

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

**June 2, 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
* Cindy Heil	Alaska Department of Environmental Conservation, Air Quality
** Bruce Carr	ARRC
Kathleen Bugkee	ARRC
Brady Loomis	ARRC
* Matt Claman	Municipal Mayor
* Sheila Selkregg	MOA/Municipal Assembly
** Lance Wilber	MOA/Traffic Department
Craig Lyon	MOA/TD
Vivian Underwood	MOA/TD
** Jody Karcz	MOA/ Public Transportation Dept.
Michael Foster	KABATA
Ron McPheters	
Jamie Kenworthy	
Dawn Bailey	DOWL HKM
Walt Parker	

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

1. CALL TO ORDER

CHAIR KEITH called the meeting to order at 1:07 PM. All Policy Committee members were present with the exception of Patrick Flynn. Cindy Heil served on behalf of Alice Edwards. 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

CHAIR KEITH asked to change the order of the agenda in order to address air quality items by moving the CO Maintenance Plan as the first item under Business Items, and then the Air Quality Advisory Committee AQAC nomination.

MR. LYON noted there should be an agenda item to give direction to the TAC. CHAIR KEITH stated this would be considered at the end of the agenda as item 6.d.

There being no objection, the agenda was adopted as amended.

4. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

5. BUSINESS ITEMS

d. Other Business Items

(1) CO Maintenance Plan

STEVE MORRIS noted that the Technical Advisory Committee released the CO Maintenance Plan public review document for 30-day public review. No comments were received from the public, but some informal comments were received from ADEC and EPA. The Plan has also been reviewed by the AMATS Air Quality Advisory Committee at several meetings and many of their suggestions have been incorporated into the draft. The TAC met on May 21, 2009 and approved the Draft that is before the Policy Committee. He noted that the Assembly has already reviewed and approved this Plan, which normally would occur after Policy Committee approval.

The Clean Air Act requires that any areas that have come into attainment of air quality standards have a plan to maintain standards for at least 10 years. Anchorage exceeded the carbon monoxide (CO) standard for many years and came into compliance in 1996. There has been a downward trend in CO concentrations since 1982. A Maintenance Plan was adopted in 2003 and it became part of the State Implementation Plan (SIP). The State is required to have the SIP approved by EPA and the Anchorage element was approved by EPA in July 2004. That Plan committed to continuing the I/M program, the Rideshare and Vanpooling program, and the engine block heater promotion program.

Revisions to the Plan were triggered by the action in July 2008 by the Assembly. They revoked an earlier Assembly action in 2007 to discontinue the I/M program. The July 2008 action reinstated the I/M Program and modified the characteristics of the I/M Program by extending the new car I/M testing exemption from four to six years and exempting vehicles with historic or classic license plates. The Plan must show that these changes do not jeopardize the ability to meet national air quality standards. The Plan shows that the increase in CO emissions resulting from the expanded testing exemptions is very small, amounting to a difference of 0.8 tons per day.

Even with the changes to the I/M program, the expected emissions through 2023 continually decline. MAYOR CLAMAN asked if this is CO only, not air quality in general. DR. SELKREGG asked what is Mr. Morris's sense whether federal standards would become more rigorous. MR. MORRIS did not expect stricter CO standards because there are no violations nationwide. There may be other new requirements related to CO₂ emissions, however, because of concerns about global warming.

MR. MORRIS noted that statistical analysis shows that the probability of violating the CO standard is less than 1% each year through 2023.

The Plan now includes transit marketing as a primary CO control measure. The new menu of contingency measures have been expanded; contingency measures are implemented only if the air quality standard were to be violated in the future. Not all contingency measures must be implemented in the event of a violation, rather individual measures can be chosen to respond

to the reason for the violation. For example, natural gas prices are projected to increase and people may rely more on wood stoves in the future. If wood burning was found to be the cause of a future CO violation, curtailing wood burning during a period of high CO may be an appropriate way to avoid a future air quality violation.

A discussion of ancillary benefits of the Plan was added at the request of the Air Quality Advisory Committee. The technical analysis in the Maintenance Plan has also been updated with new information.

