

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

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

**November 12, 2015
2:30 p.m.**

Technical Advisory Committee Members Present:

Name	Representing
David Post	Alaska Dept. of Transportation & Public Facilities (DOT&PF), Central Region, Planning
Ken Morton	DOT&PF, Central Region
Alex Edwards	Alaska Dept. of Environmental Conservation (ADEC)
Steve Morris	MOA/Dept. of Health & Human Services
Stephanie Mormilo	MOA/Traffic Division
Bart Rudolph	MOA/Public Transportation Department (PTD)
Shawnessy Leon	Alaska Railroad Corporation
Hal Hart	MOA/Community Development Department (CDD)

Also in attendance:

Name	Representing
Craig Lyon	MOA/CDD
Jamie Acton	MOA/CDD
Aaron Jongenelen	DOT&PF
Nicole Rehm	PTS, Inc.
Dean Karcz	PTS, Inc.
Dan Krechmer	Cambridge Systems (via teleconference)
Susan Shiffer	MOA/PTD
Kevin Jackson	DOT&PF
Brad Coy	DOWL
Jon Knowles	DOT&PF
Julie Jessen	HDR

1. CALL TO ORDER/ROLL CALL

CHAIR MORMILO called the meeting to order at 2:32 p.m. Sharen Walsh and Jerry Hansen were excused. John Laux was absent. Shawnessy Leon represented the Alaska Railroad Corporation in Brian Lindamood's absence; Bart Rudolph represented the MOA Public Transportation Department in Jody Karcz' absence; and Dave Post represented the AKDOT&PF in Jennifer Witt's absence. Steve Morris arrived at 2:41 p.m. A quorum was established.

CHAIR MORMILO welcomed Alex Edwards to the Committee.

2. PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT ANNOUNCEMENT

CRAIG 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. LYON requested to add the Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP) as Item 6(b) on Informational Reports.

MR. MORTON moved to approve the agenda as amended. MR. POST seconded.

Hearing no objections, the agenda was approved as amended.

4. APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES – September 10, 2015 and October 8, 2015

MR. POST moved to approve the minutes of September 10, 2015. MR. HART seconded.

Hearing no objections, the minutes were approved.

MS. LEON moved to approve the minutes of October 8, 2015. MR. POST seconded.

Hearing no objections, the minutes were approved.

5. BUSINESS ITEMS

a. Draft 2016-17 Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP)

BACKGROUND:

The Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP) is required by federal law under Title 23, amended 23 USC 134 as interpreted by FHWA in 23 CFR 450.308, when federal funds are used for transportation planning. The Draft 2016-17 UPWP defines the transportation planning activities and products to be developed by AMATS and other transportation planning agencies during the fiscal year (Jan 1st – Dec 31st). It is the basis for allocating federal, state, and local funds for short and long-range transportation planning activities within the Municipality of Anchorage.

UPWP tasks are grouped into 'Work Elements' in the following categories:

- *100 Element: Plans and Programs*
- *200 Element: Subarea and Special Studies*
- *300 Element: Air Quality*
- *400 Element: Data and Modeling*
- *500 Element: Program Administration and Public Involvement*
- *600 Element: Public Transportation*

The UPWP is reviewed jointly by the Federal Highway and Transit Administrations (FHWA and FTA). During the 2015 Federal Planning Certification, the Federal Review Team suggested a document format change and requested an early draft for review and comment.

MR. LYON noted this is the first of two very time-sensitive items. This needs to be approved in order to send it to DOT Headquarters in Juneau, and then forward it to FHWA for approval by the end of the year. This is an entirely new version of the UPWP that Ms. Acton has been working on and has ultimately created a spectacular document. He added that no public comments have been received during the public comment period from October 8th to November 5th, but a lot of agency comments have been received with a few from the Transit Department received today.

MS. ACTON also added that she had received comments from Cindy Heil and has incorporated her edits. The required MTP, the Public Participation Plan, the SIP and the TIP have also been included. The budget information has been updated to reflect the actual numbers they have. Transit has disclosed their budget, which has never previously been done. FTA and FHWA provided feedback on the new documents. The document is linked heavily, and accessible background information explains the document in further detail. Transit had some updated budget figures that will be incorporated, but this document needs to be posted today allowing the Policy Committee to approve it next week.

CHAIR MORMILO noted a typographical error on page 9 that reads, "The SIP activity identified..." that the letter "t" is missing in identified.

