

**ANCHORAGE METROPOLITAN AREA TRANSPORTATION SOLUTIONS  
POLICY COMMITTEE MEETING  
Planning & Development Center  
Main Conference Room, 1<sup>st</sup> Floor  
4700 Elmore Road  
Anchorage, Alaska**

**August 27, 2009  
1:00 p.m.**

Policy Committee members Present:

---

Name	Representing
Gordon Keith	Alaska Dept. of Transportation & Public Facilities, Regional Director (ADOT/PF)
Alice Edwards	Alaska Dept. of Environmental Conservation (ADEC), Air Quality
Dan Sullivan	Municipal Mayor
Sheila Selkregg	MOA/Municipal Assembly
Patrick Flynn	MOA/Municipal Assembly

Also in attendance

---

Name	Representing
Craig Lyon	MOA/Traffic Department
Lance Wilber**	MOA/Traffic Department
Vivian Underwood	MOA/Traffic Department
Jody Karcz**	MOA/Public Transportation Department
Suzanne Armstrong	MOA/Port of Anchorage
Leo Carroll	MOA/Port of Anchorage
Kim Stalder	Wordsmith / Port of Anchorage
Lois Epstein**	Alaska Transportation Priorities Project
Mary Ann Pease	Knik Arm Bridge and Toll Authority (KABATA)
Mike Foster	KABATA
Andrew Niemiec	KABATA
Pete Christiansen	ADOT/PF
Ron King	ADOT/PF
Aneta Synan	ADOT/PF
Cindy Heil**	ADEC
Alison Lohrke	Dowl HKM
Walt Parker	Anchorage Citizens Coalition
Duane Hippe	HDR
Sandra Cook	HDR
Roger Purcell	Mayor, City of Houston
Betty Adkison	
Yereth Rosen	

\*AMATS Technical Advisory Committee members

**1. CALL TO ORDER**

CHAIR KEITH called the meeting to order at 1:09 p.m. All Policy Committee members were present with Mayor Sullivan arriving at 1:10 p.m., and Sheila Selkregg arriving at 1:12 p.m. A quorum was established.

**2. PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT ANNOUNCEMENT**

CHAIR KEITH encouraged public involvement in this meeting of the AMATS Policy Committee. He explained that staff would first make their presentation, followed by any comments from Committee members, and the floor would then be open to public comment.

**3. APPROVAL OF AGENDA**

MR. FLYNN moved to approve the agenda. MS. EDWARDS seconded. *Hearing no objections, the agenda was approved unanimously.*

CHAIR KEITH introduced Mayor Dan Sullivan, a member of the Policy Committee who had previously served on the Policy Committee when he was on the Assembly.

**4. APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES – None****5. BUSINESS ITEMS****a. Long-Range Transportation Plan – Knik Arm Crossing**

CHAIR KEITH described what has happened over the last couple of months with regard to the Long Range Transportation Plan and Knik Arm Crossing. The AMATS Committee was sued by the Cities of Houston and Wasilla, and the Knik Arm Bridge and Toll Authority (KABATA) joined in the suit as an intervener. The plaintiffs and defendants reached a settlement on the lawsuit. CHAIR KEITH stated that AMATS feels certain they have not done anything incorrectly, but are believers in the public process, and as such agreed to move ahead with more public process on the Knik Arm Crossing issue. CHAIR KEITH reviewed the pertinent terms of the Settlement signed by all parties, including each of the members of the Policy Committee. The parties agreed that by October 15, 2009 the Policy Committee would vote to rescind the vote that moved the Knik Arm Crossing into the long range area of the Long Range Transportation Plan, and would, in fact, see that the vote is rescinded. Then, should the AMATS Policy Committee decide to propose a motion similar to the one that put the Knik Arm Crossing in the Long Range Transportation Plan, AMATS would provide at least 30 days notice for the public, specifically the Cities of Houston and Wasilla, to weigh in on the issue. Also, as soon as there is a vote to approve rescinding the June 25, 2009 vote, AMATS would no longer be under court control on the this issue.

CHAIR KEITH requested a motion to rescind the June 25, 2009 vote that moved the Knik Arm Crossing from the short term to the long term portion of the Long Range Transportation Plan.

MR. FLYNN so moved, and DR. SELKREGG seconded.

