in case. MS. HEIL commented that AMATS has to be careful about managing public expectations regarding this. The reason a full MTP Update is being done is because it was promised at the last update that a full model would be done. She is concerned that this interim will be a long drawn out process and be more expensive than it should be. MR. LYON replied that the discussion at the TAC meeting was to add the idea of an interim update to the MTP as an additive alternate so that when the contract went out, and it was decided this was still the way to proceed, then it would be added into the consultant contract. If it appears to be slowing down then MOA and DOT staff time could be devoted to do the Interim Update, and not add it into the contract. This would address Ms. Heil's concern for the extensive time to process the interim.

CHAIR CAMPBELL clarified that TAC needs to come back to the PC in December and explain what the plan is and address any concerns. He shares the concern that the interim should not be done at the same level of detail that the final is being processed, and he does not want to have any procurement issues. He asked Mr. Lyon to provide the Technical Advisory Committee's recommendations for how the Policy Committee is to move both the MTP and the interim forward. He only sees an update item, not an action item, and does not have a TAC

recommendation before him. MR. LYON reiterated that the TAC recommended going forward with the interim idea containing it in the contract as an additive alternate. ASSEMBLY MEMBER STEELE asked what the interim plan does not have that the final plan will have that would cause one process to be longer than the other. MR. LYON explained the Interim MTP looks at the current MTP to make sure there aren't any projects that haven't been done, since it was just adopted, and mark those off of the list, double check the goals to make sure they are current, and use the current model. The full MTP uses the Household Travel Survey to update the model, and the new model and assumptions to create a new MTP. MAYOR SULLIVAN asked Ms. Heil for clarification that her objection relates to the timeline being too long creating a delay, and that it should be a more narrow scope of work. MS. HEIL concurred. MR. LYON noted that was the idea for having the interim as an additive alternate.

MS. HEIL indicated that she was not at the Technical Advisory Committee meeting when the interim was discussed, but as she understands it, the additive alternate was a compromise to frustrations expressed at the meeting. She would like to know how much time it takes to see that the contract in process is working versus getting started on the interim immediately. JENNIFER WITT added the reason that the TAC recommended an interim to begin with, is because the existing MTP already goes through 2035. AMATS could add two years with the intent of having additional time to work through the Model Update and the Household Travel Survey, and do a more thorough job instead of being rushed. There was some discussion by the TAC, and Lance Wilber recommended as an acknowledgement not an action, that in theory AMATS needs to have the ability to expedite the process if they see any delays. She also added that there have been challenges getting through the procurement process within the Municipality.

MS. HEIL moved to ask the Technical Advisory Committee for a formal recommendation on how to handle the Interim Update of the MTP. MAYOR SULLIVAN seconded.

Hearing no objections, this motion passed.

c. AMATS BPAC Appointment

BACKGROUND:

The AMATS Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee provides AMATS with advisory recommendations on bicycle and pedestrian issues affecting the AMATS area. Members of this ten member committee serve rotating three-year terms. Committee bylaws limit members to two consecutive terms.

MR. LYON announced that Darrell Hess is the candidate for the AMATS Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee. He has been a long-term resident of Anchorage and is very active in community projects. The TAC has recommended the Policy Committee approve appointment of the member candidate.

There was no public comment.

MAYOR SULLIVAN moved to approve the appointment. ASSEMBLY MEMBER FLYNN seconded.

Hearing no objections, this motion passed.

d. Travel Demand Modeling Assumptions

BACKGROUND:

AMATS selected RSG, Incorporated to update the AMATS Travel Demand model to provide state-of-the-art analysis capabilities. In order to develop a robust travel demand model, regional and subarea socio-economic (SE) projections of employment, population, households and other elements are required. These large-scale planning assumptions are later allocated to analysis zones to serve as key inputs to the AMATS Travel Demand Model. The model helps decision makers to better plan and to maintain future transportation facilities without under- or over-building needed infrastructure. AMATS staff and the RSG team concurred that the updated model should include in its geographic scope the Mat-Su Valley (MSV) portion of the Mat-Su Borough given the large amount of travel between the MSV and the Anchorage Bowl.

