

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

**April 23, 2009  
1:00 PM**

Those in attendance were:

<u>NAME</u>	<u>REPRESENTING</u>
Brad Smith	NOAA
* Gordon Keith	Alaska Department of Transportation and Public Facilities, Regional Director
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
** Lance Wilber	MOA/Traffic Department
Craig Lyon	MOA/TD
Vivian Underwood	MOA/TD
** Steve Morris	MOA/DHHS
** Jody Karcz	MOA/ Public Transportation Dept.
Judy Tymick	MOA/PTD
** Lois Epstein	Alaska Transportation Priorities Project
John Weddleton	MOA/Planning & Zoning Commission
Toni Jones	MOA/PZC
Nancy Pease	MOA/PZC
Jon Spring	
Andrew Niemiec	KABATA
Mary Ann Pease	KABATA
Mike Foster	KABATA
Vern Geidl	KABATA
Dale Paulson	KABATA
Bill Greene	KABATA (via telephone)
Casey Sullivan	MSI Communications
Alison Lohrke	DOWL HKM
Walt Parker	Self
Susanne DiPietro	Government Hill Community Council

Joann Mitchell	USKH
Cheryl Richardson	ACC
Laura Brown	RLS
Rosemary Shinohara	Anchorage Daily News
Don Hunter	Anchorage Daily News
Jason Moore	Channel 2
Scott Christenson	Anchorage Press
Aves Thompson	Alaska Trucking Association

\* AMATS Policy Committee members

\*\* AMATS Technical Advisory Committee members

#### **1. CALL TO ORDER**

CHAIR KEITH called the meeting to order at 1:03 PM. All Policy Committee members were present. 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**

*There being no objection, the agenda passed unanimously*

#### **4. APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

MAYOR MATT CLAMAN moved to approve the February 12, 2009 minutes.

PATRICK FLYNN seconded.

*There being no objection, the motion passed unanimously*

## 5. BUSINESS ITEMS

### a. LRTP Amendment Memo: Knik Arm Crossing

LANCE WILBER explained that in September 2008 the Assembly adopted a resolution requesting that the Policy Committee consider an amendment to remove the Knik Arm Crossing (KAC) from the Long-Range Transportation Plan (LRTP). The Policy Committee directed staff to initiate that process. Much work has been done in the time since. Most recently, the TAC has been developing a proposed new chapter to the LRTP that would include some key elements including addressing the KAC as a project and the new planning requirements for any LRTP amendment done after December 2007. The staff has done a commendable job addressing those planning factors. In working with ADOT and MOA, the staff has been preparing a revised financial plan for the existing LRTP. That financial plan requires adding inflation to projects and developing a projection of estimated revenues into the future. In the last month, the TAC has had a work session and meetings and has worked on the review draft of the Amendment. Some of the information in the draft may be relevant for an LRTP amendment, and some TAC members feel it is not.

The project costs for all projects in the existing LRTP is shown in 2004 dollars. Staff has increased those costs to 2009 dollars and shown an estimated escalation of price over the next 20 years of the Plan. The escalation rate used in the STIP is being used in the LRTP, at least for 2009-2013. Once project costs are known, revenue stream projections are made. The existing revenue streams, based on the assumptions made to date, are not sufficient to meet the financial obligations to implement the entire LRTP. Staff has been working on new funding strategies for the LRTP to meet those needs.

The TAC has been working under the assumption that, in order to be financially constrained, the network would not be adjusted and new sources of funds would need to be sought. The predictability of funding and escalation are difficult for the second 10 years of the 20-year period, but it has been done for planning purposes. The total LRTP package, excluding the KAC, is \$4.5 billion. By 2027, the Plan must be financially constrained.

The TAC has struggled with the new funding streams needed to be financially constrained. The LRTP estimates that 8% of the funding would come from the Municipality of Anchorage (MOA).

DR. SELKREGG asked if this explanation relates to the KAC or does it relate to both items on the agenda today. MR. WILBER replied that it relates to both things. DR. SELKREGG understood that part of the evaluation of the KAC involves re-costing all of the projects in the LRTP. CHAIR KEITH stated the discussion is of two things that may be related or not. If a major amendment is made to the LRTP, such as removing the KAC, that triggers the requirement for the Plan to be financially constrained. If no amendment is made, that is not required until 2011 when the next LRTP update is done. DR. SELKREGG stated she has been interested as a Policy Committee member in what is the impact of KAC if it is included; that is, what would not be in the LRTP because KAC is included. CHAIR KEITH explained that the LRTP shows the KAC funded completely with funds outside of AMATS' control. DR. SELKREGG understood that there were earmarked funds for the KAC that were a part of the AMATS allocation, not above that allocation and that this has affected the ability to bring projects forward. She asked if the Ingra/Gambell connection, maintenance, the bridges on the other side, and other components would be privately financed. CHAIR KEITH stated the KAC is not an earmark. It began as an earmark and Congress voted to take away the earmark status, so the money came to the State as formula funds. The State Administration took some amount over \$100 million and put it toward the KAC. DR. SELKREGG understood that the total allocation to AMATS in that year was about the same as the year before with the expectation that \$100 million would be spent on the KAC. CHAIR KEITH believed there was a greater amount of money allocated in that year and the \$100 million was above the funds normally allocated to AMATS. He stated that the money is National Highway System (NHS) and could have been spent on other projects, none of which are under the purview of AMATS. DR. SELKREGG wanted to make the point that the money received for the KAC came to AMATS and because that \$100 million was received for a project that was perceived as an Anchorage project, the allocation to Anchorage from the State was not as high. MR. WILBER stated that the earmark funds for the KAC affected all of Alaska. He explained that earmarks were previously above the allocation and a decision was made that they were a part of the

allocation. Those funds resulted in the State having less ability to allocate to locations throughout Alaska.