DR. SELKREGG stated for the record that she thought there was an intent on the parties involved to reduce court costs. The case could have been battled out for a full year, spent maybe \$200,000 on court fees, and we might have had a different outcome, but it would have been an expensive path. Dr. Selkregg appreciated the spirit of cooperation in terms of the State, the Mayor, and the members of this body to try to come up with a strategy that allows the process to still be alive if we choose, and at the same time save money in terms of court costs. It's important to note that this was a motivating factor in the decision to settle.

CHAIR KEITH felt it was not good form for one government to sue another government, and felt positive that things have been worked out such that we don't have to have the judicial system settle it for us.

There were no comments from the public.

CHAIR KEITH restated the motion on the floor: to rescind the June 25, 2009 vote to remove the Knik Arm Crossing into the long range of the Long Range Transportation Plan.

*Hearing no objections, the motion passed unanimously.*

CHAIR KEITH noted with that this vote AMATS would not longer be under court control on this issue.

MR. FLYNN moved that the LRTP amendment that the Policy Committee had previously considered be remanded to the Technical Advisory Committee so they may address concerns about the rail/pedestrian access to the Knik Arm Crossing and with completion of their work provide the amendment to the public for a 30 day review. DR. SELKREGG seconded.

DR. SELKREGG was unsure of the Policy Committees overall intent, and felt that two issues came out of the court case. One was the issue of whether there was adequate public notice for our neighboring communities. The second was the issue that the railroad was added at the end and wasn't part of the original notice to the public. DR. SELKREGG's expectation today is to move to provide a 30 day notice period for the issue that the Policy Committee was originally considering. Then also pursue the Technical Advisory Committee's advice regarding the rail piece. According to our legal advice, it seemed very important to separate the railroad decision from where we put the bridge or how we approach the bridge. With that in mind, DR. SELKREGG requested clarification of the motion and the intent.

MR. FLYNN stated the motion was to remand the LRTP amendment to the TAC Committee so they could delete the reference to rail and pedestrian facilities, and then put that amendment out

to public notice. Then, he was going to propose a subsequent motion asking the TAC to consider whether it is appropriate to allow KABATA to study the issue, but does not require KABATA to do it.

DR. SELKREGG asked if the intent is to send it back to the Technical Committee for 30 days.

MR. FLYNN confirmed this was so the TAC could do their work at their next meeting at the end of September, and when that was done done, then put it out for full public comment for 30 days.

DR. SELKREGG wanted to be careful about what the Policy Committee is asking the TAC to do. If TAC is going to come back with recommendations, there should be a recommendation on how to deal with the bridge, and a recommendation on whether or not it should have rail and pedestrian, and asked for clarification on whether this was the intent of the motion.

MR. FLYNN explained that his second motion would be to ask TAC to craft language with the intent to put out 2 different possibilities or one that allows KABATA to study whether rail and pedestrian facilities would be appropriate.

DR. SELKREGG recommended that the PC make one recommendation on the Long Range Transportation Plan and whether or not the bridge should be in the Plan, and a second recommendation on whether they have suggestions on rail and pedestrian facilities.

CHAIR KEITH wanted to make clear that the Policy Committee only wants to release one amendment. There's already been confusion because there's been one amendment out to the public, and one that's going to look very similar will be coming back out again. What needs to happen first is for the PC to tell the TAC to work amongst themselves and with the Department of Law and the Municipal Attorney to see if it is possible to put in language that conveys the Policy Committee's thoughts that it just wants KABATA to consider railroad and pedestrian, and if they can successfully work out the language, then put that in the amendment and release only one amendment.

DR. SELKREGG felt, based on the court issues, that the court was concerned with the fact that AMATS spent a year's process around an amendment proposing to take it out. It would be cleaner to send it back to the Technical Advisory Committee to have them evaluate that, and then also ask them to evaluate the issue of rail and pedestrian. Then, if AMATS puts something out, it seems the first question is where we want the bridge in terms of our plan, and then the second question, which may take longer, or might be a different discussion, is do rail and pedestrian activities make sense with this and how should we approach it. DR. SELKREGG was concerned that if AMATS comes back around with an amendment that includes rail and pedestrian without having that year's discussion like before, it may open AMATS to more lawsuits.

CHAIR KEITH stated what he thought the court said, and that is if AMATS decided to add a rail and a pedestrian facility, it would require, and even KABATA agrees, a supplement EIS that would take a year or two to be done, and cost \$10 million or more dollars. If this is added in, the

Policy Committee needs to be prepared for and to go into this with their eyes open. AMATS should not be portrayed as telling them to put the railroad in there, but ask them to look at that possibility.