MR. MORRIS reviewed a comparison of the new to the revised Plan. The block heater public awareness program has been expanded and bicycling, transit, walking, etc. are promoted as alternatives to a single-occupancy vehicle. Transit marketing has also been added as a primary CO control measure because in practical terms it was combined with Ridesharing and Vanpooling into one CMAQ project and funded as one. The Air Quality Advisory Committee felt it should have the same priority for funding as the air quality public awareness program and Share-A-Ride program.

MR. MORRIS reiterated that there were no formal comments during the 30-day review period. EPA and ADEC have provided comments and editorial suggestions. The TAC reviewed the public review Draft and offered editorial changes that have been incorporated. On May 21, 2009 the TAC reviewed the Draft and recommended removing Transit Service Expansion as a primary CO control measure. The AQAC had recommended including Transit Service Improvements as a primary CO measure in the Plan with the caveat that it be subject to available funding. The TAC felt that this should not be a primary CO measure if there was no real commitment to it..

DR. SELKREGG asked what was the rationale for the TAC recommending deletion of the Transit Service Expansion. MR. MORRIS replied that there is a limited amount of money to fund transit improvements and, if Transit Service Expansion becomes a primary CO measure funding is mandated and, given the limited amount of CMAQ dollars available, there was concern with this requirement. Transit also had concerns that under the CMAQ rules operating funds can only be used for three years, so the improvement would be short-term. There was also concern that the language was contingent on

funding, so the measure might not be implemented in any case. DR. SELKREGG remarked that the commitment to transit is a big policy issue. She felt that the TAC's recommendation is more an analysis of political strategy, not technical advice. She noted that Anchorage is also behind other places in the country in terms of building a transit system. There will either be a commitment to build the system or not, and leaving it out of this document seemed to be a big gap. The question is whether over time the City wants to build a transit system, while the City is building a land use strategy that relies on that.

MS. HEIL explained that transit services is an important community decision, but whether or not it should be included in this document is the issue. Committed SIP measures must be funded; if they are not funded, there can be serious repercussions. In the 1980s there was transit commitment in the SIP and there were lawsuits and all transit operations were removed from the SIP as a result. The TAC considered whether or not it was technically responsible to include a SIP control measure that could adversely affect AMATS with regard to funding and commitment to meet conformity.

DR. SELKREGG thought that the Assembly was not aware of the totality of its actions.

MS. KARCZ explained that in 2000 a consultant did a route restructure for the transit system and they made recommendations to grow the system by \$4 million. There was no money at that time. A decision was made to apply for CMAQ to start growing the program, understanding it was only three years of funding. A total of about \$2 million in CMAQ funding was received, 18% more service was added and there were 28% more riders, but at the end of the three years there was no operating money to continue it. Transit took \$2 million of what the federal government gives transit and put it into maintenance in order to continue operating that program, which meant there was \$2 million less per year for capital projects.

DR. SELKREGG stated there would never be a situation where transit money is not competing with something. She posed the question whether a commitment is desirable in this area. The Assembly supports bus service and there is strong interest in the community to grow bus service. There is a

strategy to develop housing dependent on transit. MS. KARCZ felt the strategy to include this in the SIP is good, if the Assembly is willing to keep funding it. DR. SELKREGG responded that funding is more likely if, at the end of three years, there are people using buses and the value of the service can be measured. The only way to grow the transit system is to make commitment to it. She also expected more money from the Obama Administration for transit. CHAIR KEITH stated the issue with putting this requirement in the SIP is that it is a mandated expenditure that would come at the expense of roads, while 99% of VMT are people in cars and all cars and buses drive on roads. Including this requirement in the SIP means the Assembly is required to fund the transit expansion.

MAYOR CLAMAN asked if the AQAC discussed this topic. MR. MORRIS replied that the AQAC added this item during the public comment period. MAYOR CLAMAN understood that the old CO Plan did not include Transit Service Expansion as a primary CO measure and during this review process the AQAC recommended adding it as a primary CO measure. He asked if that was done with the support of Transit. MS. KARCZ replied that she first saw that recommendation at the TAC's meeting. MAYOR CLAMAN asked what is Ms. Karcz's position on this topic. MS. KARCZ felt it was problematic to have it in this document. A lawsuit was filed against the MOA because of a previous SIP that was to put 200 buses on the road. In the past she nominated another CMAQ project for route expansion because she felt it was a good strategy to get three years of funding, if it would be picked up for operating after three years. MAYOR CLAMAN understood that application could be made for CMAQ funding without it being included in the CO Plan.