JEFF FRKONJA with RSG, Incorporated and TERESA BREWER provided a PowerPoint presentation and discussed the following outline of events:

Regional Coordination & Collaboration

Mat-Su Borough

Initial discussions with the Mat-Su Borough and the Alaska DOT&PF regarding socio-economic projections began January 22, 2014. We reached out to the Mat-Su Borough on developing a regional growth model and scheduled a teleconference with state and local economists to discuss the merits/deficiencies of using ISER data vs. ADOL data. On January 31, 2014, AMATS & Mat-Su staff teleconferenced with Ed Hunsinger, ADOL; Donna Logan, Jim Calvin, Brad Ewing, Melissa Longshanks to discuss the ADOL data available and best methodology to develop joint socio-economic projections. Immediately following this teleconference, we spoke with Craig Lyon, Mat-Su Borough and AKDOT&PF staff via teleconference. The Mat-Su Borough stood ready to collaborate on a regional growth model with the intent to use for both the Mat-Su LRTP and our Travel Demand Model Update and by implication our MTP. We obtained and provided a cost estimate and scope of work for Allen Kemplen, AKDOT&PF.

Following this meeting, Mat-Su Borough staff and AKDOT&PF personnel met on Monday, February 3, 2014 to discuss a joint effort to undertake the development of socio-economic projections. During this time, AMATS and ADOT&PF staff met with Dr. Scott Goldsmith of ISER to find out when the ISER report might be available and the cost. These conversations have continued at the Quarterly Regional Planners meetings held four times during the past year.

Dec 4, 2013 Plenary Meeting: AMATS Policy & Procedures #6 provided to regional planners. Clear collaboration on development of the model and assumptions *I* approach was a priority.

Feb 5, 2014: AMATS Model Update was on the agenda.

May 7, 2014: Agenda items included: MSB *I* AMATS Model Updates & Socio-Economic Projections; MSB/ AMATS HH Travel Surveys; MSB LRTP Update Project Overview.

Aug 6, 2014: Agenda items included: MSB *I* AMATS Model Updates & Socio-Economic Projections; MSB/ AMATS HH Travel Surveys; MOA Land Use Updates.

Nov 5, 2014: Presentation by Lauren Driscoll, MSB Planning Chief, about the MSB LRTP and land use.

In particular, on May 7, 2014, the Travel Demand Model projections and planning assumptions were discussed in detail. Mat-Su Borough staff received invitations to October 9, 2014 TAC meetings and concurrent the Model User Group meetings. Equally, invitations to the November 6 & 13th meetings were sent.

Knik Arm Bridge & Tolling Authority (KABATA)

In June 2013, AMATS developed a Memorandum of Agreement with the Knik Arm Bridge & Toll Authority (KABATA). AMATS shared the 2011 AMATS Travel Demand Model and data so that KABATA could perform traffic and revenue updates. This agreement was executed in late August 2013. As part of this agreement, *Section 4. Model Documentation and Section 5 Presentation of Findings & Data* outlines the documentation of model changes, socioeconomic updates, TAZ refinements, network and transit modifications, financial, planning, and land use assumptions, network attributes that affect modeled travel times, HOV assumptions, changes to the growth factor, sensitivity testing, scripting and algorithm methodologies, and a list and map identifying the changes that were made to the data provided by AMATS. Further these findings and assumptions developed by KABATA are to be presented to the AMATS TAC & Policy Committees. Also, KABATA staff was invited to present information on their findings and model development on several occasions; however due to other commitments; KABATA was unable to meet with us.

Subsequently, KABATA staff was also invited to attend the October 9 2014 TAC meeting and the Model Users Group meeting. KABATA staff participated. Further, outreach to KABATA staff to attend the November, 6th TAC meeting and the continuation meeting on November 13, 2014.

MS. BREWER noted that AMATS is asking for approval of the recommendation of the Scenario Analysis and Sensitivity Test using the DOL data as the base line, and then doing the Sensitivity Analysis to consider the potential impacts in the network.

CHAIR CAMPBELL asked for public comment.

GARY KATSION with Kittelson & Associates commented that the discussion during the Technical Advisory Committee meeting made a lot of sense regarding the changeover from the ISER based modeling. If it is uncertain going forward that ISER will not be available then now would be a good time to make that change to a base that would be consistent data that is being carried on throughout, and coordination with the Mat-Su Borough and the Knik Arm Crossing Project is a must.

