

**ANCHORAGE METROPOLITAN AREA TRANSPORTATION
POLICY COMMITTEE MEETING
Planning and Development Center
4700 Elmore Road
1st Floor Conference Room
Anchorage, Alaska**

**August 14, 2008
1:00 PM**

Those in attendance were:

<u>NAME</u>	<u>REPRESENTING</u>
* Gordon Keith	Alaska Department of Transportation and Public Facilities, Regional Director
** Rob Campbell	ADOT/PF
David Post	ADOT/PF
* Alice Edwards	Alaska Department of Environmental Conservation, Air Quality
** Cindy Heil	ADEC
* Michael Abbott	Municipal Manager
* Sheila Selkregg	MOA/Municipal Assembly
* Patrick Flynn	MOA/Municipal Assembly
** Lance Wilber	MOA/Traffic Department
Craig Lyon	MOA/TD
** Jody Karcz	MOA/ Public Transportation Department
** Lois Epstein	MOA/AMATS Air Quality Advisory Group
Cheryl Richardson	ACC

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

1. CALL TO ORDER

CHAIR KEITH called the meeting to order at 1:08 p.m. All Policy Committee members were present with Michael Abbott serving on behalf of Mayor Mark Begich. A quorum was established. Alice Edwards arrived at 1:09 p.m.

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

MICHAEL ABBOTT moved for approval of the agenda. PATRICK FLYNN seconded.

CHAIR KEITH added an Informational Item 6.e on KABATA and an Informational Item 6.f to discuss a TAC member.

MR. LYON noted that Mr. Coop is available to present on the Sign Inventory Project Update and asked that it be dealt with earlier on the agenda in order to accommodate his schedule.

There being no objection, the motion passed unanimously.

4. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

CHAIR KEITH explained that the meeting minutes presented for approval are from meetings prior to membership changes, therefore, not all of the members who were in attendance at those meetings are able to approve the minutes. He stated he was comfortable taking action to approve the minutes with the members present.

MICHAEL ABBOTT moved for approval of the May 8, 2008, November 8, 2007, February 8, 2007 and January 11, 2007 minutes. SHEILA SELKREGG seconded.

MS. SELKREGG noted she was not present for the meetings, but trusted the process. MR. FLYNN understood the minutes were for meetings held in 2008. MR. LYON explained that with the changes in the Assembly members serving on the Policy Committee and the ADEC representative, there is no longer a quorum of members of the Policy Committee who actually attended the meetings in question. The minutes for those meetings have been pending approval. He spoke with Kim Stalder of Wordsmith, who has observed that

other committee bodies have approved minutes based on consensus that there is no observable, obvious error in the minutes.

MR. ABBOTT asked if the meeting minutes are kept on tape in storage for back up. MR. LYON replied that the tapes are kept as back up.

There being no objection, the motion passed unanimously.

5. INFORMATIONAL REPORT

a. Sign Inventory Project Update

MR. LEE COOP, Project Manager of the Safety Section, reported that The Sign Inventory is an attempt to account for traffic control attributes within the Municipality of Anchorage, from the Knik Arm to Portage including state and municipal road ways. Funding became available in 2005. Early in 2006, Marshall was selected to conduct this research based on their extensive experience within the U.S. Marshall acquired the appropriate software for field collection of the data. They created the meta-database indicating sign attributes, such as sign type, R1-1; provided equipment like field tablets, digital imaging, and GPS units; and software data collection. Interns were employed as data collectors during the summers of 2006 and 2007. The Paint and Sign Shop of the Municipality have kept the information up to date with regard to new installations and removals. The computerized asset management, capital planning, and work order system implementation is underway.

Currently there is a paper process, so an asset/sign management system is needed to allow quick easy searches, a pro active maintenance program, track costs associated with signs down or vandalized, establish a baseline for measuring growth in the sign inventory, and allow for better budget planning.