MS. WITT explained the TAC took the action it did because Anchorage is now in attainment and therefore no longer receives statewide designated CMAQ funding. Also, although the policy is that 10% of transportation dollars go into CMAQ activities, it is still roadway dollars. Expanded transit service is not eligible under this transportation bill for Surface Transportation Program dollars. The TAC felt it would not be technically responsible to adopt a Plan with a primary control measure that is not eligible for the FHWA program AMATS is charged to administer.

DR. SELKREGG remarked that, while recognizing that roads are important, there is not another option to fund transit. Roads are rutted in part because people are driving their individual cars. In the conversation about buses and roads, roads would not need to be replaced as often if riders could be on buses. The Mayor's comment clarifies for her that CMAQ money can be spent on transit even if it is not in this Plan.

MR. MORRIS reviewed the schedule for approval of the Plan. The next step is to work with ADEC to make the I/M program a local option, which requires changes to state regulations, an MOU with MOA, ADEC and DMV, and revision of the CO Plan to discontinue the commitment to the I/M program.

MAYOR MATT CLAMAN moved for approval. CINDY HEIL seconded.

There being no objection, the motion passed unanimously.

c. AMATS Air Quality Advisory Committee Appointment

MR. LYON explained a position has been available on this Committee for some time. Both the AQAC and TAC have recommended approval of appointing Kip Knudson to fill the petroleum industry position.

MAYOR MATT CLAMAN moved for approval. CINDY HEIL seconded.

CHAIR KEITH indicated he knows Mr. Knudson and worked with him at DOT and he believed he would be a fine addition to the AQAC.

There being no objection, the motion passed unanimously.

a. Policies & Procedures Approval

MR. LYON explained these Policies & Procedures (P&Ps) govern operations of AMATS and allocation of funds, among other things. Some editorial changes were made, such as changing three years to four years in line with SAFETEA-LU changes to make the TIP a four-year document. P&P No. 3 speaks to the specific allocation of funds between categories and adds Pavement Replacement. When the TIP was created, staff put Pavement Replacement at 20% and the TAC saw that grandfathered projects were

moved out as a result of that and recommended a range of 15%-20% in Pavement Replacement and 10%-15% for Transportation Enhancement (TE).

In addition, P&P No. 4 reflects the practice of allocating funds to NHS and non-NHS projects and the new language simply puts this into the P&Ps. ADOT will still rank and score the NHS projects.

Comments from the Planning and Zoning Commission were recently received and they will take action at their June 8, 2009 meeting.

MR. LYON explained that the guidance in P&P No. 3 is used in building the TIP.

MAYOR CLAMAN asked if input is required from the Planning and Zoning Commission prior to the Policy Committee taking action. MR. LYON replied this is not a specific requirement. The Planning and Zoning Commission serves as the Citizens Advisory Committee to AMATS and in the past there has not been specific input from them in this area. MAYOR CLAMAN asked if it would be possible to approve this contingent on their approval and, if they disagree with the Policy Committee's action, the matter could come back. MR. LYON replied that this could be done. DR. SELKREGG asked if there is time window to act on this item. MR. LYON explained the TIP is reliant on the P&Ps and the TIP has a time constraint. DR. SELKREGG hoped that next year there is more time for the Policy Committee to consider items like this.

MS. HEIL suggested that action on this item be delayed until the TIP is reviewed so the Policy Committee can see the results of the changes to the P&Ps in the TIP.

This matter was put aside until action on the TIP was completed.

b. 2010-2013 Draft Transportation Improvement Program (TIP)

MR. LYON explained that the TIP recommended by the TAC contains Table 3 with the Pavement Replacement Program at 13.2% over the four years of the TIP. There is also a draft of Table 3 showing the Pavement Replacement

Program at 20%, which results in Project G-5, O'Malley Road Reconstruction moving \$16 million from 2013 to 2014. The TAC reviewed this impact and determined, given that the P&Ps require that grandfathered projects be funded first, a lower allocation to the Pavement Replacement Program was preferable. CHAIR KEITH noted that the O'Malley project, for instance, addresses not only vehicle travel, but also bicycle and pedestrian travel.

