

**ANCHORAGE METROPOLITAN AREA TRANSPORTATION
POLICY COMMITTEE MEETING
Mayor's Conference Room, 8th Floor
632 West 6th Avenue
Anchorage, Alaska**

**February 12, 2009
1:00 PM**

Those in attendance were:

<u>NAME</u>	<u>REPRESENTING</u>
* Gordon Keith	Alaska Department of Transportation and Public Facilities, Regional Director
** Jennifer Witt	ADOT/PF
Aneta Synan	ADOT/PF
Dave Post	ADOT/PF
* Alice Edwards	Alaska Department of Environmental Conservation, Air Quality
** Cindy Heil	ADEC
* Matt Claman	Municipal Mayor
* Sheila Selkregg	MOA/Municipal Assembly
* Patrick Flynn	MOA/Municipal Assembly
Craig Lyon	MOA/ Traffic Department
Christine Bernardini	MOA/TD
** Jerry Hansen	MOA/PM&E
** Todd Cowles	MOA/Port of Anchorage
** Jody Karcz	MOA/ Public Transportation Dept.
Aves Thompson	Alaska Trucking Association
Sandra Cook	HDR Alaska
Anne Brooks	Brooks & Associates
Mary Ann Pease	KABATA
Cheryl Richardson	ACC

- * AMATS Policy Committee members
- ** AMATS Technical Advisory Committee members

1. CALL TO ORDER

CHAIR KEITH called the meeting to order at 1:13 PM. All Policy Committee members were present. Mr. Flynn participated by telephone. A quorum was established.

2. PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT ANNOUNCEMENT

CHAIR KEITH encouraged public involvement in this meeting of the AMATS Policy Committee. He explained that 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 noted that he had not brought copies of minutes, so that item should be postponed until the next meeting.

CHERYL RICHARDSON hoped that if the Policy Committee is going to look at the Economic Stimulus Package (ESP), the public could have copies of that document.

MS. BERNARDINI noted that the next Policy Committee meeting is shown on the agenda as March 12, but there has been discussion among MOA and ADOT staff to reverse the Policy Committee and TAC meetings, so that March 12 date would be a TAC meeting. MR. LYON stated that the chairs of the committees agreed, but this is a decision for the Policy Committee. He explained that the reasoning behind this change is for items to be reviewed early in the month by the TAC, so they can provide recommendation to the Policy Committee for their review later in the month. MS. SELKREGG was happy to have the TAC provide expertise around the direction that the Policy Committee provides, but she was nervous to have the Policy Committee approve what the TAC decides to do. She believed the protocol was for the Policy Committee to set the agenda for the TAC. For example, the ESP before the Policy Committee is a recommendation from the TAC without guidance or criteria from the Policy Committee to guide that recommendation. She feared that switching the meeting dates would reverse the roles of the bodies.

CHAIR KEITH stated the Policy Committee assigns tasks to the TAC and gives guidance and they then provide input to the Policy Committee. MS. SELKREGG asked when there was a discussion about the ESP. CHAIR KEITH responded that the ESP was fast moving and it was important to begin the process. MS. SELKREGG wished to ensure the Policy Committee is an effective policy-setting body. The TAC is driven by bureaucratic agencies

while the Policy Committee is policy making. CHAIR KEITH asked what is Ms. Selkregg's suggestion, given that the Policy Committee currently meets early in each month and the TAC meets later in each month. He noted that so long as the TAC acts upon guidance from the Policy Committee, the meeting dates are incidental. MS. SELKREGG felt that, in terms of efficiency, if the Policy Committee gives guidance to the TAC early in the month, the TAC could then meet later in the month. She felt the existing structure could be used more effectively. She did not see the advantage of switching the dates.

MR. LYON explained that this suggestion stemmed from the Public Participation Plan (PPP). MS. BROOKS explained that the suggestion to switch meeting dates is tied to the PPP. The hope is to establish a monthly theme for discussion to make it easier for the public to participate and track items being considered. The idea was to be able to focus and get through a decision-making structure in a single month.

MS. EDWARDS thought there would be good information in the PPP presentation and suggested that this discussion could be added as an "other business" item 5.e, Meeting Schedule.