DR. SELKREGG didn't disagree, but felt those are two separate issues; one, where in the long term plan, and two whether or not it has rail. She felt for this body, to keep us out of court, it's going to better off if we act on the decision of where it belongs, and the second decision about whether or not we want to ask them to explore the possibility of rail. Actually the timing of these two things don't have to happen exactly together because she thought the rail and pedestrian issues are complex, and we should figure out what it is our expectations are real carefully before we ask KABATA to spend \$10 million dollars.

CHAIR KEITH asked if it would it be better to instruct the TAC to prepare an amendment without railroad or pedestrian, and then have a resolution from AMATS to KABATA saying that we think they should look at railroad and pedestrian. DR. SELKREGG felt this would be a cleaner way to deal with it, and would be in keeping with the year-long process.

MR. FLYNN stated his motion was simply to remand this issue to the TAC, and have TAC prepare the amendment to the Long Range Transportation Plan deleting the reference to rail and pedestrian, and believes this is consistent with what Dr. Selkregg is asking and the motion on the floor.

DR. SELKREGG asked if Mr. Flynn's motion was in fact to have the TAC bring back the amendment in keeping with what their recommendation would be and was publicly noticed. If so, DR. SELKREGG is fine with that. She felt the Policy Committee's first question, based on this resolution if we support it, would be to the TAC asking what their recommendation would be in terms of whether AMATS should take the bridge out or leave the bridge in, or something in-between.

CHAIR KEITH stated the motion is to have the TAC take it up, remove the reference to rail and pedestrian, and reissue the LRTP amendment with the Knik Arm Crossing moved from the short term to long term. Once the TAC has completed its work, the amendment would be put out for the 30 day comment period.

DR. SELKREGG asked if when the amendment is put out for comment whether it would be removing the bridge from the plan. MR. FLYNN stated "no," it would be put out moving the Crossing from the short term to the long term, consistent with what AMATS did in June, but not inclusive of the addition of rail or pedestrian. DR. SELKREGG was fine with that.

CHAIR KEITH stated he believed it has all the necessary elements. It has a minimum of 30 days to go out, and the motion has TAC releasing the amendment rather than the Policy Committee. He noted that the amendment would be seen by the Policy Committee again.

CHAIR KEITH asked for public comment on the motion. MIKE FOSTER from KABATA noted that his understanding was that it is not a motion to delete the crossing from the Long Range Transportation Plan. MR. FLYNN clarified the motion is to remand it back to the TAC to look at the amendment that was voted on in June with the removal of a rail compatibility, a rail component and a pedestrian component, and then the TAC would make their decision whether or not to put it out for public review or coming back to Policy Committee with their decision to release it to the public for a 30 day comment period.

CHAIR KEITH stated the motion on the floor is for the TAC to release it. After they've accomplished that and taken out the reference to railroad and pedestrian, TAC would release it for the beginning of the 30 day public comment period. MR. FOSTER's understanding was that in going out to a 30 day comment period, it would also go back through Planning & Zoning, to the Assembly and back to this body. TAC releases it back to the Policy Committee at the end of the 30 day comment period. MR. FOSTER asked whether the amendment would come back to TAC, or back to the Policy Committee for a vote. CHAIR KEITH clarified it comes back to the Policy Committee.

MR. FOSTER noted the Policy Committee would be voting on Mr. Flynn's amendment to move the Knik Arm Crossing from the short term to the long term without a rail component and without a pedestrian component. CHAIR KEITH stated that was correct.

MR. FOSTER stated for the record that KABATA does not agree with that and thinks it should stay in short term. There has been discussion on what the court has decided, and the court has not made a decision. The settlement came from the parties before a court decision. KABATA is still looking at finishing the environmental process in 2010, and will be looking at a rail compatible structure, and pedestrian and bike paths will be part of that when KABATA looks at projections when the Crossing converts from 2 lane to 4 lane. MR. FOSTER stated he had heard somebody say KABATA would agree to something and that is not correct. KABATA believes that having it rescinded and back prior to the June decision was KABATA's stand, and although he can't speak for the administration, that's where administration going to stand shortly, but can't speak to that.