CHAIR KEITH asked what is the formula to determine the allocation to AMATS and FMATS. DAVE POST with ADOT/PF explained that the allocations are based on CTP, not the NHS portion of it, so there is no impact on the AMATS allocation. He thought the confusion arises from thinking that the NHS funding that goes to AMATS is an allocation, but it is based upon evaluating needs on a statewide basis.

MS. SELRKEGG felt it was important for the public to understand the cost of the bridge on the system and that there is a cost on the system. There is a limited amount of money for improvements on the NHS system. CHAIR KEITH stipulated to the fact that putting money into the KAC takes it from alternative uses in the NHS.

MR. WILBER stated that there is a financial plan in the LRTP for all projects except the KAC and a separate financial plan with different revenue sources and cost estimating for the KAC. When the Policy Committee adopted the LRTP with the KAC, it was clear that KABATA would stand on its own and would not affect the rest of the funding stream to AMATS. The increase in material costs for all projects also affects the costs of the KAC.

DR. SELKREGG asked what is the status of the staff evaluation of cost impacts. MR. WILBER replied that new revenue equal to 25% to 30% of the total cost is needed to meet the total LRTP cost. He stated that some of the new revenue sources include revenues that support infrastructure for the gasoline, some Stimulus money, creation of an Alaska Transportation Fund that would operate similar to the Alaska Permanent Fund, and either a statewide bond or statewide infrastructure bank. Those revenues would need to be a total of \$1 to \$1.2 billion over the next 20 years to make the Program whole. DR. SELKREGG felt the reality of the financial plan exists whether or not the KAC is done.

MR. FLYNN asked what portion of the 25% to 30% dollar figure is Anchorage money. MR. WILBER replied that it is \$282 million. The State portion is General Funds and other sources of fund \$1.2 billion. The federal program is

\$1.5 billion and the new programs would be somewhat less than \$1.5 billion. MR. FLYNN knew municipal bond money is used to match State funding and asked if that is included. MR. WILBER replied in the affirmative.

CHAIR KEITH commented that the LRTP has all of the facilities that will be built out in Anchorage, irrespective of funding; therefore many of the municipally bonded projects are municipally owned and operated.

MAYOR CLAMAN noted that the municipal portion is typically done through bonds.

DR. SELKREGG understood this analysis had to be done in order to proceed with the LRTP Amendment. MR. WILBER stated the TAC has seen a draft but has not acted on it; the price of oil and the price of projects have varied greatly and it has been difficult to produce an accurate estimate of current or future costs. DR. SELKREGG asked what prevented the TAC from taking action. MR. WILBER replied that there was a question whether the source and amount of projected revenue funds in the financial plan is reasonable. The TAC also struggled with the question whether the text should address things the NEPA process and final EIS did not address or things that were addressed through the NEPA process but not to the satisfaction of the Municipality. The TAC was comfortable with how the new planning requirements were addressed.

MS. EDWARDS asked if the figures shown in the column “estimated total sources of funding.” She asked if the figures shown in 2008 are the amount of money being received now. MR. WILBER replied that the figures for 2005 through 2008 are known amounts. MS. EDWARDS asked noted that beyond 2013 there are large total dollar amounts and she understood that AMATS would have to secure that much funding in those years in order to support this LRTP. MR. WILBER replied that this is correct. MS. EDWARDS noted that in 2014 the amount is \$358 million or roughly two times what is currently being received. MR. WILBER explained that he estimated when would be the earliest time to reasonably show that, and not put all of the money in one year. He felt the question is whether it is reasonable to assume there will be a new revenue stream available to Anchorage and probably the State that will bring additional funds up to \$1.2 billion in the last 10 years of

the TIP. He did not show the funds in one year only and made a best estimate for a reasonable flow of money in the last 10 years. MS. EDWARDS explained she was looking at the bond numbers that are four times what has historically been received. MR. WILBER stated those could be bonds, a bank or some other mechanism.

DR. SELKREGG viewed this as a strategy, not a prediction of what would occur. Without these mechanisms in place it is difficult for there to be certainty how the LRTP will be done. MR. WILBER concurred.

CHAIR KEITH noted that the topic of discussion is one being faced by the State, other locales, and the federal government. He noted this analysis is funding projects in the LRTP other than the KAC. DR. SELKREGG asked if the TAC is held up on this issue. MR. WILBER explained they are concerned with the validity of the new funding sources shown in this analysis. DR. SELKREGG felt these projections will change and the TAC can recognize that this is a best-case scenario. She was concerned with a lack of recommendation from the TAC and suggested the Policy Committee could recommend that the TAC view these as a reasonable set of estimates.