MS. SELKREGG asked if the Policy Committee would review the criteria for the selection of the ESP projects. MR. LYON explained that the federal requirements guided the TAC's recommendations.

There being no objection, the agenda passed as amended.

4. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Postponed to March 2009

5. BUSINESS ITEMS

a. AMATS Public Participation Plan (PPP)

CHRISTINE BERNARDINI explained the PPP is a joint effort by staff and Brooks & Associates to update a 2001 document entitled Anchorage on the Move. That public involvement program was developed prior to SAFETEA-

LU and with the reauthorization of SAFETEA-LU federal regulation required that many other areas of public participation be addressed. The effort began in late 2007 and the effort was expanded with outreach to numerous groups in the community. The plan, process, and program are before the Policy Committee today for approval.

MS. BROOKS explained that the PPP is written for the public audience. The PPP talks about who guides transportation planning, gives background on AMATS, its function, and who are the decision-makers. The PPP introduces graphics intended to help the reader understand unique things about timing of public participation in Alaska. The PPP addresses outreach for the plans and programs undertaken by AMATS, including the Long-Range Transportation Plan (LRTP) and Transportation Improvement Program (TIP), as well as the Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP), Air Quality Plan, and this PPP. There are new components in this PPP to clarify what is done and when. There is an AMATS learning series, co-sponsored events, regular AMATS meetings, a staff speakers' bureau, and specific plan outreach. The learning series is a once quarterly explanation of AMATS conducted by staff. Co-sponsored events include things such as the mayor's town meeting or other transportation-related meetings. The PPP recommends an annual meeting with regulatory agencies, attended by both the AMATS TAC and Policy Committee. There is a suggestion to expand the agenda at the regular AMATS meetings to include a status report on the transportation system for items such as non-motorized transportation, which would be scheduled close to Bike to Work Day.

MS. BROOKS reviewed a quarterly timetable, showing topics by month and required reports that will be considered by month. The PPP lists standing AMATS committees, including the Planning and Zoning Commission serving as the Citizens Advisory Committee to AMATS, the Freight Advisory Committee, the Air Quality Advisory Group, and the Women's Commission indicated an interest in transportation on behalf of welfare mothers. There is daily communication through email and the website. When the MOA launches its new website, the new AMATS website will be also. The PPP includes a table listing the things available on the web and when and how long an item is available.

MS. SELKREGG asked if the PPP discusses project criteria. MS. BROOKS stated this information is not in the PPP itself, except that during the LRTP process there is an opportunity to comment on criteria. MS. SELKREGG asked if access to that information would be integrated into the website. MS. BROOKS replied in the affirmative.

MS. BROOKS reviewed the layers of activity outlined in the PPP. The PPP includes things such as the schedule for the LRTP. The PPP includes a description of each phase of the process and how the public can provide input into the process. This is also done for the TIP.

Graphics were developed to clearly show the decision-making steps for AMATS and how the public can comment. There are also tables showing the update cycles for all major documents. There is information on the MOA CIP just to provide the public with all relevant information.

MS. SELKREGG stated she has received calls from the public saying they have followed a road project and when it is built it is not what they expected. She asked if there could be a process that shows current projects with notes indicating changes to scope and reasons for those changes, or a note that discussion of scope will occur. MS. BROOKS understood that this body programs funds, but is not involved in the design detail. However, there was interest in having a better understanding of what happens with projects that are delayed. MS. SELKREGG asked for some place that people could understand the status and timing of a project. CHAIR KEITH noted that AMATS is a policy and funding entity and, after those decisions are made, a road goes to either the State or MOA, each of which has its own public involvement process. MS. SELKREGG asked that there simply be a link from the AMATS website so that people can understand why the scope of projects change.

MS. EDWARDS noticed that the PPP includes suggestions to project teams on how to involve the public, which she found very helpful.

MS. SELKREGG stated that it is very complex for a citizen to negotiate the AMATS/ADOT/MOA process. An AMATS website with links to other

information is a tool that the public can use to be involved in a project. MS. BROOKS stated that much of this functionality is in the AMATS website.

MS. BROOKS stated that much of the background information for the PPP has been taken out of the document itself, but with links from the website. Much of this information is contained in appendices to the PPP.