DR. SELKREGG asked when Project 1, Highway-to-Highway would become a grandfathered project. CHAIR KEITH replied that this occurs after receipt of the Record of Decision (ROD) and begins final design. The environmental document and ROD are three years away for that project. DR. SELKREGG asked if this is the case for the Knik Arm Crossing (KAC). CHAIR KEITH stated the KAC does not have ROD and has not entered final design, but the funding is not from AMATS in any case. DR. SELKREGG was interested in the impact on roads on each side of the bridge. CHAIR KEITH stated the LRTP says the bridge and connecting roads on the Anchorage side are independent and not funded by Federal or AMATS dollars.

MR. LYON reviewed Table 3, comprised of six grandfathered projects, the Pavement Replacement Program, and Projects 1 through 9.

DR. SELKREGG understood that DeBarr would be under the Pavement Replacement Program. She asked if a road with potholes is considered pavement replacement, not reconstruction. CHAIR KEITH replied that DeBarr could be a pavement replacement project. He encouraged Policy Committee members to lobby for more money for roads in Anchorage, particularly for pavement rehabilitation. He indicated he would be meeting with legislators to discuss this. DR. SELKREGG asked if AMATS might list critical projects for which there is no funding and meet with the congressional caucus to discuss them. CHAIR KEITH believed such a list could be easily compiled.

MR. LYON noted that all projects below the Pavement Replacement Program, with few exceptions, have no funding. Those projects were ranked and scored. Table 10 is the Pavement Replacement Program list of projects, not in priority order. MS. WITT noted that these projects were not prioritized in order to allow flexibility. MS. HEIL commented that there was also

discussion at the TAC about funding portions of these roads that have the most significant need. CHAIR KEITH cautioned against treating a project as maintenance, which is not eligible for federal funding.

DR. SELKREGG understood the State would be doing more work on the Glenn Highway than was anticipated. CHAIR KEITH explained that the bids for that project are low, so the Glenn Highway will be done from Airport Heights in Anchorage to Palmer.

MR. LYON commented on Table 4, Transportation Enhancements, which is comprised of two grandfathered projects, the Areawide Trails Rehabilitation, the Bicycle Plan, the Pedestrian Plan, and Projects 1 through 4. The TAC recommended adding \$100,000 to the Areawide Trails Rehabilitation, the Bicycle Plan and the Pedestrian Plan. The Bicycle Plan project is for signing and striping on roadways only, so after 2013, more money is available for Areawide Trails Rehabilitation and the Pedestrian Plan.

DR. SELKREGG asked if the extension of Elmore Road, the northern access, is included. MR. LYON replied that is shown as Project 4 in Table 3, which has no dollar figures.

MR. LYON noted that additional information is coming regarding earmark funds.

DR. SHEILA SELKREGG moved to release for 30-day public review the TIP tables with the Pavement Replacement Program in Table 3 at 13%. CINDY HEIL seconded.

MS. KARCZ noted that she neglected to ask the TAC for an amendment to Table 8, Project 10, C Street Expanded Bus Facility and Intermodal Parking Garage. That \$5 million is a small earmark that the MOA decided could not be used because the total cost is \$25 million. The MOA has been working with the congressional delegation to reprogram those monies. She suggested amending this item to state "SAFETEA-LU technical corrections bill request to reprogram and rename it to Anchorage general transit needs." The intended use of the funds is to finish replacing the transit fleet.

DR. SHEILA SELKREGG moved to strike the existing project description in Project 10, Table 8 and replace it with “Anchorage general transit needs.” CINDY HEIL seconded.

CHAIR KEITH was somewhat hesitant to add a new earmark designation without approval. He suggested keeping the original title and adding “/Anchorage general transit needs.” MS. KARCZ suggested leaving the original title, shown with strike-through, and adding “Anchorage general transit needs.” MAYOR CLAMAN understood Mr. Keith’s concern is that the earmark is not yet expired, so the title should stay on the table. *This was accepted as a friendly amendment.*

There being no objection, the amendment passed unanimously.

MR. CARR indicated regarding Table 8, Project 5, C Street Construction Phase IV that the ARRC had concluded that until reprogramming language was done, nothing should be changed, but if the Policy Committee thinks that should be reflected, the change could be shown in this TIP. This project has been in the TIP for several years without action and the ARRC is working with the congressional delegation to reprogram it. He suggested amending the description to add “/Alaska railroad systemwide crossings.”