The paper process was incomplete. The database is a Title 9 requirement as the Traffic Engineer is responsible for maintaining a data base for all of the signs.

The asset management system includes 65,000 traffic control signs such as speed limit, no parking, and school zone signs on State and municipal roadways. The municipal parking meters are considered an asset. Other items to be added are signal pole locations, along with other signal assets, striping, an in-house inventory for the Paint and Sign Shop maintenance and materials and customer service tracking from beginning to completion, including the maintenance associated with the sign, providing a complete history on record for each sign.

The project consisted of two phases: Data Collection by Marshall and Data Maintenance. Data collection was accomplished with this system and it can be kept up-to-date by process. The program is user friendly and integrates with the second phase by following the work from the beginning to the end offering a customer service piece with Internet capabilities. Maintenance work orders will be created and tracked online. Use of the program will concurrently update and log all activity.

MR. COOP reviewed a graphic depicting the location of all the signs in the municipality. The map of phase one operates with a GPS coordinated system; interns locate signs using GPS. With this technology, signs have been found beneath snow berms.

The condition of signs is a concern. A rating system of good, fair and poor has been established. MR. COOP noted rating could be subjective. Retroreflectivity requirements have been approved by the federal government. This program will be available in time to include those requirements. The 7,500 poor condition signs need to be replaced. He noted that poor signs exist all over the municipality. This is an on-going issue, as the fair condition signs will eventually become poor. Poor condition stop signs totaled 1,000 needing replacement. There are approximately 1,000 poor condition signs to be replaced by the end of 2008 with the available grant funding. The Municipality will take over the sign replacement project at the beginning of 2009.

In April 2008, GBA Master Series was hired as a consultant. Marshall continues to act as a subcontractor for continuity between phases one and two. The State was involved with the selection of the consultant; Ron

Martindale was on the committee to ensure the program is suitable to their needs. A Notice to Proceed was issued on 8/8/08 and work has been initiated. The system accomplishes what the Municipality needs: keeping history, a customer service package, Internet capabilities, work orders and self-updating by the process.

The system has been beneficial so far. Consultants to the municipality have been able to access the database to share files on various projects. The Highway-to-Highway consultants were able to use information to replace all of the signs. Tucson, Arizona and Mobile, Alabama showed interest in our system. Other departments such as Addressing have benefited from the information the program provides with regard to the issue of spelling of street names. This arrives online just in time to meet new Federal requirements for retro-reflectivity. A system will be developed to proactively replace signs when they meet a level of degradation from their original state. The sign inventory will be initiated to do so. Tests will be conducted on various materials with respect to direction spacing. The information will be shared with the State, so everyone will have access to the lifecycle of a sign based on the material. Engineer grade material has a life of 3 to 5 five years. Prismatic signs offer a 15-year life span.

CHAIR KEITH noted the Municipality is taking over this program in 2009. He asked if the Municipality would be taking over only municipal signs or both municipal and State-owned signs. MR. COOP replied that the budget would only include municipal roads.

MR. FLYNN asked if the Management Inventory system selected is used by the ADOT. MR. COOP replied that ADOT will have the system and will be provided with a municipal map and tablets for use with the system. The Municipality will be providing hot spots where updates happen remotely and ADOT will have access for syncing updated activity. MR. FLYNN asked why State roads are not being handled along with the municipal roads. MR. COOP explained that the Municipality has its own Sign Shop, which is equipped to manufacture, install and maintain signs. The State has a different process. The municipality can maintain stop signs. The requirement for freeway signage is different and most likely would not be taken over.

CHAIR KEITH stated that budget is an ongoing concern.

MS. SELKREG asked if Mr. Coop is in contact with Fred Carpenter of the IT department for coordinated efforts. MR. COOP replied that he contacted Dan Barnhart and Michael Sweeney, who were also on the selection committee to ensure the systems interface. They also provided input for the selection of GBA and were impressed.