MR. MORRIS arrived at 2:41 p.m.

CHAIR MORMILO asked for public comments. There were no comments.

MR. RUDOLPH moved to approve and incorporate the edits as noted. MS. LEON seconded.

Hearing no objections, the motion was approved to incorporate the Transit modifications.

MR. POST recommended approval of the Draft 2016-17 UPWP as amended to the Policy Committee. MR. MORTON seconded.

Hearing no objections, the motion was approved as amended.

b. Citizens Advisory Committee Appointments

MR. LYON noted that staff is requesting the AMATS Policy Committee to appoint the slate of individuals listed below to the Citizens Advisory Committee (CAC). He added that twenty-nine applicants applied for the six Assembly District seats. In addition, five seats on the CAC will represent various community organizations. Completed applications and letters of interest were considered by a three (3) member review board consisting of the AMATS Coordinator, the AMATS Area Planner with the Alaska Department of Transportation and Public Facilities and an AMATS Planner, and the following names are recommended for approval:

Name	Seat	Term Expires
John Tolley	District 1	2019
Julee Trudeau	District 2	2017
Adison Smith	District 3	2019
David Cushwa	District 4	2018
Jonathan Lang	District 5	2017
Leslie Holland-Bartels	District 6	2018
Bruce Bustamante	Anchorage Chamber of Commerce	2019
Debbie Ossiander	Chugiak-Eagle River Chamber of Commerce	2017
Zachary Walker	JBER	2018
Bob French	Federation of Community Councils	2019
Jon Spring	Planning & Zoning Commission	2018

While committee memberships are for three-year terms, staff has randomly staggered the initial appointments. The regular terms of the committee members shall commence upon approval by the Policy Committee and shall expire on February 14th of the year his/her term expires. The CAC Subcommittee, consisting of Aaron Jongenelen, Jamie Acton and himself, received thirty applications and reviewed them. Their attempt is to recommend a diverse group in regards to ethnicity, profession and geographic location, representation from academia youth groups and/or senior groups.

CHAIR MORMILO asked for public comments. There were no comments.

MS. LEON moved to accept the recommended names for the CAC positions and forward them to the Policy Committee. MR. POST seconded.

Hearing no objections, this motion passed.

In response to Chair Mormilo, MR. LYON replied that it took thirty days to request nominations and a full day to review the thirty applications.

c. Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) 2015-18 Administrative Modification #6**BACKGROUND:**

An administrative modification to the AMATS 2015-2018 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) is needed to update Table 3 Roadway Improvements, Table 4 Non-Motorized, and Table 5 Congestion Mitigation Air Quality (CMAQ). Included as information items are updates to Table 3 Roadway Improvements, Table 6 National Highway System (NHS), Table 7 Transit, Table 8 Other Federal, State and Local Funded Projects within the AMATS Area, and Table 9 NHS/Non-NHS Improvements outside AMATS, but within the MOA. Annually, there is an apportionment split between the Municipality of Anchorage and the Alaska Railroad for FTA Section 5307 Urbanized area formula funds. The FFY 2015 FTA Section 5307 and 5340 full year allocations were determined in September 2015 at \$13,914,817. To reflect the approved apportionment split, Table 7 must be adjusted for total FFY 2015 transit funding to the Municipality of Anchorage (MOA) for \$4,630,738, and to the Alaska Railroad as well as individual project amounts. In addition to the FTA 5307 and 5340 funds allocations and split; FTA also provides and confirms the allocation of Section 5310 Enhanced Mobility for Seniors and Individuals with Disabilities funding and Section 5339 Bus and Bus Facilities Program allocation to the Municipality of Anchorage, which are also included in this proposed administrative modification. This administrative modification includes additional projects that constitute the “illustrative” list of projects allowed under federal regulation 23 CFR 450.328(e). Should a scheduled project encounter delays and be unable to advance as proposed, if actual project bids come in lower than estimated, or if sufficient funds are identified for other reasons, a project from this illustrative list can be selected in order to make maximum use of the funds. If a project is selected from the illustrative list, it must be incorporated into the fiscally constrained portion of the TIP before work can proceed.