CHAIR KEITH stated the TAC has been charged with considering an amendment to the LRTP and what has changed. He believed the TAC was focusing on what has changed, but the bulk of the LRTP Amendment they developed is a rebuttal of the NEPA process in the EIS. He suggested not confusing the NEPA process with the planning effort. He believed this is the only project in the LRTP with an EIS that is not a near-term project. He stated that the NEPA process, which is very process-oriented and involves the public, has completed. Those who are unhappy with the result of that NEPA process cannot have their concerns addressed by the Policy Committee. Those who are unhappy with the results of that process are trying to use a planning document amendment to air their grievances, which is improper. He felt that all grievances about the EIS should be removed from the LRTP Amendment. He felt it was appropriate to air those grievances in a standalone document.

DR. SELKREGG asked what changes were identified as making it essential to add the KAC to the LRTP. She thought that process occurred quickly.

CHAIR KEITH replied that process involved 18 months and the process to remove has been shorter. The reason for the Amendment was that a regionally significant project was coming on line, which requires an amendment to the LRTP.

TONI JONES asked for clarification of the action before the Policy Committee. CHAIR KEITH explained the Policy Committee is trying to decide whether to release the Amendment to the public. He felt the Amendment is not ready for release because there is not completed staff work from the TAC or a recommendation from the TAC, and he is still asking what has changed. He noted that a new mayor will be taking office in a few months and it seemed appropriate to have that person's input into this decision. He also has heard rumors what KABATA is planning in terms of changing funding, but that is not in the record. He believed KABATA is performing due diligence on funding strategies and the design of the project. He believed the TAC could perfect the Amendment, the new mayor could have input, and KABATA could conceivably have a better strategy for the project. He saw no reason to hasten to release the Amendment until these things are accomplished.

MAYOR CLAMAN asked whether a motion is needed to release the Amendment in order for the Policy Committee to move the matter forward.

PATRICK FLYNN moved to release a proposed Public Review Draft 2009 Amendment to the 2025 Anchorage Bowl LRTP with the 2027 revisions to delete the Knik Arm Crossing. The Amendment document will include the TAC review draft and the draft financial tables. SHEILA SELKREGG seconded.

MR. FLYNN felt it was reasonable in the public review process to review whether or not the NEPA-related review items should be in the LRTP Amendment.

DR. SELKREGG stated that at the time the LRTP Amendment was initiated she raised the issue of a cost review, as well as the cost of the infrastructure itself and her concern about securing funding and anxiety and concern about what would happen if the project was not completed and who would then be

responsible for it. She felt that needs to be assessed. Furthermore, as this process has been underway the issue of the beluga whales has become an important issue. She also felt the issue of urban sprawl has not been addressed, particularly in terms of the cost of infrastructure to the Mat-Su and Anchorage and the State in terms of supporting a new community on the other side of the bridge. She felt there are new issues that should be addressed. She remarked that she attended the TAC meeting and heard from KABATA that this is a complex time to be funding the bridge and to find partners. She questioned at what point this project becomes so expensive that it is not a good investment.

CHAIR KEITH stated he had asked the Policy Committee to not take action until the third party estimate of the project was done. That is now completed and that estimate is approximately the same as KABATA estimated. DR. SELKREGG asked why that cost did not increase when the cost of every other project has gone up. She noted that everything before the Policy Committee in the last two years has increased. She was suspicious of that and noted there have been moments in the process when she has been suspicious of the process. CHAIR KEITH stated that since September the cost of construction materials including steel has gone down considerably. He also noted that the Mat-Su Borough and the MOA addressed the issue of urban sprawl in the NEPA process. DR. SELKREGG asked if the belugas have been addressed. CHAIR KEITH responded that is an environmental and permitting issue that could scuttle the project regardless of whether or not it is in the LRTP.

MS. EDWARDS was concerned about releasing the LRTP Amendment document to the public, feeling it is important to be cognizant of the process. The TAC has been working very hard and has gone to lengths to ensure this Amendment is done properly. They have not completed their technical review and have not given the Policy Committee a recommendation. She felt it is important to allow the TAC to do its work before releasing an Amendment. She looked at the tables related to fiscal constraint and questioned whether they are reasonable and realistic, based on past history. She felt that to ignore that and put this out for public review is a disservice to the process.

CHAIR KEITH noted that when a new mayor is in office it is possible that they could request any action taken by the Policy Committee to be rescinded. For this reason, he felt it would be wise to wait until a new mayor takes office so the Policy Committee does not look foolish in taking action and then coming back several months later to rescind that action.

MR. FLYNN had no concern beginning the public review process at this time, but whatever the new mayor is thinking would impact his decision whether or not to ultimately approve the LRTP Amendment.

MAYOR CLAMAN thought everyone on the Policy Committee is moving forward with the best intentions and no one would be acting foolishly. He felt that public comment should be taken.

CHAIR KEITH noted that typically when a document is released to the public the AMATS bodies have 80% confidence in it. It has been reviewed by the public, through the Assembly, through the TAC and then to the Policy Committee as a nearly completed working document. He felt that the confidence level in this Amendment is at a 10% to 20% level. He felt that after public review there could be major changes to the Amendment, noting that is a time-consuming and painful process.

TONI JONES, speaking as the Chair of the Planning and Zoning Commission that sits as the Citizens Advisory Committee (CAC) to AMATS, was disappointed when there was mention of the bodies that review documents before they come to the Policy Committee and the CAC was not mentioned. The Operating Agreement requires that the CAC review every major document before it comes to the Policy Committee and the CAC expects the Policy Committee looks at and considers its recommendation. She stated that the Planning and Zoning Commission has not looked at this Amendment, but suggested that this be viewed from a planning perspective, not a political perspective. She stated she has been following transportation planning in Anchorage for over 30 years and she has watched this project for 20 years. She expected it would come up again and again.