MS. SELKREG noted that her district has had a request for the smart carts, the signs that digitize the speed of an oncoming car. She stated they have a history of free floating in the municipality. In the past the police have paid for them, and they currently do not want to be responsible for them. There has been discussion of getting rid of the smart carts. She spoke with Mr. Wilber regarding the high value of the smart carts in neighborhoods and she would like to see the responsibility of them moved to the Sign Department. MR. COOP replied that there has been discussion in doing so. Mr. Kniefel has been in touch with Fleet to release them. MS. SELKREGG noted that if they are not being used in the street they are a waste of tax dollars. MR. COOP agreed that they are desirable and valuable in the traffic calming programs. He noted that a Safe Routes to Schools grant was recently received and it included a similar speed zone device. MS. SELKREGG suggested Mr. Abbott's assistance in settling the matter of smart cart allocation. MR. ABBOTT recognized that there is no department available to pay for them and the associated operating costs; work on this issue is underway.

CHAIR KEITH asked about the source of energy for the carts. MS. SELKREGG understood that they operate using solar energy. MR. ABBOTT explained they are operated by gas generated with solar supplement. CHAIR KEITH noted the gas generators require more maintenance and the batteries often wear out. MR. ABBOTT stated they add value when used. The Administration is in the process of trying to determine how to implement their use.

MR. LYON explained that there are two issues at hand. Mr. Coop provided the update to the Sign Safety project. In addition to the sign inventory, the TIP was not clear in their language that sign replacement was included. The FHWA was contacted and they agreed that sign replacement was a

permissible expense. The TAC moved to allow sign replacement. The initial funding provided in the TIP was for a planning phase. The funding for sign replacement needs to be drawn from the construction phase. The TAC agreed to move a specified amount of money to the construction phase. The two actions occurred; this is simply a point of history of the project. CHAIR KEITH noted that when the funds are depleted, a source funding must be identified to continue the program. MR. LYON noted the municipality would absorb the cost in 2009. MR. ABBOTT explained that there was a remaining balance of funds. The goal was to use the remaining balance for sign replacement for State and local roads.

MS. SELKREGG noted the staff recommendation is to move the necessary funds. MR. LYON clarified that the TAC took that action.

6. BUSINESS ITEMS

a. Third Quarter Obligation Report

MR. POST reported that, in essence, approximately \$4 million is being redistributed. The impact is not significant. Project G-1, Old Seward Highway, O'Malley to Brandon, is requesting an additional \$854,100. This figure reflects the fact there is a construction oversight consultant. This is the only item that requires action by the Policy Committee.

With regard to Project G-6, Old Glenn Highway Rehab, Eagle River – Fire Lake to Peters Creek, the Municipality opened the bids and realized a decrease of \$1.3 million. A portion of that difference will be used to offset the A/C in 2009. The A/C in 2009 budget will decrease from \$12 million dollars to \$9 million dollars. In an effort to balance the overall budget, the 2008 A/C amount is \$390,000 dollars. With regard to the Project G-9, Lake Otis Parkway Surface Rehabilitation and Safety Project, there was an approximately \$500,000 construction cost increase. It is standard policy that the increased costs are automatically approved in the construction phase. MS. SELKREGG asked how the additional costs are assessed. MR. POST explained that the project manager reviews any budget increase for its appropriateness.

MR. POST explained that it was anticipated that \$2.5 million would be de-obligated from the 15th Avenue Channelization project in 2008, however, it is now anticipated to occur in 2009.

The construction for Project G-2, Chester Creek Trail Connection will occur in 2009, creating a \$3.6 million dollar reduction in the Transportation Enhancements spent in 2008 and an increase of \$3.6 million in Transportation Enhancements in 2009.

Staff approved up to a \$125,000 design increase for Project G-4, Glenn Highway Trail Rehab.

The overall 2008 balance essentially comprises approximately a \$5 million increase and the decreases are approximately \$4 million. The balance is \$3.924 million.