DR. SHEILA SELKREGG moved to amend Project 6, Table 8 to add “/Alaska Railroad systemwide crossings.” MAYOR CLAMAN asked why Anchorage funding should be amended to allow spending outside of Anchorage. MR. CARR explained this allows flexibility to choose crossings that need the funding most. Not all of the bad construction projects are in Anchorage. In fact, Anchorage has been a leader in rehabilitating crossings using general fund bonds.

DR. SELKREGG asked what is the status of the Raspberry Road crossing. MR. CARR replied there is no project for that grade separation. DR. SELKREGG understood Anchorage’s needs are met through the ARRC and Anchorage spending money. She asked if there are any areas in Anchorage that have need. MR. CARR stated that over the last five years he has worked with Jim Lamson at the MOA PM&E office to prioritize needs and those needs are being addressed.

MS. HEIL noted that if the name of Table 8, Project 5 is changed Table 3, Project 8 should be changed as well to remove the project reference.

MAYOR CLAMAN stated there is no money allocated to Project 8, Table 3 and although there is an earmark for Project 5, Table 8, there is no money to spend. DR. SELKREGG asked if the Spenard Road crossing is in need of attention in the next five years. MR. CARR replied that it is not. DR. SELKREGG asked if it is appropriate for the TIP to include money being spent throughout the state. MS. HEIL suggested changing the title of Table 8, Project 5 to include language “/Alaska railroad systemwide crossings as needed.” MR. CARR suggested that no amendment is needed.

DR. SELKREGG asked if AMATS money can be allocated for statewide projects. She thought this should be revisited at the time the TIP is being finalized. *She withdrew her amendment.*

There being no objection, the main motion passed unanimously.

MAYOR MATT CLAMAN moved for approval of the proposed Policies & Procedures. CINDY HEIL seconded.

DR. SELKREGG moved to establish a regular monthly meeting for the Policy Committee at an agreed upon time and that the packet be received in advance.

MAYOR CLAMAN agreed that it is beneficial to receive the packet in advance. He thought the pattern of meeting the fourth Thursday of the month has been workable. He also recommended waiting to discuss new schedules until after July 1 when the new Administration is in office.

DR. SHEILA SELKREGG moved that the Policy Committee receive its packet adequately in advance and schedule meetings for the fourth Thursday from 1:00 PM to 3:00 PM. MS. HEIL stated that this schedule has already been adopted. DR. SELKREGG noted that it is a significant effort for her to arrange her employment schedule to attend Policy Committee meetings.

CHAIR KEITH questioned whether a motion is needed. MS. HEIL felt encouragement is enough. She stated that staff is trying to adhere to the adopted schedule. Occasionally circumstances might arise that affect the schedule. The situation of preparing a TIP coincident with an LRTP Amendment is unusual. DR. SELKREGG asked that the Policy Committee members be polled when a meeting date is changed.

DR. SELKREGG *withdrew her amendment.*

There being no objection, the motion passed unanimously.

c. AMATS Air Quality Advisory Committee Appointment
Addressed earlier in the agenda.

d. Other Business Items

(1) CO Maintenance Plan
Addressed earlier in the agenda.

6. INFORMATIONAL REPORTS

a. LRTP Amendment Memo: Knik Arm Crossing
MR. WILBER explained the TAC passed Resolution 2009-1, the intent of which is to ensure the TAC has adequate time to provide a recommendation before the Policy Committee takes final action on the LRTP Amendment regarding the KAC. This is summarized in the final clause of the resolution.

MAYOR CLAMAN saw that the TAC is scheduled to meet June 11, 2009 prior to the time the Policy Committee is scheduled to take up this Amendment. So long as their recommendation is completed on June 11, he was comfortable with this resolution. DR. SELKREGG also encouraged the TAC to take action on June 11.

MR. WILBER stated the Planning and Zoning Commission held its second public hearing on the Amendment last night and the hearing was closed. The public comment period closed last Wednesday and significant comments were received in the last two days of that period. Staff has prepared an Issue-

Response addressing the comments. The Planning and Zoning Commission put a motion on the table to remove the KAC from the LRTP and postponed action to June 8, 2009. An Assembly work session is scheduled for June 5 to review work-to-date, primary issues and how those issues have been addressed, and to remind the Assembly of their role to make a recommendation to the Policy Committee. A TAC work session is scheduled for June 4.