CHAIR KEITH suggested to Mr. Foster some of the confusion has happened because various members of KABATA have told this body as well as the TAC what they're going to do. CHAIR KEITH suggested Mr. Foster have KABATA's board decide what it's going to do, speaking specifically of the railroad and pedestrian, pass a resolution, and then everybody agrees with what your intent is. MR. FOSTER stated KABATA has had a couple meetings with the governor in the past couple weeks, and as soon as they have some clear direction from administration, Mr. Foster will be presenting it to the KABATA board, and their Board will make a resolution. MR. FOSTER hopes this body will be aware of that and take that into consideration.

DR. SELKREGG noted it is very clear to her that the KABATA organization is extraordinarily committed to pursuing this project, and they've indicated that they have legal counsel. DR. SELKREGG expressed concern about the protocols around this amendment. She noted the reference from KABATA's representative just now about going back and revisiting the Planning & Zoning Commission, and going through that whole issue again is based on the fact that we're going to be releasing language that's different than what the P&Z saw. DR. SELKREGG believes the Policy Committee would be better off asking the TAC to make a recommendation on record, and release the same amendment that was originally considered by P&Z with their recommendations to the Policy Committee for action, if that's the case. It is basically between leaving the crossing in or leaving it out. If AMATS doesn't notice this based on the same framework that the public process was built around, AMATS is liable to be in a situation where KABATA will say it wasn't noticed correctly, and you need to go back and do this for a year. When, in fact, DR. SELKREGG believes the record shows the Policy Committee's intent was to listen to the public, and reaction came after an in between based on public process.

DR. SELKREGG asked Mr. Wilber if it would be possible to release the same language we originally released for public review to P&Z, and have the Technical Advisory Committee take in comment, and then come to us and recommend an action in between for us to act on. CHAIR KEITH noted what Planning & Zoning saw was simply an amendment to take the Knik Arm Crossing completely out. The TAC fashioned some sort of a compromise between take it in, leave it out, and the issue was the public was never noticed with the compromise.

DR. SELKREGG requested a brief recess to consult with her attorney. CHAIR KEITH agreed, and the meeting recessed at 1:33 p.m. The Policy Committee reconvened at 1:35 p.m.

DR. SELKREGG stated she was comfortable with 30 days, and she is also comfortable that if for some reason the TAC had us move it out, it is consistent with the original notice and the action is compatible with the process.

MR. FLYNN withdrew his motion.

MR. FLYNN moved that we remand the LRTP amendment to TAC so that they can remove the reference to the rail/pedestrian and return the LRTP amendment to the Policy Committee so the Policy Committee can vote to release it for public comment should they so choose on September 24. MAYOR SULLIVAN seconded.

DR. SELKREGG noted that in terms of KABATA's confidence in the State administration to act and to be compatible with their intent, she just wanted to put on record the hope that the State administration takes the time to determine the impact of this project on the overall system and other transportation needs.

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

**b. Air Quality Conformity Determination - memo**

MR. LYON reported on the Air Quality Conformity Determination for the 2010-2013 TIP. A memo and the public review draft were included as part of the meeting materials. It will be put in the system tomorrow to schedule it before the assembly. The TIP shows the Knik Arm Crossing in the short term. The budget for the emissions standards are such that projects shown in the Determination won't be running afoul of the air quality standards. AMATS needs to put the Air Quality Conformity Determination out for 30 day public review, and are asking the Policy Committee to release it. CHAIR KEITH noted to meet the requirements to get the TIP out on time, AMATS is doing everything as if the Knik Arm Crossing is in the short term so we meet those deadlines. Should something change, it would require a major amendment to the TIP and to the LRTP.

DR. SELKREGG moved to approve the release the conformity determination report. MAYOR SULLIVAN seconded.

With regard to the inventory boundary, MR. FLYNN asked for clarification on whether the inventory expansion occurred in 2004. MR. LYON will check with Mr. Morris and provide a response back to Mr. Flynn.

DR. SELKREGG asked about the impact of expanding the boundary, and if AMATS is now monitoring that area. MR. LYON will check with Mr. Morris and provide a response back. MS. EDWARDS noted this was consistent with how it was all done in the maintenance plans going back to 2004, and was fairly sure the approach to the inventory boundary was consistent. MAYOR SULLIVAN noted it stated in the text that boundaries were expanded slightly because significant residential and commercial growth occurred in south and west Anchorage in the past two decades.