The 2009 cumulative effect includes the original A/C reduction of \$9 million and a cost increase of \$3.6 million to Transportation Enhancements.

CHAIR KEITH noted that the reallocation of funds is one reason to have a three-year review of Transportation Enhancements rather than year to year.

MICHAEL ABBOTT moved to approve the cost increase of a \$854,000 cost increase for Project G-1, Old Seward Highway, O'Malley to Brandon.
SHEILA SELKREGG seconded.

CHERYL RICHARDSON asked how \$275,000 was left over in Project 7, Anchorage Areawide Trails Rehab. MR. POST was unsure and indicated he would investigate this. MS. RICHARDSON asked if there was flexibility to use the money on area wide trails. MR. POST replied that it was possible to reprogram those funds. MS. SELKREGG asked if reprogramming of those funds should be done at this meeting. MR. POST replied there is a TIP line item for Anchorage Areawide Trail Rehabilitation, but without knowing why it was de-obligated, he was reluctant to take action. He noted the full \$31.9 million has been obligated. An amount of \$275,000 is relatively small. In the past, multiple years of rehabilitation funding has been grouped together; perhaps this can be considered in the upcoming TIP. CHAIR KEITH

suggested that these funds could be used to defray over run costs on Transportation Enhancements project. He asked Mr. Post to find out more about those de-obligated funds.

There being no objection, the motion PASSED unanimously.

MS. SELKREGG noted an article in the *Anchorage Daily News* regarding a proposed trail in Eagle River that might be on bear habitat. There were strong statements with regard to putting park users in danger, on the heels of recent bear attacks this summer. She was concerned that if the trail was constructed, the Municipality will be held liable in the event of a fatal bear attack. She asked if there is an environmental assessment for the trail and if bear habitat is addressed. MR. POST replied that the Department of Natural Resources is involved. Fish and Game has also shared similar concerns. There is no solution or decision regarding the issue. MR. ABBOTT noted the park is in the EIS process at this time and alternatives are being considered. Any funding determination would have to be consistent with the EIS outcome. MS. SELKREGG hoped the State, federal government and Municipality would establish criteria for the trails. Her district is heavily populated with bears and she is receiving many phone calls by concerned citizens who feel strongly to either protect the bears or kill the bears. She stated protocol on how to avoid building future trails with threatening wildlife is needed.

CHAIR KEITH noted that with Transportation Enhancement funding of approximately \$2.5 million, the chances of receiving \$22.5 million to build the trail are unlikely. MS. SELKREGG noted that in her experience, if a project is planned, the funding becomes available.

b. AMATS Policy and Procedures, Relating to Funding Allocations

MR. FLYNN reported on a work session he attended on behalf of the Policy Committee. The work session covered potential benefits and downfalls of adjustments to funding allocations. One point of interest was that, while the allocations made by the Policy Committee have been consistent, the execution has not been consistent. An area of focus for the Technical Advisory Committee is to ensure that allocations are obligated as approved by the

Policy Committee. A suggestion was made to allow for flexibility. He understood the conversation was that there would be no harm in instituting flexibility in the balance between Transportation Enhancements (TE) and Roadways as long as there was no commitment to a different number.

MR. POST stated that funding is limited. In the past the Policy Committee requested an explanation of what portion of the total Roadway projects is spent on transportation enhancement-like facilities. In 2004, only construction costs were examined. The two largest costs are construction and right-of-way. DeArmoun Road was one of the two large projects in 2008, so it was compared to the two large projects occurring in the current fiscal year. Coincidentally, the figures approximately equaled 12%. The \$1.926 million spent in 2008 does not include any portion of transportation enhancements in the road projects. MR. FLYNN explained that Mr. Post was referring to things such as trails built adjacent to roads with Roadway funding instead of pure TE funds. CHAIR KEITH commented that funding for these TE-like items is absorbed in the Roadway. MR. FLYNN noted there is conflict as to whether those portions of Roadway projects qualify as TE. There is a traditional category of TE that includes separate corridors for non-motorized traffic. MS. SELKREGG asked if the 12% represents the purchase of right-of-way related to TE. MR. POST replied that the combination of right-of-way and construction cost is 12%. MS. SELKREGG asked if the 7% figure indicates construction only. MR. POST explained that figure is the projects in the TIP that are specifically TE, from environmental design to right-of-way and construction. Right-of-way and construction were used as a simple way to illustrate that the TE-like components of Roadway projects are typically 12%. The environmental and design costs are approximately commensurate for right-of-way and construction costs for any particular element.