MS. SELKREGG asked for discussion of the best scheduling of TAC and Policy Committee meetings to make the process understandable. She thought that at each meeting, the Policy Committee should give guidance on the role of the TAC for the next month. CHAIR KEITH believed this is the current process. MS. BROOKS stated the PPP suggests picking a topic for a particular month and seeking information from entities/individuals involved with that topic. MS. SELKREGG wondered what is the best way for the Policy Committee to drive the direction of the TAC and the TAC to then help the Policy Committee with technical analysis of issues. She asked if each agenda should include discussion of what the Policy Committee would like from the TAC at its next meeting. CHAIR KEITH believed when the Policy Committee wants the TAC to do something the Policy Committee provides instruction. This is unrelated to the actual calendaring of meetings. He suggested adding an agenda item for each meeting to discuss what the Policy Committee wants the TAC to do at its next meeting.

MAYOR CLAMAN felt it was appropriate to identify topics over the coming year and sustain the general direction to the TAC to get information on those topics in advance of the Policy Committee meeting. If a particular issue needs additional discussion, the TAC can be given that request in advance of a particular month's meetings. CHAIR KEITH stated the Policy Committee also could give the TAC direction to cover other information and come back to the Policy Committee. MS. SELKREGG stated that she understands there are many times judgment calls must be made and she had no concern with that, so long as those judgments are based on criteria the Policy Committee has set. She favored adding an agenda item to allow the Policy Committee to give direction to the TAC on the following month's topic.

MS. EDWARDS asked to amend page 29 Table 13 to change "Air Quality Plan is a federally required document for maintenance areas" to say "Air

Quality Plan is a federally required document for non-attainment and maintenance areas.”

MAYOR MATT CLAMAN moved to approve and adopt the AMATS Public Participation Plan. SHEILA SELKREGG seconded.

MS. SELKREGG asked if there is a summary explanation for the ranking of projects that are included in the TIP. MR. LYON replied that these documents are available, but noted that several individuals score numerous projects, so the information is voluminous. MS. SELKREGG asked if ranking of the projects selected could be accessed from the website. MR. LYON stated that could be done. MS. BROOKS stated that 26-28 of the PPP explains that the public can access the scoring sheets after projects are scored.

ALICE EDWARDS asked to amend Table 13, the second row, “Air Quality Plan” under “update cycle” so that the first sentence shall read, “...a federally required document for non-attainment and maintenance areas.” MAYOR MATT CLAMAN seconded.

There being no objection, the amendment passed unanimously.

MS. SELKREGG cited page 27, Draft TIP and Needs List and asked where the document would state that the actual ranking of projects would be made public. MS. BROOK noted that this information is included on page 27.

There being no objection, the motion passed unanimously.

CHAIR KEITH commended the consultant for their work on this project.

CHAIR KEITH announced that the independent third party estimate for the Knik Arm Crossing is completed and available on the ADOT website. He also offered a written poll taken by KABATA of support/non-support of the Knik Arm Crossing.

b. First Quarter Obligation Report

DAVE POST explained that the Obligation Reports are intended to show how the program is tracking with the TIP. At this point, the current year TIP is

from June 2007 and the figures in the Obligation Report should match the Admin Mod #1. He explained the column titled “Obligated/Deobligated through 12/31/08” which represents what has been obligated to date in FY08. The next column is “Anticipated Additional FFY2009 Obligation,” which is the obligation expected through FFY2009. These funds are regular AMATS funds only.

Table 3: Roadways

MR. POST noted that funds were going to be borrowed from the State for Project G-1, Old Seward Highway, but it was instead purchased outright with regular AMATS funds last year. Project G-6, Old Glenn Highway Reconstruction Phase II was borrowed from the State in the amount of \$8.461 million. MS. SELKREGG understood that both last year’s money and a portion of this year’s money were used for this project. MR. POST confirmed this was the case. He noted that this is an issue that will continue to arise, as there are large projects and smaller allotments of funds.