CHAIR KEITH stated this Amendment would go to the CAC for review before going to the TAC.

SUSANNE DiPIETRO with the Government Hill Community Council urged the Policy Committee to release the Draft LRTP Amendment. She heard concerns about environmental information being in the Draft and she stated page 13 of chapter 12 of the current LRTP is a condition that the Policy Committee put on the plan that the EIS is released and the comments from the Municipality of Anchorage, Mat-Su, Alaska Railroad Corporation, and public have been addressed. The Policy Committee put a condition on this project that the environmental issues raised in the NEPA process be responded to and addressed as a condition of including it in the LRTP and she felt it is completely relevant to include those comments. She felt in terms of the comment that putting this out for public review would cause more work in the future that there should be consideration that the public is fully capable of understanding the concept of the Draft. She felt it would be helpful for the public to know what the TAC is thinking and what information might be coming to the Policy Committee. She saw no downside to releasing the Draft.

CHAIR KEITH stated that Ms. DiPietro is referring to the comments from the public that are addressed in the Final EIS, not by the AMATS Policy Committee.

LOIS EPSTEIN, Alaska Transportation Priorities Project Director, disagreed that there have not been important changes. The beluga whale listing has happened since the Final EIS was issued. When the Final EIS was issued, the National Marine Fisheries Service said they preferred a no action alternative. This has not been resolved through the NEPA process and it is of significant concern because the current design does not meet the requirements of NMFS. An independent cost estimate was produced and the numbers are not vastly different than the amounts KABATA estimated, but the fine print says the project would not go forward if the financial risk were only placed on the private partners. It states clearly that as engineers who have built these projects around the country there must be an equitable sharing of risk with either the State or MOA. Thirdly, the worldwide economic downturn will affect the financing for the project. There is no certainty who will pay for Phase 2 Ingra/Gambell. Any problems with revenue for the KAC would come from the State or MOA and this is an

important planning decision for AMATS. At the same time, \$5 million is being spent a year when it is uncertain whether or not the bridge will be built.

CHAIR KEITH stated that some of these questions are the appropriate work of the TAC for the Amendment.

MIKE FOSTER, Chair of the KABATA Board, stated he was amazed that the TAC has been tasked with coming up with a recommendation and they are diligently working on it and at the same time there is a motion on the floor to move forward without that. There have been comments about the endangered species, belugas, record of decision, and concerns about impacts and those issues are still being reconsidered. There are issues about cost and viability and those are being evaluated. The State is looking at this as part of overall transportation needs. Recently there have been discussions about making the bridge foundation rail-ready. He suggested that action be delayed until the new mayor takes office. He offered to provide information from KABATA on environmental and cost issues, and in terms of design, cost and revenue projections, and the revenue stream from the tolls. He thought that it is nothing short of a political move to not wait for the TAC recommendation.

CHERYL RICHARDSON stated she has never heard of AMATS having to examine the financial consequences of removing a project from the LRTP. MR. WILBER explained that effective December 11, 2007 when the Policy Committee makes an amendment to the LRTP additional requirements are necessary. This is a new planning requirement of all MPOs.

WALT PARKER stated that based on what he heard, the planning process for the KAC is barely underway. Because there is no planning process that will give answers, the project has no business being in the LRTP and should not have been put there in the first place. He noted that he cut the ribbons on the last two large bridges in the state and has experience with them. He stated that the current situation can continue to cost the public enormous amounts of money without any real decision.

CHAIR KEITH made the point that the KAC is the only project in the LRTP with an EIS.

CASEY SULLIVAN, contractor to KABATA, corroborated the comments of Mr. Foster. He felt the Amendment is process driven. While he understood the opinions stated, there is a process and that process is not completed. He believed it would be irresponsible to release this Amendment without the full work of the committee.

DR. SELKREGG stated that no one is any fool that there are different perspectives among the members of the Policy Committee, but she suggested that the TAC has drug its feet because there is reluctance on the part of the State for this Amendment to go forward. At their last meeting, the TAC spent most of their time on another topic. She noticed that the time schedule shows two TAC meetings to discuss public comments, which she questioned. She stated the Policy Committee has asked the TAC to do this work and there is a reluctance to do the work. She thought there was intent to slow this down until there is a new municipal administration.

CHAIR KEITH stated that having this Amendment done in December 2008 was never realistic. When the Amendment to include the KAC in the LRTP was done, it took 18 months. This process is lengthy and the public review periods are established. He felt there might be a desire to accelerate the process to pass an Amendment before a new mayor takes office.

MAYOR CLAMAN noted that it appears Chair Keith wants to engage in debate on this topic and, if so, he recommended that Chair Keith pass the gavel and allow him to take the chair. CHAIR KEITH suggested completing public comment and then calling for the motion.