ASSEMBLY MEMBER FLYNN asked if AMATS has Department of Labor numbers from 2009, and if so, does AMATS know how they correlate with the ISER numbers. MS. BREWER replied the numbers tracked very well with the earlier numbers. ASSEMBLY MEMBER FLYNN also asked what were the differences and assumptions for the Department of Labor in 2013 versus 2009 that may have contributed to any divergence. PETER MCCLUNG with the McDowell Group noted that in the ISER 2009 projections, ISER used major assumptions such as the opening and completion of the Knik Arm Bridge, a higher price of oil was anticipated – which are now changed. The assumptions behind the DOL projections are largely based on migration, and for the most part ADOL does not make econometric assumptions but they look at trends. However, they did have assumptions regarding migration into the Mat-Su Valley versus into Anchorage. He believes the current trend rate of migration for the MSB would have been off of the charts so at some point they had to impose a limit to it. MR. FRKONJA added that another assumption was the operations of the LNG pipeline, and the original 2009 ISER forecasted a much earlier timeline. MS. BREWER noted that she spoke with Dr. Goldsmith recently and he stated the planning assumptions that ISER used from 2009 had definitely changed. For instance, the Knik Arm Bridge is not open, oil prices have declined, and the state general revenue is diminished. In this discussion, Dr. Goldsmith stated the analysis and results would change but he hasn't had time to conduct that analysis which means he cannot confirm or deny the various impacts.

MS. HEIL stated that she had missed the last two TAC meetings, but she finds there are technical issues, and a technical disagreement between the Technical Advisory Committee and staff. She indicated that AMATS is attempting to build a model with the most current and accurate information; Mat-Su has validated a model, but there are different years that do not match up, and since this will happen every four years AMATS has to be defensible. If there is a controversial project such as the bridge and Glenn Highway decisions, and AMATS does not have good solid numbers then it will be before the Committee again to explain the numbers. She recommended either using the model outputs from Mat-Su for AMATS inputs, or getting an independent third party, such as Jeff Houk out of FHWA in Denver, to say here are all of the issues and suggestions as to how they are to update the models with the latest assumptions. It would be nice to have an outside interpretation whether it is to include just the MPO, or go the

whole entire region that is beyond AMATS boundaries, and include suggestions on how to handle a technical issue between the TAC, staff and the consultants.

CHAIR CAMPBELL indicated that other MPOs have issues where they are adjoining populated areas which they do not control in terms of their planning regulations or any other methodology, but there must be some method by which those other MPOs operate. MS. BREWER suggested a consistency checklist and policy developed in conjunction with the state and MPOs. Many states have baseline data that they use, and then each Borough would work from that baseline data and refine it for their socioeconomic projections, and allocate that to the TAZs. CHAIR CAMPBELL added that the Mat-Su Borough obviously has, at this point, developed their own model, but he is not sure they completed a process within the last few years or how long they have had that model. The Mat-Su is now growing up in the world and becoming more sophisticated, and in the past it was decided to incorporate that area as part of the AMATS model to generate traffic numbers coming across the Knik River Bridge and the Glenn Highway. He noted that there has been concern in the past as to how the traffic numbers are generated in the Valley, and now there is a metropolitan area which is becoming more sophisticated and they're generating their own numbers, and currently AMATS has a disagreement about the Mat-Su numbers versus the AMATS model overlaying their area in numbers that AMATS is generating. He added that there is an underlying difference of how AMATS generates those numbers using outdated ISER information. MS. BREWER expressed that it is unknown if there is a disagreement because Mat-Su has not responded yet.