MR. POST explained that Project G-4, Eagle River Road Rehabilitation, has a cost increase of \$250,000 for design funds. Project G-5, Eagle River Loop Road Rehabilitation, had a construction cost increase of \$750,000. Project G-9, Lake Otis Parkway Surface Rehabilitation and Safety Project, had a similar cost increase of \$500,000. Project 1, Spenard Road – Fireweed to Minnesota, has requested \$1.745 million of design funds; those funds will take this project from the environmental phase to plans, specifications and estimates. He noted projects where funds are being de-obligated, totaling about \$4 million.

MS. SELKREGG asked if the deobligation on 15th Avenue is due to changes in design or no intent to proceed. MR. POST stated this is a very dated project and he is not familiar with it.

Table 4: Transportation Enhancements

MR. POST stated that Project G-2, Chester Creek Trail Connection was to be obligated last year, but was not. It will be obligated this year at a cost of \$3.4 million.

Table 5: CMAQ

MR. POST explained that Project 3, Transit Fleet Expansion/Replacement, is for People Mover replacement buses. This project was originally in the TIP for \$600,000 and now is at \$5.6 million. Last year in order to minimize the dollars borrowed from the State, \$2.9 million that by policy would have gone into CMAQ were used. The additional \$2.7 million is this year's CMAQ allocation.

The total AMATS revised allocation is \$26,128,000 and the anticipated obligation amount is \$26,680,570. The latter is well within the targeted range of +/- 15%.

MS. SELKREGG asked if there is sufficient funding to cover the projects Mr. Post discussed. MR. POST replied that the projects shown for obligation are using funds in this year's allocation. MS. SELKREGG asked if the transit fleet expansion would happen. MR. POST replied that it is in the report. MS. SELKREGG asked if there are other projects borrowing next year's funding. MR. POST replied that the 2010-2013 TIP must still be developed. He noted that there is not a road project hitting the ground this year, but the funding program can proceed as shown.

c. 2006-2009 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) – Administrative Modification #1, Economic Stimulus Funding

CHAIR KEITH stated the House and Senate have met in a free conference committee and have developed an Economic Stimulus Package (ESP). The differences between the two bills when they went into committee included \$30 billion in House for highways and \$27 billion in the Senate; \$7.5 billion in the House for transit, including rail, and \$8.4 billion in the Senate. The Senate package was reduced from a total of \$900 billion to \$789 billion, so some figures will be reduced. The information before the TAC is based on the House figure of \$30 billion for roads.

Surface Transportation Program (STP)

DAVE POST stated the amounts shown for STP, bus purchases, and TE were based upon the allocation percentages that are used for distributing those funds in the TIP. He noted that Project G-6, Old Glenn Highway South

Birchwood to Peters Creek is a \$21.1 million project, so allocating \$15.5 million in ESP requires another \$5.6 million from the 2010 TIP. MS. SELKREGG remarked that this is an extraordinarily expensive project and asked what was the rationale for it to be the most important project in the TIP. MR. FLYNN noted that this was a high priority for the Eagle River representatives on the Assembly during discussion of the legislative package, due in large part to water work being performed in the area. Making all of the work happen concurrently is most efficient. MR. POST stated it was not necessarily put at the top of the list. The process is for projects to be ranked and scored and put into the list in order. Projects then move up the list as other projects are constructed. When this project was initially put on the list it was likely not the highest ranking. Part of the rationale for it ranking high at this point is its location in a high growth area and the fact that it is a substandard road. CHAIR KEITH added that grandfathered projects are such because they have gone through the environmental process and not moving forward means repaying funds to the federal government.

MR. POST stated that one of the most important considerations in developing the ESP is deliverability. The second STP project on the ESP list is Lake Otis/Tudor at \$5 million, which is needed to supplement the earmark. Another \$2.3 million could be used for CMAQ to purchase replacement buses; this allocation based on the AMATS Policies & Procedures allocation and would supplement the \$5.6 million for bus purchases in the 2009 TIP.

Transportation Enhancements

Chester Creek Trail is shown with \$1.26 million, supplementing the \$2.1 million in regular TIP funds. Anchorage Areawide Trails has the other \$1.26 million. Only one of those projects would move forward. MR. POST noted that an additional \$1.3 million in State TE funds will be put toward the Glenn Highway Trail resurfacing.