BILL GREENE stated that passing the motion to put the LRTP Amendment out for public review contravenes pages 3, 16, 22 and 23 of the recently adopted Public Participation Plan. The beluga is a separate process under the exclusive jurisdiction and control of the National Marine Fisheries Service that requires consultation before KABATA can do anything. The *Anchorage 2020 Comprehensive Plan* identifies on the first page of Chapter 4 that the most important and serious problem in Anchorage is that it has no room to grow and that, if and when the bridge becomes a priority, it would have to be considered. The current *Comprehensive Plan* does not consider the bridge,

but recognizes the extremely limited amount of land in Anchorage. To say that it does not conform to the *Comprehensive Plan* is incorrect. The cost to the system is not to the AMATS system, but rather to the State system. There is no cost to AMATS from this project. KABATA has a firm agreement with ADOT that the Ingra/Gambell connection will be paid for solely by KABATA. The two potential partners have not withdrawn. Originally \$231 million came to the state and only \$93 million of that was finally allocated to the project. The remainder of those funds has already been spread around to this MPO and other MPOs in the state. The cost estimate has always been in year of expenditure dollars; the LRTP has not always been in year of expenditure dollars, nor has the TIP. The small difference in cost estimates is explained by the fact that KABATA numbers have done that from the beginning. The sharing of risk is not with the city, it is out of the toll revenue and the city should be unaffected.

MS. RICHARDSON stated there is a shared risk for the MOA insofar as the Federal dollars that Alaska receives that go into the NHS are allowed to be flexed. Those funds can go into CTP or STP community projects. It is a State policy to not share those dollars and instead put those dollars into the NHS.

MR. POST stated he has worked on financial constraint on prior versions of the LRTP and his reading of the federal guidance is that finances have to be steeped in history and there must be a trend, not identification of new sources of funding. Basing a decision on an anticipated change to secure \$1.2 billion there is question whether it would pass muster with the federal government, in regard to the Air Quality Conformity in particular. He felt there is the potential for an unintended consequence of having to do a new Draft Amendment to the LRTP to drop \$1.2 billion in projects. He felt that, in part, this was a concern of the TAC that stalled its action. He asked if AMATS has ever released a Major Amendment or an LRTP Draft that the TAC has not endorsed. MR. WILBER believed that has not occurred. He stated he, too, was concerned whether FHWA would be receptive to the idea of showing new funding sources so he talked to Juneau representatives of FHWA and they said the key is for the Policy Committee to think that assumption is reasonable. The federal funding assumptions do need to be based on historical trends. He was very cautious and aware that it is

necessary to include the FHWA in this process. He consulted them on this approach, otherwise this would not be before the Policy Committee.

MARY ANN PEASE voiced agreement with Ms. Jones that this decision should be placed on a planning process. The TAC is extremely competent and has been reviewing this Amendment in a very limited amount of time compared to the time spent when the project was put into the LRTP. There are unanswered questions around this Amendment. There is absence of facts and material presented by municipal staff as part of the technical review process and evaluation. They quoted blogs and referred to media events and came down with a financial analysis of McQuary as part of their analysis. She hesitated to say they are not the most competent in terms of financial analysis and do not have all the facts. She felt more issues should be vetted before a decision is made to present information to the public. She questioned how the Policy Committee could ignore the fact that the TAC is not even ready, willing, and able to move forward with the Amendment.

MS. SELRKEGG asked that Ms. Jones offer further comment. MS. JONES asked Mr. Wilber to verify Mr. Greene's statement with respect to whether bringing this forward without action by the TAC is in violation of the Public Participation Plan. MR. WILBER stated he does not have the Public Participation Plan before him. MS. PEASE supplied Mr. Wilber with a copy of the Public Participation Plan.

DALE PAULSON with KABATA understood the new public involvement process requires that the document be out for public review for at least a week before there is any formal action on it.

CHAIR KEITH asked if this document was listed on the website. MR. WILBER stated that copies were available to the TAC and staff and Chair Keith was emailed the document over a week ago in order to allow time for review. It was not released because the TAC was still working on it. The Policy Committee received a copy of this more than one week in advance.

MR. WILBER stated he saw nothing in the Public Participation Plan on pages 4, 16 or 22 other than a statement that a public review draft must be put out, which approval of this motion would do, and that a public review is

required for an amendment, when there is comment there must be response to the comment, there must be financial constraint, and a Conformity must be done.

MR. GREENE suggested that Mr. Wilber review pages 22 and 24.

DR. SELKREGG called for the question on the motion.

MR. FLYNN read the motion on the floor: to release a proposed Public Review Draft 2009 Amendment to the 2025 Anchorage Bowl LRTP with the 2027 revisions to delete the Knik Arm Crossing. The Amendment document will include the TAC review draft and the draft financial tables.

***The motion PASSED with Gordon Keith and Alice Edwards objecting.***

DR. SELKREGG referenced the schedule for this item, noting there are two public comment review sessions for the TAC to review the Planning and Zoning Commission recommendation on both May 14 and May 21. MR. WILBER explained that introduction to the Planning and Zoning Commission is scheduled for May 11 and he wanted to be sure that the TAC begins reviewing any comments from then on May 14. The Planning and Zoning Commission will also consider this matter again later in May or at least the first of June and the TAC will look at any comments from that meeting. DR. SELKREGG asked for clarification of the June 5 and June 19 dates for the Assembly work session. MR. WILBER stated that work session has not been calendared, but he was talking with the Clerk about those dates.

MR. WILBER noted that the Policy Committee might wish to act on the Air Quality Conformity, which should be released commensurate with the LRTP Amendment.

MAYYOR MATT CLAMAN moved to change the order of the day to consider agenda item 5.b, Draft Air Quality Conformity. SHEILA SELKREGG seconded.