CHAIR KEITH asked for comments from the public. LOIS EPSTEIN, a member of the TAC, asked for clarification on whether, if the Knik Arm Bridge gets moved to the long term, a new air quality conformity determination would need to be done and released. CHAIR KEITH stated that amendments to TIP, LRTP and Air Quality would be required. MR. LYON clarified it would require amendments to both Air Quality Conformity Determinations, the one for the LRTP and the one for TIP.

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

**c. AMATS Resolution on Port of Anchorage Grant under the grants for Transportation Investment Generating Economic Recovery (TIGER) Program**

SUZANNE ARMSTRONG reported on the resolution being brought to the Policy Committee by the Port of Anchorage in support of its grant application. The Port of Anchorage is asking the Policy Committee to support its grant application under the Transportation Investment Generating Economic Recovery (TIGER) Program.

MS. ARMSTRONG reported the TIGER program was established under the American Recovering and Reinvestment Act of 2009. TIGER is a \$1.5 billion dollar discretionary grant program. Highways, bridges, rail and port structure development programs are all eligible projects under this program. It is the only pot of funding that was made available for port infrastructure development programs like the Port of Anchorage. There's no formula funding under surface transportation programs like there are for rail and highways. This was one opportunity the Port of Anchorage had to seek funding for the port expansion project.

DR. SELKREGG discussed the Port's enjoyment of the benefit of guaranteed major loans, having a partner in economic commitment, and its reliance on the municipal financial. DR. SELKREGG, understanding there is a fairly complex structure around the economic strategy for the port, asked how this additional grant money would fit in that overall needs package, what it does in terms of the loans, or what it is replacing. DR. SELKREGG thought it would be helpful to update the Assembly, and also the administration, on what kind of relief this grant would provide to the financial demands on the port.

CHAIR KEITH asked how many dollars the Port of Anchorage is seeking, and if that money would be for a discrete element of the port, or is it just part of the overall funding. MS. ARMSTRONG stated the Port of Anchorage is requesting \$226 million dollars in the grant application. This grant proposal took many months to assemble because the Port wanted to put forth the most competitive application it could because they would be competing nation-wide for a relatively small portion of money. For the \$226 million dollars being requested, the Port will also contribute in that package almost \$200 million dollars. Referring to the Port's Intermodal Expansion Project, the Port is looking for funding for completion of the north extension and the barge berth facilities, approximately \$97 million of stimulus funds would be put towards the completion of the north extension and the barge berth areas which will allow the port to move commercial operations off of the current facility onto the north extension so there would be no interruption of commercial operation if they are able to do that. The second segment of funding they are requesting support for is at the south extension where currently they have two petroleum berthing facilities and also a dry bulk facility for our cement facility. Completion of the south extension will eliminate a conflict in terminals the Port currently has with their petroleum and their dry bulk facility. This south replacement would consist of \$128 million dollars in stimulus funds, and \$20 million dollars in Port funding. The last segment included as part of the grant package doesn't include any stimulus funding, but is the north replacement which will allow them to condemn and demolish a portion of the current infrastructure at the Port of Anchorage and to rebuild that area which once rebuilt will be used for container, general cargo, military and cruise ship operations, and the Port is looking to spend \$144 million of its own revenue and other funding sources to complete that. The grant package the Port has put together for this

application shows that between 2010 and 2012, the Port will be able to complete three essential facilities; the north extension and the barge berth facilities, the south extension, and the north replacement. Without the TIGER grant funding, the Port will only be able to complete the north extension and barge berth facility, and the north replacement. It won't be able to touch the south extension until after 2012. There are a number of economic benefits derived from getting into the south extension in a more timely manner.

DR. SELKREGG asked if the Port packaged in the demolition of the north replacement piece, because they wanted to demonstrate a match, and was it a required match. MS. ARMSTRONG responded that there is no required match under the TIGER Program, and the Port felt that in building a competitive grant application, they would fair better showing what their contribution is to this segment. The Port is showing all the money and where all the funds are invested to date. In the north extension and barge berth facility we are requesting \$97 million in TIGER funding for that, but will also show the \$78 million dollars that they've spent to date to complete that segment of the extension.

DR. SELKREGG was concerned that by signing the resolution, the Policy Committee would be going on record as supporting the whole Port project. MS. ARMSTRONG explained that the resolution speaks to the service that the Port of Anchorage provides, the service areas it provides to, support for the Port's application, and urges Secretary LaHood to award a grant.