FTA-People Mover

MR. POST referred questions on these projects to Jody Karcz.

FTA-ARRC

MR. POST noted that these funds are only eligible for use by the railroad.

National Highway System

\$25 million is included for Glenn Highway Rut Repair, \$25 million for Glenn Highway lighting project, and \$14 million for Minnesota Drive rut repair.

MS. SELKREGG asked how soon the work on Minnesota Drive could be done. CHAIR KEITH replied that there are two time periods under consideration: 90 days to go to contract or 180 days. Minnesota Drive could be done in 90 days. MS. SELKREGG asked if the \$1.3 million for Glenn Highway resurfacing under TE is part of the NHS rut repair. MR. POST explained that these are separate funding sources. CHAIR KEITH explained that the NHS funding goes to the State and the others are AMATS.

CHERYL RICHARDSON asked if the State has approved this list of projects. CHAIR KEITH replied that the list is not necessarily approved.

CHAIR KEITH stated this list is the recommendation from the TAC, which was based largely on the policies of the Policy Committee. Those guidelines are an allocation of 10-20% TE, 10% CMAQ and 70-80% Roadways. The total available for the time period under discussion is \$124 million. 70-80% of that is \$87 to \$99 million. The grandfathered projects total \$136 million. This is a net under funding of \$36 to \$48 million for those projects. At the same time \$12 million is going to TE and \$12 million to CMAQ. He then reviewed the Anchorage area rut repair needs, which shows the serious problem with ruts in Anchorage, totaling \$75 million in need. CHAIR KEITH noted that a sample of a rut taken from an Anchorage road was available for inspection by the Policy Committee. This sample proves that the problem is not base failure or plastic deformation, rather the rut is from physical grounding.

MS. SELKREGG asked if there has been science whether it is more cost efficient to pay up front for concrete than to use less expensive asphalt. CHAIR KEITH stated that concrete ruts also, probably at the same rate as asphalt in the first few years.

MS. SELKREGG asked if some of the grandfathered projects are part of the bond package. MAYOR CLAMAN stated there is no overlap of these projects in the bond package. MR. POST stated that Spenard Road from Benson to Chester Creek is in the bond package. ADOT must complete the

environmental document for the entire section of that road. MS. SELKREGG asked if there are no other funding sources that might be available for these projects. CHAIR KEITH stated there are State General Funds, however, there is a state deficit. MAYOR CLAMAN stated the bond package approved by the Assembly includes Spenard Road from Hillcrest north.

CHAIR KEITH referenced the agreement between the State and MOA titled Connect Anchorage, which delineates the projects agreed to in that document totaling \$1.1 billion. MS. SELKREGG asked if this agreement between former Governor Murkowski and former Mayor Begich was based on a public process. CHAIR KEITH responded that all of the projects in the agreement are contained in the LRTP, which underwent a significant public process. MS. SELKREGG noted that there are a number of priority lists and she wanted to understand how to weigh this particular list in context of public participation. CHAIR KEITH reiterated that these projects underwent a public process associated with the LRTP. MS. SELKREGG understood there are grandfathered projects that were selected as part of the LRTP process, a priority list called Connect Anchorage that is also from the LRTP, but they are not entirely the same. She asked what is the right protocol to follow in deciding where to put money. MR. POST stated the starting point for the ESP was the projects that are high priority in the TIP.

CHAIR KEITH stated the LRTP and Connect Anchorage include projects funded by FHWA, including the State's share of NHS, the AMATS allocation, and MOA bond money.

CHAIR KEITH questioned if all the buses in the Program can be afforded, given the backlog of Roadway need. He summarized that there is \$2 million in 2009 CMAQ, \$2.87 million in 2008 borrowed CMAQ, and 10% of the FFY09 AMATS allocation in the amount of \$2.4 million, totaling \$7.3 million. Adding that to 10% of the ESP totaling \$2.28 million is a sum of \$9.6 million.

MS. EDWARDS clarified that \$7.9 million of that \$9.6 million is the amount dedicated to bus purchases.