MS. SELKREGG asked what the correlation is between the 12% and the 6% budgeted in 2008. MR. POST noted there is no correlation. The 6% relates to projects in Table 4, which this year is Chester Creek. The 12% is that portion of the two Roadway projects this year, the Old Seward Highway and the Old Glenn Highway, that have transportation enhancement elements. MS. SELKREGG understood it is above the specific TE identified and reflects similar improvements along the Roadways. Substantial improvements along Roadways are occurring that are not necessarily in the TE. MR. POST

indicated this is correct. CHAIR KEITH stated it is an accounting measure. The Committee has chosen to not include those items in TE.

MR. POST noted that due to the cost of inflation and reduction, the purchasing power is one-quarter of what it was in 2004. He indicated the entire maintenance and operating budget for ADOT was flat until 2004 when it began to climb with the rate of inflation. This is significant in that the only source for State roads with capital maintenance needs, with the exception of NHS, is the AMATS program. The TE analysis sheet indicates there is presently \$82 million in rut repair needs, which continues to grow. CHAIR KEITH noted the previous list is budget to budget, which does not acknowledge the addition of significant lane miles or signals, and only reflects a portion of the needs. MR. POST noted that there is competition for the resurfacing of roads, as the only funding source is AMATS through the TIP process. MR. FLYNN remarked that there are also State funded earmarks. MS. SELKREGG understood that this is an issue that exists not only in Anchorage, but throughout the state. The matter is not only an earmark, but working with the State and the Governor's office for a broader initiative that has to do with the maintenance of the roads. MR. ABBOTT requested a list of every road that needs work so they can be included in the municipal capital budget request. CHAIR KEITH noted that the Municipality is very supportive of obtaining State General Funds to support maintenance.

CHAIR KEITH noted that Congress would hopefully approve a new federal funding bill. The outcome for FY 2008 and FY 2009 is unknown. There is not enough funding nationally to fund what Congress has authorized for FY 2008. In Alaska, it is likely that \$100 million will have to be cut from the budget; some of that will impact AMATS. There are fixed items that must be funded, so the impact on projects will be even greater. He suggested that the timing is not good to change the policy without knowing the outcome. He suggested revisiting the issue when the bill has been finalized. MR. ABBOTT expected that it would be at least another year before a new transportation bill is adopted. CHAIR KEITH noted that FY 2009 begins October 1, 2008, so the funding bill does not run out until October 2009. MR. FLYNN noted that at the work session, representatives discussed the transportation bill process and they were optimistic that a short-term solution would be available to get through federal fiscal year FY 2008 and likely FY 2009. The House passed a

bill but the Senate failed to take action before the recess. They believed it would be addressed in the fall. There is no anticipation that action would begin to update SAFETEA-LU until the new President is elected.