***There being no objection, the motion passed unanimously.***

**d. Other Business Items**

**1. Draft Air Quality Conformity Plan**

MR. WILBER explained there has been a consultation with FHWA, EPA and ADEC and, given the network would be the same as 2005, the only difference is that the analysis would be to 2027 rather than 2025. The approach is to extrapolate the previous years out two additional years.

DR. SELKREGG asked if there is a public process related to this document.

MR. WILBER replied that the public process for this document would be done concurrently with the LRTP Amendment.

MAYOR MATT CLAMAN moved to release with the Air Quality Conformity Plan concurrently with the Draft LRTP Amendment. SHEILA SELKREGG seconded.

MS. EDWARDS noted that if as a result of the public process the network changes, the Conformity would have to be changed as well.

MR. WILBER noted that the Conformity requires a 45-day review, but the proposed time frame would still be met.

*There being no objection, the motion passed unanimously.*

**b. Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) – Criteria and Project Nomination Forms**

MR. LYON explained that in the process of developing a new TIP, nominations for new projects are solicited. There is also review of the criteria used to rank and score all of the projects. The Planning and Zoning Commission was asked for their thoughts on the new criteria for Roadway, Transportation Enhancement (TE), and Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality (CMAQ) projects. He indicated that comments from all groups are shown on a spreadsheet. Those comments that staff did not require a change are shown in white, those with which staff is in agreement are highlighted in yellow, and those with which the TAC agree are in highlighted in blue. MR.

LYON noted that the Policy Committee also has the criteria in all three categories.

MAYOR CLAMAN explained he must depart the meeting and asked that Michael Abbott stay at the meeting as his proxy.

DR. SELKREGG felt it was difficult to follow the spreadsheet. She asked regarding comment 9 what are the other criteria that have a total of 20 points. MR. LYON noted that he had also prepared the criteria with track changes. DR. SELKREGG found this very helpful.

CHAIR KEITH suggested the body put a motion on the floor to accept all changes recommended by staff and the TAC and those with which there is disagreement can be further discussed.

PATRICK FLYNN moved to approve the changes to all criteria as recommended by the TAC. DR. SELKREGG had concern because she had not been able to review the changes. CHAIR KEITH asked if there is urgency to this action. MR. LYON explained that the TIP must be adopted by the end of the federal fiscal year, which is the end of September. To do that, there must be criteria to rank and score the projects. The schedule is to rank and score projects within the next couple of weeks. Both new and existing projects that are not grandfathered must be ranked.

DR. SELKREGG seconded.

DR. SELKREGG asked why the TE criterion “Improves Safety”, which is to “promote safe movement of pedestrian and bicyclists,” was reduced. MR. LYON replied that it was originally 20 points and was left at 20 points. There was a suggestion to increase it to 25 points and that was done, but neither the TAC nor staff accepted that. MR. ABBOTT asked what was the score for this criterion in previous years. MR. LYON replied that it has been 20 points.

MR. LYON noted there were many comments made at the Planning and Zoning Commission that helped to clarify these criteria. The TAC then reviewed those comments and accepted some of them.

DR. SELKREGG asked what is the total point value for “Improves Quality of Life.” MR. LYON stated the suggestion was to move it to 20 points, but it stayed at 15.

MR. LYON noted that that Ms. Epstein suggested a peer review of all criteria at the beginning of the process through which other MPOs could provide some input and that is a suggestion for the future.

DR. SELKREGG commented that Anchorage suffers from unattractive roadways and the public wants roads that improve the quality of their lives. She favored considering the point value for “Improves Quality of Life.” Anchorage does not match *Anchorage 2020* and the only way to get there is to reward projects that improve quality of life. MR. WILBER noted that when projects come in for scope, things like noise, crime, speeding and other factors that are related to quality of life are identified and those things are addressed in other criteria. DR. SELKREGG noted that other criteria have a value of 20 points while “Improves Quality of Life” has a value of 15 points.

MICHAEL ABBOTT moved to increase the total point value of Criterion 6 “Improves Quality of Life” to 20 points. SHEILA SELKREGG seconded.

***There being no objection, the amendment passed unanimously.***

TONI JONES, Planning and Zoning Commission and CAC Chair distributed minutes from the Commission’s where this topic was discussed. She encouraged the Policy Committee to support the Commission’s recommendations sitting as the CAC. The Commission had lengthy discussion on these topics and that body has substantial expertise including attorneys, land developers, planners, and others. The Commission looks at the totality of impacts that a project has on the community, on commerce, on children walking to school, on elderly, on movement of freight, etc. As Chair of the AQAC, she also suggested that the comments of the AQAC on the CMAQ criteria be considered. That group recommended specific reference to the Comprehensive Plan in the “Required by or Supports an Approved Plan” criteria.

MR. FLYNN asked if the April 9, 2009 Planning and Zoning Commission recommendations were incorporated into the information before the body.

MS. JONES replied that they were, but she did not see the changes to the nomination forms. MR. LYON clarified that the topic before the Policy Committee is the criteria.

DR. SELKREGG thanked Ms. Jones for appearing before the Policy Committee today.

JOHN WEDDLETON, member of the Planning and Zoning Commission, noted that comment #8 appears to have been done. He noted regarding comment #25 that the formula was originally correct but the use of it was wrong, as it would have rewarded expensive projects. Now with the changes the criteria is correct, but the formula is wrong. MR. ABBOTT asked if this was the intent of the Planning and Zoning Commission. MR. LYON stated he would check this criterion for accuracy.