MS. SELKREGG understood there is a demand for buses and that \$6.2 million is needed to get back to 1980 levels of bus service. MS. KARCZ stated

that buses must be replaced either every 500,000 miles or two years. At this point, 18 of 55 buses have been replaced. A total of \$13 million is needed to replace the remaining 32 buses. MS. SELKREGG understood that this does not expand service. MS. KARCZ stated this is correct. MS. SELKREGG stated the Assembly has expressed a desire to see expansion of bus service, which is not attained even with \$9 million in the budget. CHAIR KEITH noted that bus schedules are changing. MAYOR CLAMAN stated that two routes have been eliminated and service on the four lowest use days have been eliminated. MS. SELKREGG asked what is the total value of the TIP program this year. MR. POST replied that there is \$26 million for the regular AMATS program, \$25 million in ESP, and \$5.9 million FTA funds to People Mover. MS. SELKREGG understood the total is \$58 million. She was concerned that, in a time when people are losing jobs and have less money, services to those most vulnerable are being cut. The current level of bus ridership is not as high as in the 1980s. If additional routes could be created, the buses could be filled. MR. POST clarified that there is a total of \$64 million under local control comprised of FTA funds and ESP and 2009 AMATS funds. Of those funds, 19% is FTA to the MOA, 15% is CMAQ, 11% is TE and 56% is Roadways. MR. LYON asked if the FTA figure includes the railroad. MR. POST replied that the railroad could allocate its funds statewide. MS. SELKREGG asked what percentage is going to buses. MR. POST replied that 12-13% is going to buses.

CHAIR KEITH remarked that the ESP is a jobs bill, not a transportation bill. Using the \$2.3 million of ESP in Roadways rather than for buses means jobs in this state where buying buses means jobs in another state. Also, buses comprise 1% of travel and cars comprise 99%; buses also drive on the roads. MS. SELKREGG stated she has heard that ridership will increase if the buses are available.

CHERYL RICHARDSON stated Anchorage Citizens Coalition has been working with a nationwide coalition called Transportation for America, which attempted to get transit operating funds included in the ESP, but was not successful. That effort will come forward again in the omnibus bill, which will follow the stimulus bill, and finally through the T4 legislation. She thanked Mayor Claman's office for support in this effort. The larger issues relate to the PPP and the fact that how AMATS sets its policies is not yet addressed.

She thought there had not been an open discussion about how funds are allocated between transit and roads. She stated that ridership may be at 1% but the target is the commuter. The Mat-Su commuter is being subsidized at \$20 a ride while the Hillside commuter is not being subsidized at \$3 a ride. To lose even three days of bus service is taking mobility away from people who potentially need it to get to work. Postponing a road project does not hurt like not getting to work.

AVES THOMPSON with the Alaska Trucking Association stated the idea of the ESP is to create jobs. There is much unmet need in terms of road repair and putting people to work fixing those roads will create jobs. He did not oppose buying buses, but noted the \$75 million in rut repair need in the MOA. He noted that ruts in roadways pose serious safety concerns. He felt the \$2.3 million should be used for roads rather than buses.

CHAIR KEITH explained that FTA money comes to People Mover and can only be spent on transit. That allocation is \$5.9 million and none of that funding is being spent on buying buses. MS. KARCZ stated that the focus has been on shovel-ready projects. She stated the policy of AMATS is to allocate 10% to CMAQ and those funds can be used for buses. She has been talking about the need to replace buses for many years. There are also shovel-ready projects at the Tudor Road Public Transportation Department campus that the CMAQ money can be used to fund, including energy efficient lighting, hoists for the shop, safety improvements associated with bus washing, and security improvements to the 25-year building. MS. SELKREGG stated that these are difficult budget times and she hoped that spending on transit in the next year or two would be focused on providing buses. She felt that cutting bus service for people who rely on it to get to work is essential issue. She felt the primary focus for transit money should be on buying buses. She acknowledged the point made regarding allocation of FTA money for use on transit only and understood the need to maintain the road system.

MAYOR MATT CLAMAN moved to distribute ESP funds as recommended by the TAC. PATRICK FLYNN seconded.

CHAIR KEITH moved to amend to reduce replacement buses by \$4.6 million (\$2.28 million in ESP and the 10% AMATS 2009 allocation). MAYOR

CLAMAN noted that the motion deals only with the ESP, so Mr. Keith's motion would be only the \$2.28 million in ESP. He asked if those funds would be put into rut repair. JENNIFER WITT stated the \$2.28 million in funds would go into the Pavement Replacement project in the TIP.