MR. LYON noted that a few of the items require the TACs recommended approval to the Policy Committee. He added that the memorandum has been broken down to reflect the items that require action by the TAC, and those that are for informational purposes only, and explained them as follows:

TAC Approval:**Table 3 – Roadways**

- Updated O’Malley Road Reconstruction, Abbott Road Rehabilitation, and Pavement Replacement to balance the TIP based on the 4th Quarter Obligation Report.
- Updated Spenard Road Rehabilitation to reflect the change in funding source, from Federal to Local Bonds.
- Moved C Street Ocean Dock Road Access Reconnaissance Study from 2015 to 2016.

Table 4 – Non-Motorized

- Updated the 2015 Bicycle Plan Project Implementation to reflect the 4th Quarter Obligation Report.
- Moved the FFY18 funds into FFY17.

Table 5 – CMAQ

- Updated the Anchorage Ridesharing project scope to reflect the change to a contract managed service.

TAC Informational:**Table 3 – Roadways**

- Reflect the Construction overrun funding for Dowling Road Reconstruction and Eagle River Road Rehabilitation.
- Increase the funding for the Safety Improvement Program (Traffic Count Support) project.
- Added in Illustrative line items for Abbott Road Rehabilitation Phase II and Pavement Replacement Program.

Table 7 – Transit

- Updated the Transit Table to reflect FFY15 FTA Section 5307 funds.

Table 6, Table 8, and Table 9

- Updated to reflect current Draft 2016-2019 STIP.

SUSAN SHIFFER, Contracted Services Administrator for the MOA Public Transportation Department, noted that the vanpool contract is ending its term in 2016. This allows an opportunity to update the program with the use of a model that is being used by transit agencies throughout the U.S., and using CMAQ funds to subsidize vanpool groups. This would move the process from doing the day-to-day matching and managing vanpool groups by going to totally privatized contracting services that would be responsible for most of the day-to-day vanpool group administration and management. The significant change is that the contracted service will provide the vehicles, and instead of paying them a management fee with the MOA purchasing the vehicles, the MOA will pay stipends up to five hundred dollars per vanpool group per month. This will utilize more of the CMAQ funds, but the money that is being saved by not buying vanpool vehicles will be spent on the fixed route fleet and the demand response fleet. They should still be able to keep the costs minimal for the users.

MR. JONGENELEN added that the memorandum and TIP are slightly different than those that were posted due to a change that had to be made in the Non-Motorized Table 4. The Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan funding is being moved from 2018 to 2017. He had originally put it in A/C from 2017 to 2016, but following discussion with the consultants and Kevin Jackson with DOT&PF, it was determined that A/C was not needed.

MR. RUDOLPH noted that the second paragraph of the memorandum discussing splitting the 5307 and 5340 funds, shows the dollar figure on the memorandum is just the federal share. It will not match the actual TIP.

CHAIR MORMILO asked for public comment. There was no public comment.

MR. MORRIS moved to forward this to the Policy Committee with the minor modification to paragraph two made by Mr. Rudolph. MR. POST seconded.

Hearing no objections, this motion passed as amended.

**d. Congestion Management Process (CMP) Technical Memorandums 5, 7, 8 and 9:
Status of the System and Final Report**

BACKGROUND:

Cambridge Systematics is currently developing and updating the Congestion Management Process (CMP). The revised CMP will help to identify appropriate strategies to improve safety and reduce traffic congestion on area roads. Draft Technical Memorandums 5, 7, 8 and 9 and the Status of the System Report are being presented today for approval along with the earlier tentatively approved Technical Memorandums 1, 2, 3, 4 and 6. Also, staff is seeking tentative approval of the final CMP update pending edits and changes. Staff and Cambridge Systematics presented Draft Technical Memorandum No. 5 (CMP Problems & Needs), No. 7 (Implementation Plan), and the Status of the System Report as an informational item at the September 10, 2015 TAC meeting. In order to allow adequate time for review by the TAC, Draft Technical Memorandums 5 and 7, and the Status of the System Report, the initial comments were due by end of business, Friday, Sept. 25, 2015, and revisions were made to these memorandums and the status report regarding the differences in travel time and the segment lengths, and minor edits included title and heading updates. Initially, these documents were scheduled to be approved on October 8, 2015, but due to additional analysis and project team comments, these technical memorandums and the Status of the System Report are being presented today along with Technical Memorandums 8 and 9.

DAN KRECHMER with Cambridge Systematics provided a PowerPoint presentation via teleconference.

Staff is requesting approval of the Draft Technical Memorandums 5, 7, 8, 9, and the Status of the System Report along with the previously approved Technical Memorandums 1, 2, 3, 4 and 6. These will make up the final CMP Update document. Staff is also requesting tentative approval of the CMP Update in its entirety pending final edits and changes, and the final will be brought before the TAC for approval on December 3, 2015.