Transportation advocates would be ecstatic if an agreement was reached by the end of FY 2009. He respected Chair Keith's concern to not make alterations at this time; however, he did not anticipate a fundamental change for at least eighteen months from this date. He suggested proceeding in a way that does not compel AMATS to change allocations, but rather to offer flexibility. He proposed to give Roadways the flexibility of 70%-80% of the total AMATS allocation and TE 10%-20%. He referred to a previous motion he put before the Policy Committee to change the total allocation of Roadways to 70%-80% of the total AMATS allocation and Transportation Enhancements to be 10%-20% of the total AMATS allocation. CHAIR KEITH stated he did not recognize a pressing need to take action. MR. ABBOTT stated he is generally supportive of the proposed motion by Mr. Flynn. ADOT would appreciate a month or two to consider the implications of the motion to gain further information based on likely findings from Washington DC. He was inclined to support action in the October/November time frame. CHAIR KEITH stated that he was unsure more information would be available in by October/November.

MS. RICHARDSON provided three charts indicating the Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality (CMAQ) money being received by the state and the actual allocation of those funds. Essentially, of five years, two years of CMAQ money was un-allocated at the state level and shifted into other projects. With regard to trails, of the six years of Transportation Enhancements averaging \$2.6 million a year, only \$1.5 million was spent. She also provided an example of how those funds are pushed out in the TIP. This has been done with the Mountain View Trail and buses, as well as other projects. She stated the new public participation program at AMATS is being developed and she requested trends reports of the process. If stakeholders are not present year after year, this trend is not obvious. Providing a trend is helpful for the public to understand what funding is available, how it is allocated, and how it is actually spent. Trends are also beneficial for decision makers to make the most informed choices.

MS. SELKREGG asked if the \$275,000 not being spent in FY 2008 is an example of how funding is pushed out. CHAIR KEITH noted that it would be helpful to apply the past model of information provided by Ms. Richardson to current information and see a five-year trend.

WALT PARKER stated he was in support of the motion. He believed the ratio would make it much easier in terms of the LRTP and *Anchorage 2020*.

BERNADETTE BRADLEY clarified that the policy change taking place is for Transportation Enhancements from 30% to 10%-20%. MR. FLYNN explained that the change would be from the current allocation of 10% to the flexibility of 10%-20%.

MR. POST noted that from the staff perspective, when one portion of a program has twice as much potential for funding, it is difficult for staff to decide on a funding proposal. He recognized the desire for variability to achieve a target range. Having a specific target to achieve is easier rather than halving or doubling a specific portion of a program. This makes it difficult for staff to create a TIP. MS. SELKREGG asked if the intent is 15% and what is the benefit of a 10%-20%. MR. FLYNN replied the benefit is flexibility. He recognized it would remain incumbent upon the Policy Committee to provide annual guidance to stay within the bands as the TIP is developed. In some years the target may be closer to 20% and in others it may be closer to 10%.

CHAIR KEITH felt it would work better to have flexibility rather to keep to a fixed figure of 15%. MS. SELKREGG asked if it would be possible to complement a Roadway project with additional funding. She requested an example of a monetary benefit of having a flexible range. CHAIR KEITH suggested that it could mean 10% less money to fix Debarr Road. He noted that while Debarr Road is in poor condition, it is competing against all other roads, TE and buses.

MR. ABBOTT stated that this is true only to the extent that federal funds are requested; there are a variety of other funding sources for Debarr Road, including General Funds. In recent years, in terms of investment in state roads in Anchorage, General Funds have dwarfed AMATS funding of

projects, on a scale of \$100 million versus \$30 million to \$40 million annually. CHAIR KEITH asked how much of that funding goes to road repair. MR. ABBOTT assured him that if this is a high priority for ADOT, he assumed the Governor would rank it appropriately high and the Municipality would as well. CHAIR KEITH stated that if State dollars are used to fix roads and federal dollars to execute TE projects, the federal aid process is so cumbersome that all of the TE funding can be spent in upfront costs. MR. ABBOTT replied that the Municipality is willing to engage in discussions as to which funding source is best suited for which project. He stated this is the first he has seen this prioritized list of ADOT projects. He did not think they were part of the cooperative ranking process that was initiated several years ago. If these are high priorities for ADOT, they need to be considered. CHAIR KEITH stated he has testified before the state legislature that there is \$300 million in need in the region and he did not get a positive response. The idea that the Legislature will suddenly release funding to repair DeBarr Road is speculative.