CHAIR CAMPBELL commented that he is not sure there is an easy answer to this, and he is concerned that staff and TAC are on opposite sides of this issue. He thinks the Policy Committee should send this back to the TAC for them to work this out, and then present it to the PC with a unified recommendation. ASSEMBLY MEMBER FLYNN commented that he spent some time researching this and is also concerned. He stated the "splicing" model looks like "cherry picking" as opposed to a defensible number, whereas the staff recommendation does look defensible particularly given that the labor numbers matched, more or less, the ISER numbers back in 2009. Starting from the same point with one system being updated and the other has not been updated, he thinks the idea of moving the Department of Labor as AMATS basis, as apparently Fairbanks has, is a good idea because there would not be a future concern if ISER decides to do updates in the future or not. He also thinks it is reasonable, as AMATS moves forward, to look at whatever numbers the Mat-Su is projecting and seeing if that is a different input that AMATS would want to put in for that region rather than the DOL numbers, or use that as part of the Sensitivity Analysis that was discussed here. He remarked that it would be in the interest of time, and given the fact that the Interim MTP needs to be completed.

ASSEMBLY MEMBER FLYNN moved to adopt the staff recommendation. MAYOR SULLIVAN seconded.

ASSEMBLY MEMBER STEELE intends to agree with Assembly Member Flynn, but the whole issue is that Mat-Su is on a different timeframe and the years do not match up, and the assumptions they made some time ago do not match reality. Knowing that the Mat-Su has

problems with their numbers means AMATS cannot use them, and he thinks staff has provided reasonable solutions, and at some point the problems will have to be reconciled, and he feels this is a defensible route to take.

MS. BREWER reminded the Policy Committee that as a part of the AMATS Travel Model Update RFP they will continue to outreach the Mat-Su Borough, and continue to coordinate this and have a plan going forward in the future.

ASSEMBLY MEMBER STEELE asked for clarification that staff and the TAC came up with the same conclusion or did they differ. ASSEMBLY MEMBER FLYNN replied that they differed because the TAC has the “spliced” recommendation. He explained that the “splice” is using the ISER 2009 numbers for Mat-Su and the Anchorage numbers from Department of Labor.

JENNIFER WITT with DOT&PF stated that the Interim Update is not contingent on this model being done, and that is the reason AMATS wanted to differ from the TAC because they want to allow this to move forward. She has since learned, as stated in the memorandum from staff, that AMATS does not know for sure how the Mat-Su Borough did their modeling. She realized recently that they did not have access to the Mat-Su process, and that it was actually DOT working on the Parks Highway Alternative Corridor process; and a very, very thorough job was done using 2009 ISER, which was consistent with what AMATS used, in forming it with the 2010 Census. Also, it showed very good detail about the desegregation of the DOL numbers. It was recommended that staff meet with the Mat-Su Borough and their consultants to understand what they did. She came up with the term “splice” and noted the risk of using a much lower number, in the Mat-Su, is that AMATS has the potential to greatly underestimate the impacts of growth in Anchorage. What the Mat-Su model does consider and is currently working on in their LRTP, are the impacts of the bridge, and RSG made it clear that these growth numbers do not consider the impacts and the potential changes in population in households based on that bridge. She offered this as further explanation and noted that this is frustrating for staff because only two TAC members were able to attend the work session held with the consultant. She can defend a “splice” much better than she can accept using a totally different set of assumptions and saying to Mat-Su that AMATS thinks they will have 25,000 fewer people in 2040 than they are planning for in 2035. It would be more desirable to come to an agreement between Mat-Su and Anchorage as to how it is going to grow, and she deferred this to the Municipality to choose which is appropriate for growth rates within the MPO, and she would also defer the same to the Mat-Su Borough. There is no reason why AMATS cannot accept the Mat-Su Borough’s assumptions for itself, especially when the greatest impact of the bridge will be coming into Anchorage from the Mat-Su, potentially back and forth.

MAYOR SULLIVAN asked how time sensitive this is in order to not delay any of the process, and is it better to overestimate than to underestimate in terms of the impact of dollars that are received since it is based on traffic count and population, and does that essentially mean more money. MR. LYON feels that if a region implies they will have a certain amount more population than they will ultimately request more funds to accommodate for that growth to help

with transportation issues. MAYOR SULLIVAN commented that population certainly can make a difference, but does the amount of cars coming into Anchorage not counterbalance the impact. MR. LYON said that is possible because it is unknown what the split would be. ASSEMBLY MEMBER FLYNN noted that it is a growth pattern issue because if they were to develop in a manner that would tend to be a more self-sufficient economy then you would have less impact.