MS. LEON noted that she does not see Technical Report 8 – Strategy Effectiveness included in the presentation.

MR. MORRIS referred to the Status of the System Report, Figures 2-14 and 2-15, stating that he was somewhat confused because some of the comparisons have asterisks beside them. For example, the AM peak travel times from Glenn Highway to Artillery Road to C Street it shows there is a significant improvement between 2006 and 2014. It appears the same distance is not being looked at. MR. KRECHMER indicated that their intention was to make the 2014 run compatible with 2010, but it was not a good comparison. They will definitely look into it further.

MS. LEON asked Mr. Krechmer to check the titles on these figures because the title appears to have different years referenced than the dataset details.

MR. POST referred to the Technical Memorandum 5 noting on page 5-18 Table 5.1 references road projects considered for the CMP. It is not clear as to how the projects were selected because he believes the intent of these projects is to address some of the congestion identified on page 3-14 regarding the PM peak level. In the past, they have identified connecting the Glenn and Seward Highways particular benefit, and he is curious what the process was for looking at road projects and considering them for inclusion as a CMP project. MR. KRECHMER replied they used the analysis that was done as part of the Status of the System Report, and with some of the work that was done in the MTP, and attempted to match the projects. MR. POST asked what is the significance of having road projects considered for inclusion within the CMP when they are already in the MTP. MR. KRECHMER noted that the idea is to have them be compatible and sort of reinforcing the projects, and they felt there was a need to have projects identified to be able to address them. MR. POST commented that in previous MTPs, the connection to the Glenn and Seward Highways was considered to be the centerpiece of the MTP, and was one of the things that was beneficial to the system, as a whole, throughout the entire Greater Midtown area because the congestion was from the lack of connectivity saturating the system. It was not a new project but is in the MTP.

CHAIR MORMILO asked for public comment. There was no public comment.

CHAIR MORMILO asked if it is necessary to approve this today since it will be coming back in its entirety in December. MR. JONGENELEN explained that, technically, yes the technical memorandums need to be approved before they can proceed, and forward the draft to the Policy Committee so that they may start reviewing it.

MS. ACTON informed the Committee that Technical Memorandum 8 and the final draft are currently available online.

MR. MORRIS asked if the technical memorandums will eventually be compiled in the Status of the System Report and the CMP. He is wondering if it would make more sense just to work on those two reports since they will be combined, and why separate processes exist for the technical memorandums, and approve the compiled report at a later date. It seems that it would make more sense to have these incorporated into two reports now, and work on them. He expressed that it is very confusing to have four individual technical memorandums.

MR. JONGENELEN explained that getting approval of one large document proves to be more difficult to obtain input from individuals. Having smaller reports distributed over time allows an easier process for the technical people, the committees, and members of the public to provide their comments.

CHAIR MORMILO clarified that the Committee is just approving the additional technical memorandums and the Status of the System Report, but will still have to approve the overall

report. She added that she is not sure if she has seen the draft final report. MR. JONGENELEN replied that the Committee is seeing the compiled final report for the first time. CHAIR MORMILO stated that it was not included.

In response to Chair Mormilo, MR. LYON replied that he is not sure if this is time-sensitive, but he does know this is one of two items that were corrective actions previously, and was the reason why the federal certification is still open.

MR. HART expressed that these are foundational to the draft, and he is assuming that staff is doing the draft final document in parallel with the memorandums that are presented. He added that he is comfortable making a recommendation on the technical memorandums that are physically in front of the Committee.

MR. LYON clarified that the approval would be for Technical Memorandums 5, 7, 9 and the Status of the System.

MR. HART moved for the recommendation of Technical Memorandums 5, 7, 9 and the Status of the System. MR. MORTON seconded.

MR. MORTON asked if the Committee would have the ability to approve Technical Memorandum 8 by email. MR. LYON noted that it has been done before.

MR. MORTON recommended a friendly amendment to poll the Committee regarding Draft Technical Memorandum 8 for inclusion as part of this within the next couple of days.

CHAIR MORMILO restated the motion as amended.

MR. POST expressed that he is still confused of the significance of projects that are specifically identified as CMP projects versus those that are not, and asked for further clarification regarding what is the significance of something not being incorporated into the CMP, especially the Glenn and Seward Highway connection. MR. LYON noted that he did not have that information presently available, but would be able to obtain it after the meeting.