MS. BRADLEY asked if the motion allows for the community to use less than 10% for TE. CHAIR KEITH replied that the entire state of Alaska is required by FHWA to spend no less than 10%. MS. BRADLEY asked how many road projects have been over the 10%. CHAIR KEITH stated he did not know, however, there have been projects that have exceeded 10%.

MR. LAMSON asked if there is a similar priority list for road repair for the Mat-Su region. CHAIR KEITH replied he has one for the entire region. MS. SELKREGG asked to see the entire list.

JENNIFER WITT clarified that the rutting is being dealt with on a region wide basis. ADOT is trying to gather information to understand what are the contributing causes of ruts and what is being done to address it through asphalt. This list has not been available previously because it was pulled from maintenance. There is a list of the fifteen most rutted sections and, through the year 2011, assuming there is the same amount of money dedicated to preventative maintenance, only four or five projects out of fifty can be addressed. The information was brought forward to illustrate the unmet needs that AMATS is unable to address through the TIP. The information is also an attempt to gain the attention of legislators.

CHAIR KEITH noted that the document reveals helpful information, such as the fact that studded tires are the biggest contributor to ruts, not the sub base below the slab. He clarified that the list is consistent with the pavement management plan. The priority is set by the maintenance department. MS. WITT stated the focus is ruts and it does not address other issues with pavement. CHAIR KEITH replied that this is included in another list where the mode of failure might be that pavement is at the end of its useful life.

MS. SELKREGG stated she was reminded of a discussion at a past meeting of the issue of depletion of funds. There is an expectation of how the TIP works; many projects are introduced and are shifted annually. There is a reality of choice between maintenance and the roads, which is a large policy issue. She suggested that staff and the Policy Committee approach the issue with a global lens, and consider reframing the issue to seek a solution in an effort to avoid facing it again. The consequence might be making difficult decisions like not building a road and shifting funds to maintenance. She felt that the public would be pleased with such decision-making. CHAIR KEITH noted that capital funding could not be spent for the maintenance of roads. MS. SELKREGG explained that the thought of the resurfacing projects as maintenance projects. Many roads need resurfacing and reconstruction. CHAIR KEITH noted that the Policy Committee has been concentrating effort on the signed agreement between Municipality of Anchorage and the State of Alaska to relieve congestion by building new routes. The agreement does not address the issue of maintenance and road reconstruction. MS. SELKREGG noted the coordination of moving people between state and local roadways is evident on Tudor Road. She understood the turn at Elmore Road would be resolved this summer. CHAIR KEITH replied there is a contract with one milestone that should be complete before the winter. The entire intersection will not be complete until a later date.

MS. RICHARDSON appreciated the discussion of maintenance as it has been an ongoing issue. The public polls indicate a desire to maintain roads rather than building new. She was curious about what information is available to the public so there can be public input. She asked how to access the information regarding how much the City is pulling from the State General Fund above and beyond the typical AMATS allocation for transportation

systems. She suggested the information be available at a central location like AMATS. MR. ABBOTT referred her to Mr. Lamson who could provide a summary of the last several years of General Fund to capital state and municipal road projects. MS. RICHARDSON felt this type of information would be helpful and suggested that health and education stakeholders would like to provide input.

MR. LAMSON noted that the list is not exclusively non-NHS roads. CHAIR KEITH stated this list is non-NHS to the extent that AMATS funds are not used for the NHS. Of the limited federal funding available to accomplish all projects, these must be done out of AMATS. NHS has its own funding category that has a history of being severely under funded. The entire NHS receives \$80 million to \$90 million annually. MR. FLYNN asked if there is a prioritized list for Anchorage NHS routes that could be considered in the municipal legislative program with a match from NHS.