MS. SELKREGG noted that Planning and Zoning Commissioners Pease and Yoshimura are consistently concerned with neighborhood impact and the balance between commercial and neighborhoods. They both recommended in comment #28 to increase the total points for "Neighborhood Integrity" to 15 points. MR. ABBOTT asked what was staff's reluctance to accept comment #28. MR. LYON explained that projects score well in different criteria. There are numerous criteria so that all of these things can be considered and staff felt that 10 points captured the idea of neighborhood integrity. DR. SELKREGG noted that comment #7 is that "Economic Benefit" is "biased toward projects that benefit commercial development at the expense of neighborhoods." She said it is a struggle to have a neighborhood identity in Anchorage. She stated that *Anchorage 2020* is about healthy, vibrant, and well defined neighborhoods and it might be nice to consider increasing the score for "Neighborhood Integrity." MR. ABBOTT stated regarding comment #7 that there is one criteria that deals with economic benefit and that has been downgraded from 20 points to 15 points. Much of comment #7 was addressed. DR. SELKREGG indicated she was glad to move on.

***There being no objection, the main motion passed unanimously.***

MS. EDWARDS asked if there is a joint TAC/Policy Committee work session on this topic prior to the next Policy Committee meeting. MR. LYON replied in the affirmative.

**c. Human Service Transportation Coordination (HSTC)  
Plan**

JUDY TYMICK with the Public Transportation Department introduced LAURA BROWN with RLS Associates. She explained that the Department has contracted with RLS Associates to update the HSTC Plan. MS. BROWN explained the HSTC Plan exists by virtue of SAFETEA-LU. An HSTC that was conducted for 2007-2008 has been updated. A local meeting was held in order to ensure there is understanding of the Plan and to vocalize their needs. Agencies, local officials, the general public, organizations representing elderly and low-income individuals were invited to attend, in total 274 organizations, and 52 attended.

DR. SELKREGG departed the meeting at 3:00 PM.

As a result of the public meeting, a good needs assessment was possible to determine the benefit of coordinated transportation for the area. This Plan has been successful over time. Community transportation in Girdwood was expanded, the Governor's Coordinated Transportation Task Force was formed, Challenge Alaska has a shared vehicle, and there is a Vanpool purchase partnership with the Mat-Su Borough.

MS. BROWN briefly noted the requirements of SAFETEA-LU. The Plan must be locally developed, which was accomplished through the involvement of the parties mentioned previously. An inventory of services was done through an online survey completed by transportation providers. If a provider did not do the survey, RLS also provided one-on-one interviews. Goals and strategies were developed and a working group prioritized those. There were also two public meetings that provided input into those goals and strategies. The TAC has approved the HSTC Plan with one minor change. After TAC approval, page 68 of the Plan was amended to clarify that the FTA 5317 funds will be competitively bid. The next step is for the Policy Committee to adopt the HSTC Plan.

MS. BROWN reviewed the goals of the HSTC. Goal #1 is to enhance mobility management activities. This goal involves examination of what is being done, drawing the resources together, keeping the lines of communication open, and negotiating new opportunities. MS. TYMICK remarked that a new mobility coordinator position will be advertised in the coming weeks and that position will work with AMATS to develop a travel options program.

MS. BROWN stated Goal #2 is to improve interagency and public communication to increase awareness and ridership. The working group will participate in this, as they have access to and understand the various organizations involved. New organizations will be added to the Plan, as appropriate.

Goal #3 is to utilize existing resources fully and seek new funding sources to expand and improve transportation services within Anchorage. This goal speaks to opportunities to expand People Mover, AnchorRIDES, the Vanpool program, and others.

Goal #4 is to expand services while eliminating gaps. This goal speaks to sharing resources and identifying the ability for a service to meet needs.

Goal #5 is to establish transportation service to underserved populations and outlying areas. This goal suggests strategies to continue working with the Mat-Su Borough, Girdwood, the Hillside, and other communities and how to address the needs of particular populations.

Goal #6 is to improve safety. This goal speaks to continued work with the Safety and Security Plan and promoting the Vulnerable Populations Plan.

Goal #7 is to incorporate new technology and capital to improve existing mobility options and serve more people. Some of the SAFETEA-LU opportunities are capital-related. This goal addresses technology such as interactive voice response, which other communities have found reduces the time spent scheduling paratransit trips and increases customer services.

MS. BROWN reviewed next steps, which is Policy Committee adoption of the HSTC Plan and the eligible applicants would then begin the competitive process for 2008-2009 funds.

MICHAEL ABBOTT moved to adopt the Human Service Transportation Coordination Plan as presented. PATRICK FLYNN seconded.

*There being no objection, the motion passed unanimously.*

**d. Other Business Items – None**

**1. Draft Air Quality Conformity Plan**

*DEALT WITH EARLIER IN THE MEETING*

**6. INFORMATIONAL REPORTS**

**a. Obligation Report – 2<sup>nd</sup> Quarter**

ANETA SYNAN explained that this Report compares the program project funds as approved in the TIP Administrative Modification with the latest projected estimates of need. There were three projects requiring additional funds, but those increases were at a level that required either staff or TAC approval. Therefore, this report is informational to the Policy Committee. The changes were: 1) to obligate an additional \$270,000 for Roadway Project G-3, Huffman Road Reconstruction (Old Seward Highway to Pintail) to cover additional design-related expenses; 2) to obligate an additional \$100,000 for design funding for Roadway Project G-6, Old Glenn Highway rehabilitation (Fire Lake to Peters Creek); and 3) to obligate an additional \$300,000 for TE Project G-3, Muldoon Road Landscaping & Pedestrian Improvements to cover increased right-of-way expenses. MS. SYNAN noted that the total program is well within the 10% variance allowed.