MR. MORTON asked if there was any money identified in the TIP to advance that project in the next two years. MR. JONGENELEN thinks it is updated every four years. He explained that if a project is not in the CMP, it does not mean it cannot move forward in a different way. These are just projects that are specifically addressing congestion versus other projects that are specifically addressing safety, or bottlenecking issues. It is not a bad thing for that project to not be in the CMP because they can consider adding it, if need be, but without any funding identified in the current TIP it will have to be considered at a later date.

CHAIR MORMILO wondered if the recommendation question is whether that should be included in this report. MR. POST reiterated that what was not clear to him is what the process selection was and the criteria applied to that, and if it was appropriate. MR. KRECHMER indicated that a

match between projects that were identified for a somewhat short term implementation and funding, and the congestion needs that were identified. The guidelines will show some mitigation, and there is no a reason why you cannot have projects due at any time. This was meant to be more as guidance than a specific plan because it is the MTP that really drives the plan and funding, and this is more of an advisory document. The purpose, for example, is if a project is being considered that specifically addresses congestion, and thinking about combinations of strategies and projects that may address congestion on their own or integrated into other projects to help address congestion. It would not need to be set aside and updated every four years when it would just require a simple motion or desire by someone. MR. POST believes that addressed his concern because it was not a short-term project.

Hearing no objections, the motion was approved as amended.

In response to Ms. Leon, MR. LYON noted that this is not a funding constrained document, and there is no reason why future CMP type projects would be included as recommendations into the MTP.

6. INFORMATION ITEMS

a. Bike Plan, Pedestrian Plan and Areawide Trails Plan Project Updates

DEAN KARZ with PTS, Inc. provided a PowerPoint presentation. NICHOLE REHM with PTS was also present and assisted with responding to questions.

MS. LEON asked if the Cost Benefit Analysis factors are available on the website. MS. REHM replied that it is online and the initial assessment was also given to the Technical Advisory Committee.

There were no public comments.

b. Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP) Status

Jon Knowles with DOT&PF provided a PowerPoint presentation.

MR. MORRIS noted that there has been a significant decline in injuries and deaths and asked if Mr. Knowles had a way to sort out how much of that contributed to the HSIP program versus having safer vehicles that had airbags. MR. KNOWLES replied that have not yet looked into that, but he is sure that is a combination that includes private entities making their vehicles safer. MS. MORMILO added that it involves a variety of information as they try to correlate all of the crash data to see a combination, and it does fluctuate. Some year might show a major reduction, but when looking at overall volumes, all of the volumes may show a reduction in vehicles travelling resulting in fewer crashes. There are a lot of factors included into those crashes. MR. KNOWLES

indicated that recent articles stating that when the economy is doing well, vehicle crashes throughout the United States increase due to more people driving. MR. MORRIS asked if major highway improvements, such as the Seward Highway, show results in the reduction of crashes, and if changes in these areas are visible by showing a reduction in crashes, or major injuries and deaths. MR. KNOWLES indicated that they do look into that and it reflects in the post-construction analysis, and what they are getting in return for the money that is spent.

MS. LEON asked what DOT does if they notice that the changes result in an increase of incidents. She noticed that one of the pull-off's on the Seward Highway going south appears to be in a dangerous spot, and inquired if the possibility exists to reconsider the change that was made. MR. KNOWLES explained that following three years of reviewing post-construction data if something else can be done with that intersection. The state, as a whole, is behind in the crash data base, and has found that other state DOTs have the same issues. In some instances, they do not want to wait the full three years before looking at alternatives. The Sterling, Seward and Glenn Highways are included in different HSIPs projects that have been completed, and are continually being reviewed in order to reduce crashes.

In response to Chair Mormilo, MR. KNOWLES answered that the nomination process is filled annually, but if the need arises it can be filled at anytime and is referred to as a supplemental nomination.

There were no public comments

7. COMMITTEE COMMENTS

MR. RUDOLPH introduced the new Transit Planner, Collin Hodges from upstate New York.

8. SCHEDULED AMATS MEETINGS

Policy Committee, November 19, 2015, 1:30 – 3:30 PM

Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee: December 1, 2015, 6:30 – 8:30 PM

Technical Advisory Committee: December 3, 2015, 2:30 – 4:30 PM

9. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 4:30 p.m.