MR. FLYNN moved to change policy and procedure 3, changing allocations to roads from a fixed 80% to a flexible range of 70%-80% and to change the total allocation for transportation enhancements from a fixed 10% to a flexible range of 10%-20% of the total allocation. MS. SELKREGG seconded.

The motion passed with Abbott, Flynn, and Selkregg in favor and Edwards and Keith dissenting.

MR. ABBOTT departed at 2:26 p.m.

6. INFORMATIONAL REPORTS

a. KABATA

CHAIR KEITH noted that the Policy Committee had been provided responses to questions posed to KABATA from the Policy Committee and Technical Advisory Committee. MS. SELKREGG suggested that it would be appropriate to discuss this at the next Policy Committee meeting. She noted that there was discussion previously that the Policy Committee could make the decision that the Long-Range Transportation Plan (LRTP) should change in light of energy issues and the possible need to focus on transit. She asked if it is important, in terms of the Record of Decision process, that there be a

formal expression of the Policy Committee's apprehension and the State's position. CHAIR KEITH responded that the Record of Decision is on a parallel line. A Final EIS has been published and the process now is for the FHWA to review the Final EIS in San Francisco and Washington DC. MS. SELKREGG noted that part of the Record of Decision requires that this project be in the LRTP and that needs to be supported by the community. Therefore, if because conditions have changed, there is not community support, it would seem necessary to formally notify FHWA of that fact. MR. FLYNN understood that, given the rules associated with a Record of Decision, the community would be responsible for the funding if the project were removed from the LRTP at this time. If there is a desire to indicate a change in community support for this project, it would be via an Assembly resolution. CHAIR KEITH felt the FHWA had everything before it that is needed for that agency to make a decision. Taking the project out of the LRTP or TIP is one way the Municipality of Anchorage could indicate non-support. MS. SELKREGG felt this was important to do in the context of changing conditions. CHAIR KEITH stated that the individual at USDOT and FHWA who signed the Record of Decision is fully cognizant of the current conditions.

CHAIR KEITH asked that the Policy Committee members review the responses provided by KABATA and a discussion be calendared at the September meeting. MS. SELKREGG also asked for staff's review of the document and a report.

b. TAC Membership Issue

CHAIR KEITH noted that the letter from KABATA notes that, "KABATA is compelled to note the irreconcilable personal conflict of interest of Ms. Lois Epstein as a member of the AMATS Technical Advisory Committee and Air Quality Advisory Group. The conflict arises due to the divided loyalty presented by her paid employment as Director of the Alaska Transportation Priorities Project whose avowed goal is to terminate the Knik Arm Crossing project. In light of that conflict, it is incumbent on Ms. Epstein to be recused from further participation in or communication with members of the Policy and Technical Advisory Committee as well as the AMATS Air Quality Advisory Group and its members regarding any and all aspects of the Knik

Arm Crossing.” He asked if the Policy Committee wishes to address this issue at its September meeting.

MR. FLYNN noted that the letter from KABATA contains a number of citations, however, the paragraph read by Chair Keith contains none. He stated that it would be problematic if the qualifications of being a member of an AMATS committee is whether or not an individual agrees or disagrees with projects potentially before AMATS. He did not object to discussing this matter as a Business Item in September. He noted that Ms. Epstein’s contributions to the Technical Advisory Committee are useful and he appreciates her continued participation. CHAIR KEITH asked that this item be calendared as a Business Item at the Policy Committee’s September meeting. He also asked that a determination be made whether or not this discussion should occur in executive session.

MS. EPSTEIN noted that she represents the Air Quality Advisory Committee on the Technical Advisory Committee and she feels she has been able to ask questions that need to be asked. She did not see a conflict as she is not financially compensated based on whether or not this project goes forward.

7. SCHEDULED AMATS MEETINGS

Technical Advisory Committee, August 28, 2008

Policy Committee, September 11, 2008

Technical Advisory Committee, September 25, 2008

8. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 2:39 PM.