DR. SELKREGG stated she has asked that the TAC minutes discussing the impact of the cost of the bridge on the existing TIP be supplied to her. She offered to double-check the date of that meeting, which was the first TAC meeting she attended after being elected to the Assembly. She felt it should be clear that there is an impact on the system, although funding for the KAC was an earmark. MR. WILBER stated he has received information from the State on the amount of money directed to the NHS system since the earmark for the bridge. DR. SELKREGG stated she also has asked for a financial statement for the \$44 million that has been spent and has received a pie chart only. This is public money and she thought the public would like to know where that money has been spent, particularly on positions and contracts.

MR. POST felt the TAC resolution speaks to their concerns with the LRTP Amendment schedule. He distributed a comparison of the timeline for the LRTP revision that put the KAC into the LRTP to the current schedule for the LRTP revision to remove it from the LRTP. Until the TAC has a draft Amendment that staff has prepared, there is no ability for them to take action and make a recommendation. In the 2027 LRTP Amendment a draft was presented to the TAC in January 2006. That draft was prepared by KABATA consultants and time was needed to make that document appropriate for AMATS. The TAC recommended release of the Amendment on October 10, 2006 and adopted it on April 12, 2007, which staff presented as a bare minimum timeline for an amendment. Six months is generally the minimum time period needed between release and approval. The 2029 LRTP amendment process is abbreviated and this speaks to the concern the TAC was trying to address in their resolution.

MS. WITT asked whether, if there is not a TAC recommendation on June 11, the Policy Committee intends to take action at the end of the month without that recommendation. DR. SELKREGG stated the Policy Committee is asking for a TAC recommendation on June 11. MS. WITT asked whether, if the recommendation is that the technical document remains unsatisfactory and requires more work and that Policy Committee action be delayed beyond the June 25 Policy Committee meeting date, the is TAC missing its opportunity to make recommendation. DR. SELKREGG recalled there were questions related to the out years and whether or not the Federal government would be comfortable with the strategy proposed because it is difficult to estimate that far out. She believed that Mr. Wilber had contacted the Federal representatives to discuss the strategy being taken. MR. WILBER stated he spoke with regional FHWA representatives and told them the approach being taken and he was told it did not seem unreasonable, but the reasonableness will depend on the Policy Committee decision in the end, both on source and on levels. DR. SELKREGG understood there has been reluctance on the part of the TAC regarding the approach, but the Policy Committee welcomes their recommendations. She felt some of the issues are unresolvable. MS. WITT stated the document released for public review has problems, including the fact it does not specify the reasons why the KAC should come out of the LRTP and what has changed since it was put into the LRTP. There are also concerns about the accelerated process of this Amendment. DR. SELKREGG hoped the TAC would focus on issues, not the schedule. MS. WITT noted the TAC received the document in April. She was aware the Policy Committee had a perception that the TAC was reluctant to do its job and that it was dragging its feet when in fact the TAC was trying to get the TIP out for public review. She wanted to know if the Policy Committee intends to act on June 25 with or without a TAC recommendation. DR. SELKREGG asked if the draft LRTP Amendment does not indicate there are costs associated with urban sprawl that are hard to meet. MS. WITT explained that the TAC did not recommend the LRTP Amendment because it found the Amendment inadequate.

MAYOR CLAMAN felt it is fair that at the June 11 meeting the TAC should make some recommendation and if there are portions of the Amendment that cannot be recommended, the reasons for that should be articulated.

MS. HEIL suggested that, given that sometimes it takes longer than anticipated to get things done, perhaps the TAC can be given a time frame of at least one week prior to June 25 to make a recommendation to the Policy Committee so that the June 11 meeting could be continued, if needed. DR. SELKREGG favored that recommendation.

MR. WILBER noted that the wording of the resolution is the TAC to provide a recommendation before the Policy Committee takes final action, which is scheduled for June 25. The TAC will meet on June 11 and do its best to make a recommendation. The goal is to provide a recommendation before the Policy Committee's scheduled action on June 25. He stated that as Chair of the TAC he would schedule additional meetings as needed to attempt to formulate a recommendation on or before June 25.

DR. SELKREGG asked if the TAC is considering public comment, as she felt there are adequate reasons for the Amendment. She asked if the public has offered reasons. MR. WILBER stated that a large number of comments have been received both for and against the project.