MR. LYON suggested the motion should be to approve Admin Mod #1. MAYOR CLAMAN wished to deal with the ESP separately.

MS. SELKREGG questioned why bus money would be taken away when there is \$2.6 million to Chester Creek Trail. CHAIR KEITH explained there is a separate TE funding allocation being used for that project.

MR. POST noted that Admin Mod #1 shows the illustrative projects, which are secondary projects if for any reason one of the Option 1 projects is not deliverable, or if additional funds come available.

MAYOR MATT CLAMAN seconded.

MS. SELKREGG suggested allocating the FTA funds to bus replacement and new bus purchases. MIKE ABBOTT explained that decision would rest with the Assembly at the point FTA grants are received. MS. SELKREGG asked what is the protocol to use the FTA money for replacement buses and new buses, if that is the Assembly's desire. She expressed her understanding that ridership would exist if buses were provided. MR. ABBOTT explained that when the ESP is finalized and the FTA amount is known, it would be brought to the Assembly as a grant for appropriation. At that time, the Administration recommendation will be described and the Assembly can adjust it. MS. SELKREGG stated her intention would be to use the FTA money for replacement buses and new buses. CHAIR KEITH clarified that his motion is not related to new buses, but to replacement buses. MS. SELKREGG stated that in a time when money is scarce, the importance of buses increases.

The amendment passed with Claman, Keith, and Edwards in favor and Flynn and Selkregg dissenting.

CHAIR KEITH moved to amend Table 5, Project 3 under Projects to delete \$2.4 million so the total for that project is \$3.2 million and put that \$2.4 million into the Pavement Replacement Program. He noted that this 10% allocation of the AMATS 2009 allocation was based on Policy Committee P&P#3 that requires 10% of total dollars be put into CMAQ. ALICE EDWARDS seconded.

CHAIR KEITH proposed his amendment because there are unmet needs in roads.

MAYOR CLAMAN felt it was important to keep the commitment to replace buses. He supported using more of the ESP for jobs for people in Alaska, but he did not favor this amendment.

MS. EDWARDS asked if this project has been initiated, given that it is part of the 2009 Program. MS. KARCZ replied that Public Transportation Department has contacted bus companies to find out if the MOA can piggyback on their orders and has written at least one letter indicating the intention to do that. She believed the State has begun the process of transferring money from FHWA to FTA. MS. WITT stated this Admin Mod #1 had to be in hand before Headquarters would initiate that action.

MS. SELKREGG remarked on the number of road projects in the Program and specifically noted that landowners abutting Fireweed Lane and Spenard Road are outraged about those projects. She felt that some of the transportation projects could be re-examined to determine which are most essential. She did not support the amendment. She did not believe problems could be solved simply by taking funding from buses. She asked if Fireweed Lane could be pushed out by one year. MR. POST stated that project is not in the current TIP. MS. SELKREGG asked if Spenard Road could be delayed. MR. POST stated the \$1.7 million is for the environmental document and a portion of the design phase. MS. SELKREGG noted that project is highly unresolved. She thought the \$1.7 million from Spenard Road could be allocated to road rut repair. MR. POST was uncertain of the consequence of that action. MS. SELKREGG hoped to develop a strategy that does not cripple the bus program.

The amendment failed with Keith in favor and Flynn, Edwards, Selkregg, and Claman dissenting.

SHEILA SELKREGG moved to postpone the Spenard Road project for one year and allocate \$1.7 million. MAYOR CLAMAN noted that project is not on the agenda and the meeting is past the hour of adjournment.

There being no objection, the motion passed unanimously.

SHEILA SELKREGG moved to approve Admin Mod. #1. MAYOR MATT CLAMAN seconded.

There being no objection, the motion passed unanimously.

d. Other Business Items – None

6. INFORMATIONAL REPORTS – None

7. SCHEDULED AMATS MEETINGS

Technical Advisory Committee, February 26, 2009

Policy Committee, March 12, 2009

8. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 3:25 PM.