DR. SELKREGG suggested with regard to financial questions that it would be valuable for this body and the Assembly to get a handle on how the whole project's structured.

CHAIR KEITH asked for public comment on the proposed resolution.

LOIS EPSTEIN, TAC, asked if, on page 2 of the resolution where AMATS would be supporting the application but the word "application" is not in first line, it should be added. MS. EPSTEIN felt that if it wasn't added it could be interpreted as support for the whole project, and several of us have been on the record stating they have questions and there are issues still being looked at.

MS. ARMSTRONG had no problem if the Policy Committee wished to clarify that it is in support specifically of the Port's application to the U.S. Department of Transportation.

MS. SELKREGG noted that the Municipality is on record on supporting the Port, she would like to see us get this grant money, and would rather spend the grant money than have it come from another pot. Although initially concerned, DR. SELKREGG wanted to go on record that the resolution supporting the grant is title specific, and she is comfortable with that.

MS. ARMSTRONG noted that Anchorage Assembly did pass a resolution in support of the Port of Anchorage applying for a grant in March, and the proposed resolution is similar to that resolution.

LOIS EPSTEIN encouraged the Assembly to continue to look at the phasing issues, and whether each item is independently justified, and to look carefully at the needs, especially in an economic downturn, and whether there is in fact going to be the traffic that justifies each phase of the project, and finally the operating expenses and budget constraints over the long-term, and lay out those concerns.

DR. SELKREGG concurred that this is a big project, and we have to be smart and be partners in understanding what's going, and really look at how we're doing, and what the numbers are to supporting the assumptions around the money. DR. SELKREGG mentioned the possibility of a work session to look at those issues.

CHAIR KEITH asked MS. ARMSTRONG if the Port is asking the Policy Committee for its support for the application, and not necessarily the phasing plan. MS. ARMSTRONG confirmed this is correct. MAYOR SULLIVAN noted that in the resolution's title it makes it very clear what the resolution speaks to.

MS. ARMSTRONG noted there are other entities around the state that are looking to submit applications for the funding. Port Director Sheffield was told on Monday by Commissioner Von Scheben that the State of Alaska was not going to be pursuing funding under this grant program, and the Port has received a letter of support from Commissioner Von Scheben.

MR. SULLIVAN moved to approve the resolution. DR. SELKREGG seconded

MR. FLYNN moved to amend the motion to correct the spelling of President Obama's name in paragraph 8, line 2 of the resolution. DR. SELKREGG seconded.

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

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

**d. Other Business Items - None**

DR. SELKREGG departed the meeting at 1:58 p.m.

**6. INFORMATION ITEMS**

**a. AMATS Allocation**

PETE CHRISTIANSEN with the State of Alaska, Department of Transportation and Public Facilities, gave a presentation on Allocating Transportation Funds to Municipal Planning Organizations on how AMATS funds are allocation. Alaska is exempt from the federal funding

scheme for allocation of funds to MPOs, and DOT&PF chose to devise and adopt a formula that would be more beneficial to Alaska's MPOs. MR. CHRISTIANSEN discussed the criteria and data the State uses in this formula, and how it is applied and scored. Although Alaska fares better using its own formula as opposed to the federal formula, the Policy Committee expressed concerns that certain criteria undervalue Anchorage. MR. CHISTIANSEN confirmed this was correct, but noted that the formula was developed to be applied fairly state-wide and takes into account the differences between cities and rural areas including populations and tax bases that can help support the transportation system whereas in rural there is no tax basis, and often not even a borough. CHAIR KEITH commented on the backlog on paving for State roads, and how the Municipality, although it has a tax base, cannot tax and bond to maintain state roads.

MR. WILBER asked if there would be an opportunity for the Policy Committee, during the STIP review process, to weigh in. All of the percentages or points Anchorage gets the most for get the least weight, and is not beneficial to us on the non-NHS system. When this process was originally created years ago, there was a public process and it was the best method at the time, but that does not mean that Anchorage should not weigh in on this criteria and this method to get a fair share of the money , and not just say 27% is fair. Also, the fact that Anchorage has a tax base seems to count against us. If there is an opportunity to comment, there are a lot of technical matters related to this, and the TAC should take a look at it and provide ideas as well, and then have a thoughtful reception at the State when they're reviewing the STIP.