MAYOR CLAMAN departed at 2:40 PM and MICHAEL ABBOTT served in his stead.

A member of the audience stated when the Assembly originally approved the Amendment to include KAC in the LRTP it was with the contingency that there be no more State funding. Since then KABATA has said a revenue guarantee might be needed. It was unclear to him if the Policy Committee is looking at the project as originally approved or one where a revised finance plan is needed and revenue guarantees may be needed because the credit markets have changed and the private sector does not want to take all the risk. He felt that KABATA should define the project and whether or not there is a \$100 million limit and no more State funding. He felt this was a fundamental question.

CHAIR KEITH stated that there has been discussion of what might happen, but no overt movement to do those things. For this reason, he questioned the pressing need to do something in June. The only project before the Policy Committee is the one in the LRTP that says no more public money will be

spent and it includes the bridge and the Ingra-Gambell connection. DR. SELKREGG stated that the body has been provided with a document that the bridge is moving forward looking for a private partner and there was a footnote thereon that there is an expectation of public participation. The fact is that the bridge is not moving forward with a sense it is not using public money, but rather it is moving forward looking with private financing but with public participation, which is different than the original project scope. CHAIR KEITH stated the LRTP says the project will be funded through the public private partnership process. DR. SELKREGG understood that KABATA is looking for a private investor and at the Policy Committee's last meeting the document provided by KABATA indicated that in order to do that the investors are requiring participation from the public. CHAIR KEITH stated that the \$80 million is the public money in the public private partnership. DR. SELKREGG thought that different documents were being discussed. She stated that the cost of this project is significant and of significant public concern, if there is expectation that public dollars will support it. The Ingra-Gambell connection is not included in the project pricing. CHAIR KEITH stated the LRTP says that project would be funded by toll revenues.

VIVIAN UNDERWOOD with Transportation Planning stated that after the TAC work session and following the TAC meeting staff was asked to come up with new information about the purpose of this Amendment. She did provide that information and everything she brought up was disregarded as either irrelevant or not technical by some members of the TAC. At the April 23, 2009 Policy Committee meeting where the public review draft was released, Ms. Epstein outlined many of the issues that she had outlined for the TAC. Chair Keith indicated that some of those questions were the appropriate work of the TAC for the Amendment. She asked that the Policy Committee clarify what it wants the TAC to comment on as technical and relevant. DR. SELKREGG asked for a written list of the areas that she reported to the Policy Committee last fall. She was astonished that there is a lack of reasons for this Amendment. She suspected there is political motivation; there was when the project was originally included in the LRTP. MS. UNDERWOOD referred the Policy Committee to the following issues in the Issue-Response: Issue 22 regarding environmental issues, Issue 23 regarding financing details, Issue 32 regarding the economic downturn, Issue 39 regarding risk to

the State or MOA, and Issue 40 regarding the Ingra-Gambell infrastructure. The issues to which she drew the Policy Committee's attention were: 22, 23, 27, 32, 37, 39 and 40. She asked which of these issues is the appropriate work of the TAC.

CHAIR KEITH did not think it was the Policy Committee's position to tell the TAC which issues are relevant. MS. UNDERWOOD noted that Chair Keith said at the April 23 meeting that some of these issues are the work of the TAC. CHAIR KEITH stated they are the work of the TAC. DR. SELKREGG felt that which issues are worth the TAC's work is a policy question. She stated she has heard numerous concerns.

CHAIR KEITH stated the general direction to the TAC is to identify what has changed since the KAC was put into the LRTP, not what is rumored to have changed. When changes actually occur would be the appropriate time to do an amendment. DR. SELKREGG suggested that a special meeting be scheduled to go over the things that have changed, which have been articulated several times before the Policy Committee.

MR. NIEMIEC stated that KABATA and the State of Alaska have articulated serious concerns with this Amendment process. The Amendment violates Federal regulations and AMATS is ignoring the P&Ps it has put in place. He felt the Policy Committee should look at its charge and responsibility and then carry on. He thought the Policy Committee would find that this process is invalid.

CHAIR KEITH noted there are two letters dated May 18 and June 1 from Deputy Commissioner of DOT&PF Frank Richards. The May 18 letter discusses process problems and the June 1 letter responds to the Planning and Zoning Commission's questions on the May 18 letter. Deputy Commissioner Richards says there were serious breaches in this Amendment process.