CHAIR CAMPBELL referred to Mayor Sullivan's question as to the timeliness of this information and whether it was important to the development of either the interim or the long-term plan that the PC should make a decision this month, and not affect the schedule. MR. LYON pointed out that on the next to the last page of the memorandum; it talks about schedule implications and budget implications. It would require an additional month to prepare the "spliced" version and approximately \$15,000 worth of costs to do that actual work.

ASSEMBLY MEMBER STEELE indicated there have numerous attempts to get Mat-Su to attend the meetings with no results. He thought it would be interesting to hear their point of view, and whether they would support the growth numbers. CHAIR CAMPBELL feels the issue is that AMATS is overlaying another planning area with Anchorage numbers, and that is not a good practice. He would prefer to see an agreement reached internally, or however it is done, to have the Mat-Su generate their numbers and have AMATS process this again for the Knik River, and take those numbers and incorporate them into the AMATS model.

CHAIR CAMPBELL restated the motion is to adopt the staff recommendation for the model.

Hearing objections, CHAIR CAMPBELL called for a vote.

AYES

Assembly Member Flynn
Mayor Sullivan

NAYS

Assembly Member Steele
Ms. Heil
Chair Campbell

Motion failed with 2 ayes, 3 nays.

MAYOR SULLIVAN moved to postpone action on either recommendation until the December 18, 2014 meeting, allowing staff and the consultants to engage with the Mat-Su Borough and KABATA and attempt to refine numbers. ASSEMBLY MEMBER STEELE seconded.

Hearing no objections, this motion passed.

e. CY 2014-15 UPWP 2015**BACKGROUND:**

Staff received notice in September of 2014 by ADOT&PF Headquarters/Juneau of the “estimated funding availability” of federal metropolitan planning (PL) funds to be allocated to the AMATS Work Program. For purposes of developing the 2015 Budget, we were advised to use \$1,262,098 in PL allocation, with a required \$92,327 in non-federal match for a program total of \$1,022,465. This breakdown reflects a 90.97% federal funding level, with the required 9.03% local match.

Staff noted that the final amount of PL funds may be subject to an annual obligation authority limit, which has yet to be determined by ADOT Headquarters. [estimated at 85%.] Additionally we utilized the 20.0% OH rate as set by the Municipal OMB. The Municipality will continue to provide ADOT&PF Central Region with \$121,647 of our annual PL allocation, with the remainder supporting MOA in-house personnel and consultant contracts. Central Region must provide their own match for the PL funds they receive.

MR. LYON stated that this is the budget for 2015, and staff requested of the Committee to review and approve a major adjustment to the 2014-15 Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP) to incorporate a 2015 Budget. He also noted that this amendment incorporates a new Table 2 as an attachment to the existing Two-Year Program. The Year 2015 Financial Budget constitutes this adjustment, and the overall program and intent of work to be undertaken remains as approved by the AMATS Policy Committee on December 19, 2013. The Technical Advisory Committee is recommending approval by the Policy Committee.

There was no public comment.

ASSEMBLY MEMBER FLYNN moved to approve the CY 2014-2015 UPWP 2015 Budget.
MS. HEIL seconded.

Hearing no objections, this motion passed.

f. Other Business Items**6. INFORMATION ITEMS****a. Other Informational Items**

MR. LYON pointed out that there will be a Joint Policy Committee/Technical Advisory Committee briefing on December 8, 2014 at 1:30 p.m. by KABATA and their consultants and is being held in the Mayor’s Conference Room.

7. COMMITTEE COMMENTS

MS. HEIL noted on Monday, November 17th, the state released proposed regulations for PM-2.5 that mostly addressed Fairbanks. However, there are a couple of areas that are statewide, one being the episode alert levels for PM-2.5. She highly recommends the Municipality look into that and possibly submit comments.

ASSEMBLY MEMBER FLYNN requested Mr. Lyon to contact Mr. Morris regarding this topic.

8. SCHEDULED AMATS MEETINGS

Technical Advisory Committee, December 4, 2014, 2:30 – 4:30 PM

Joint PC/TAC KAC Briefing, December 8, 2014, 1:30 – 3:30 PM

Policy Committee, December 18, 2014, 1:30 – 3:30 PM

9. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 3:24 p.m.