MR. FLYNN asked if these are 2009 dollars or were they borrowed out of 2010. MS. SYNAN replied that these are out of the 2009 AMATS allocation.

**b. Public Transportation Route Changes**

JUDY TYMICK reported that in response to the need to cut the budget, service on four holidays was removed from the People Mover schedule; those

holidays are Martin Luther King Jr. Day, Presidents' Day, Veterans Day and the day after Thanksgiving. People Mover will also be reducing service on Eagle River routes 77 and 78 by 30%. The Planning Division is drafting schedules for those routes. MR. ABBOTT asked when these changes take effect. MS. TYMICK replied that holidays took effect earlier this year with Presidents' Day and July 20 is the start date for route changes. MR. FLYNN asked that the finalized product be sent to Mr. Lyon to send to the Policy Committee and the Assembly.

**c. Annual Air Quality Report for EPA**

MATT STICHICK with the municipal DHHS stated that the Department currently monitors for carbon monoxide (CO), PM-10 and PM-2.5 and in the next year lead monitoring and ozone monitoring will likely be added. He reviewed information on the earlier CO penetration study.

MR. FLYNN asked if Anchorage is currently in attainment for sulfur dioxides and nitrous dioxides. MR. STICHICK stated Anchorage is in attainment for sulfur dioxides and nowhere in the country is in violation for nitrous dioxides.

MR. STICHICK stated that in the mid to late 1990s Anchorage did an analysis of the CO problem, trying to address prior violations. A saturation study and a cold start emission study were conducted. CO is colorless, odorless, and poisonous and approximately 75% of CO in Anchorage comes from automobile emissions. There are four CO monitoring stations in Anchorage and Eagle River. A surprising finding in the saturation study was that some of the highest concentrations of CO are in older neighborhoods rather than at busy intersections. CO is produced when vehicle engines are cold and the majority of emissions are released in the first five minutes of operation, before the vehicle leaves the driveway. After five minutes of operation, CO production is significantly reduced. Plugging in a vehicle substantially reduces emissions by almost 60%. The second maximum concentration of CO, which is the regulatory standard, was violated last in 1996. Anchorage still ranks in the upper 2% of the national average for CO concentrations. Anchorage compares relatively well in terms of PM-10 and PM-2.5. PM-10 is primarily silt or pulverized road material. PM-2.5 is soot or other combustion products. There are PM-10 monitoring stations in Downtown, at Tudor Road, in Airport Heights, and in Eagle River. PM-2.5

problems typically only arise with wildfire smoke and there is some localized impact from wood burning. There have been prior PM-10 violations, but those have been associated with extreme events, such as windstorms. There was violation in 2007 in Eagle River and DHHS is seeking approval for that. PM-10 is highest during break-up and freeze-up. A substantial reduction was achieved in the early 1990s through paving programs. Since then, reductions of PM-10 concentrations have been difficult to achieve.

MR. ABBOTT asked for comment on the PM-10 violation in Eagle River in 2007. MR. STICHICK showed this violation on the graph. He stated that AMATS is typically within the national average for PM-10. The event in Eagle River occurred in December 2007 during a windstorm and there is evidence that it was transport from the Mat-Su Valley into Anchorage.

Anchorage is well within the yearly and four-hour average standards for PM-2.5. Anchorage is involved in an ambient air toxics study for concentrations of volatile organic carbons (VOCs) and poly aromatics (PHs). The primary concern with those studies is benzene. There are substantial ambient concentrations of benzene, which can be even higher inside of homes. Homes with an attached garage can see concentrations as much as ten times higher than outside.

FLYNN asked when the new EPA benzene regulations would come into effect. MR. STICHICK replied that there is a regulation requiring refiners to limit benzene concentration to 1.3% and currently gasoline in Anchorage contains as much as 5.5% benzene. This goes into effect in 2011. Anchorage is doing the baseline study to see the effectiveness of that 2011 regulation.

MR. FLYNN recalled that when the I/M program was discussed, DHHS theorized whether there may be other ways to address CO than I/M testing. He asked if this thinking has progressed. MR. MORRIS thought the discussion was regarding other pollutants. The priority for DHHS is PM-10, particularly at this time of year when there are many complaints related to dust. MR. FLYNN noted that he understood that a waiver was being sought for a PM-10 violation that occurred in Eagle River because of wind-blown dust. He asked how the waiver process is proceeding. MR. MORRIS stated

the State is involved and the 30-day public review process closes May 11. After that process, the waiver will be submitted to the EPA.

**d. Other Informational Items**

**Policy Direction to the TAC**

MR. FLYNN commented on the excellent job the TAC did on the TIP criteria review. He stated that, if some sort of resolution is reached on the Draft LRTP Amendment, he would like to see it before the next Policy Committee meeting.

**7. SCHEDULED AMATS MEETINGS**

Technical Advisory Committee, May 14, 2009

Policy Committee, May 28, 2009

CHAIR KEITH noted there would be a joint Policy Committee and TAC work session on May 7, 2009.

**8. ADJOURNMENT**

The meeting adjourned at 3:30 PM.