MR. PARKER stated that the June 1 letter indicates an attitude by the State toward the entire AMATS process that he finds extremely disturbing. Deputy Commissioner states in that letter, "to my knowledge no such testing has been performed on a regional basis with respect to removal of the project." He

could find nowhere that any testing was done on a regional basis to insert the project into the LRTP. CHAIR KEITH stated this is correct. He stated AMATS is a body of the Anchorage Bowl and does not represent the region. There is not a body that does modeling for all of upper Cook Inlet. There was modeling in the Bowl before the bridge was included and with the bridge included. MR. PARKER stated that Federal DOT has not really been a part of this process and it was incredible to him that AMATS has come to the point where the State is standing up against the citizens of Anchorage who have made their viewpoints clear, including a vote by the Planning and Zoning Commission against the original Amendment to include the KAC in the LRTP. He stated that the attitude of the people of Anchorage toward this project will not go away. He noted that the June 1 letter from Deputy Commissioner Richards states, "the (Public Participation) Plan requires that Municipal commissions, such as the Senior Citizens Commission and the Diversity Advisory Commission, be formally briefed regarding any amendments to the LRTP," but they were briefed. AMATS was created in the 1968 Highway Act because state highway departments were running roughshod over communities.

CHAIR KEITH noted that the letters from Deputy Commissioner Richards are addressed to him and they are about process. They do not speak to support or non-support of the bridge.

DR. SELKREGG stated that at one point last summer she had the impression that even if the KAC were taken out of AMATS the Governor would look for money for it. This project was brought to AMATS through an earmark from Congressman Young. She thought there are potentially conflicts of interest. There has been preliminary investigation into who owns the land on the other side and it appears there may be affiliations with Young's family. She was appalled that \$44 million has been spent to date; consultants have come to her embarrassed for having been a part of this project. This is a public gravy train at the cost of Minnesota Drive being resurfaced and good roads being built. It was difficult for her to read the letter from Deputy Commissioner Richards and feel bad about the process. She felt that to suggest one thing is more political than another is ridiculous. She stated that this bridge is swung around by politics, it is not driven by need in the community. She had respect for the people working on this

Amendment and sympathy for the staff that is caught in this political struggle and the effort on their part to bring integrity in review.

A member of the audience stated that as lifelong Alaskan this project goes back to the 1970s and 1980s. Having lived through the earthquake and seen how what happened in Seward impacted Anchorage, and recognizing the anticipated population growth of 200,000 new people in the state in the next 10 to 12 years, he believed that traffic could not be handled on the highways. DR. SELKREGG stated there has never been a bridge of this size built anywhere without at least one half million people on the other side and preceded by a ferry system. She agreed that there would likely be a bridge someday, but thought it was 40 to 50 years before it is needed. The gentleman referenced all the resource development in the state and a transportation center across the bay. He stated that \$20 billion would happen with Tyonek lands and resource development, including coal and aggregate. They will do the development and Anchorage will have no access if this is not opened. He stated that this is the only project that has the wherewithal to open the entire state for new energy, access, and transportation. He felt it was not sensible to stall this and make it a political or legal/financial issue. He stated that by all estimates it is in the popular majority to get it done.

MR. POST mentioned that there is no mention in the TAC resolution of the June 25 date. The Resolution reads, "Now therefore be it resolved, that the TAC requests the Policy Committee delay action on the Amendment until the TAC has prepared a final recommendation that considers public comments received and a more thorough review of the financial analysis." The concern about the process is regardless of position on the Amendment.

b. Non-Motorized Transportation Update

MR. LYON reviewed the monthly AMATS event calendar contained in the Public Participation Plan and noted that the Non-Motorized Transportation Plan status report is scheduled for this month. The Plan has three components: the *Pedestrian Plan* adopted last October; the *Bicycle Plan* that has received over 300 comments and will go to the Planning and Zoning Commission in August and then the Assembly; and the *Areawide Trails Plan* will start after that.

c. Other Informational Items

Instructions to the TAC – None

None

7. SCHEDULED AMATS MEETINGS

Technical Advisory Committee, June 11, 2009

Policy Committee, June 25, 2009

8. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 3:02 PM.