CHAIR KEITH felt it would be worthwhile to assign the issue to TAC to review the funding allocation, criteria and formula in more detail and to make recommendations. The Policy Committee concurred, and directed TAC to handle the matter.

MR. CHRISTIANSEN noted that the STIP comment period is being extended to October 16, providing 45 days to get this done, but cautioned if the State is going to act on the Policy Committee's comments on the funding allocation issues, it will likely take longer than the period the State has to get the STIP out. MR. WILBER noted that it might not affect 2010, but it may benefit Anchorage in the future. In addition, RON KING/ADOT, suggested AMATS consult with FMATS on the formula noting that FMATS had also expressed concerns.

MR. FLYNN noted everyone is probably wondering how the replacement of SAFETEA-LU will turn out. Some of the discussions will be a larger allocation for system operations as opposed to system construction and maintenance. It may effect how we want to address the state formula issues. There is limited public transit in the state, and so operation would be where those dollars would tend to be focused, and in that area be more heavily weighted towards metropolitan plant.

#### **b. Implementation Status of Adopted AMATS Plan**

MR. LYON reported that this has grown out of the Pubic Involvement Plan which requires an implementation status of all the AMATS adopted plans in the month of August. The only ones we're currently still working on besides LRTP and the TIP are the recently adopted Non-

Motorized Plan which is one component of the Pedestrian Plan. We are currently working on a Bike Plan which has a public hearing draft that will be used for public review when it goes to P&Z. The Mid-town Plan and the Hillside District Plan are still in the works, but close to completion. MR. WILBER reported that P&Z will be looking at issue/responses on the Hillside District Plan and beginning their deliberations on August 31, and the Mid-town Plan will probably be out for a public review draft in another month.

**c. Third Quarter Obligation Report**

ANETA SYNAN, Alaska Department of Transportation and Public Facilities, reported on the AMATS FFY09 Third Quarter Project Obligation Report. It is being presented for informational purposes only, and no action is required from the Policy Committee.

The report does reflect additional needs approved by staff if the need is for less than \$250,000, then they were automatically approved for several projects that were under construction. This is allowed under our policies and procedures. MS. SYNAN discussed the projects requiring additional funds. Project G.1., Old Seward Highway, O'Malley to Brandon required an additional \$491,400 for unanticipated right of way costs. Project G.5, Eagle River Loop Road Reconstruction required an additional \$450,000 in design costs, and an additional \$1.7 million in construction costs were needed. Project G.9, Lake Otis Parkway Surface Rehabilitation and Safety Project, required an additional \$150,000 to cover additional construction costs.

The Chester Creek Trail Connection project; staff approved an additional \$250,000 to complete the design documents. The final project that additional funds were approved for was the Ship Creek Trail for an additional \$95,000 obligated to cover final construction administrative costs, and this was offset by an excess in design funds of \$175,000 that were de-obligated for the project.

When staff first looked at the additional obligation needs, there was an in-balance of almost 10%. In the TIP, staff has proposed providing advancing \$2.5 from 2010 Eagle River Road Rehabilitation Project, and by doing that it brings the TIP into balance for the 3<sup>rd</sup> Quarter.

MS. SYNAN reiterated that this report requires no action by the Policy Committee, but is for informational purposes only. The money from the Eagle River Road Rehab project was approved by the Policy Committee at the end of the 1<sup>st</sup> Quarter.

MR. FLYNN asked how much of the 2010 project funds have been obligated to address 2009 projects. MR. CRAIG will check and respond back to the Committee.

MAYOR SULLIVAN asked about the de-obligation funds noted on page 2 of the report, and why those funds weren't being used to offset the Eagle River Project rather than 2010 funds.

MS. SYNAN explained that the de-obligated funds were used already to offset increases in other projects with additional needs.

JENNIFER WITT, in response to the Committee's question on how much of the 2010 funds were used to offset the 2009 program, explained it will only be Eagle River Road advancing \$2.5 million into 2009. What is happening in 2010 is we will be using economic stimulus funds to supplement the 2010 TIP money to make the Old Glenn Highway Project complete.

**d. Other Informational Items**

**7. SCHEDULED AMATS MEETINGS**

Technical Advisory Committee, September 10, 2009

Policy Committee, September 24, 2009

Technical Advisory Committee, October 8, 2009

**8. ADJOURNMENT**

The meeting adjourned at 2:34 p.m.