

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

**September 24, 2009  
1:00 p.m.**

Policy Committee members Present:

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

Also in attendance

Name	Representing
Craig Lyon	MOA/Traffic Department
Lance Wilber*	MOA/Traffic Department
Van Le	MOA/Traffic Department
Vivian Underwood	MOA/Traffic Department
Jim Lamson	MOA/PM&E
Bob Owens	MOA/Legal
Steve Morris*	MOA/DHHS
Jody Karcz*	MOA/Public Transportation Department
Aneta Synan	ADOT/PF
Dave Post	ADOT/PF
Ron Martindale	ADOT/PF
Andrew Niemiec	KABATA
Mike Foster	KABATA
Walt Parker	ACC
Duane Hippe	HDR
Sandra Cook	HDR
Roger Purcell	Mayor, City of Houston
Suzanne DiPietro	Government Hill Community Council

\*AMATS Technical Advisory Committee members

**1. CALL TO ORDER**

CHAIR KEITH called the meeting to order at 1:03 p.m. All Policy Committee members were present with George Vakalis representing Mayor Sullivan, and Patrick Flynn arriving at 1:05 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 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. VAKALIS moved to approve the agenda. DR. SELKREGG seconded. Under Other Business Items, MR. LYON added a proposed resolution for the Highway to Highway Project/Statewide Transportation Improvement Program. Approval of minutes, agenda item 4, was postponed as copies of the minutes had not been provided to the Committee. Under Informational Items, agenda item 6(c), Upcoming Planning/Design Status was postponed.

*Hearing no objections, the agenda as modified was approved unanimously.*

## **4. APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES – June 2, 2009 & June 25, 2009 - *Postponed***

## **5. BUSINESS ITEMS**

### **a. Long-Range Transportation Plan – Knik Arm Crossing**

MR. WILBER reported the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) recommendation, based on guidance from the Policy Committee, is for the Policy Committee to release a new revised major amendment to the Long-Range Transportation Plan (LRTP) for the Knik Arm Crossing that would illustrate the project being shown in the long-range element of the LRTP. He advised the Policy Committee when it took action to rescind its June decision, the June LRTP amendment had consisted of 3 separate elements; the Knik Arm project itself, including a description, scope and timing; new planning factors required to be done through a major amendment process; and a revised financial plan. Although the rescinded June LRTP amendment was approved by the Policy Committee as a package, MR. WILBER indicated the guidance from the Policy Committee was appropriate to conversations only on the Knik Arm Crossing.

If the Policy Committee does decide to put out an LRTP amendment, MR. WILBER recommended the financial plan and the planning factors also be considered as well. He noted the financial plan and planning factor elements as part of the prior LRTP amendment have been out for public review, to the Planning & Zoning Commission, the Assembly and the Policy Committee. He stated these elements have met the requirements of the public involvement plan. He noted the TAC wanted to include it all as part of the proposed LRTP amendment. MR. WILBER noted after discussions with the TAC and staff, staff recognized there is a benefit to focusing on just the Knik Arm Crossing should the Policy Committee decide to do that. He stated the technical obligations of the financial plan continue to be met.

MR. WILBER explained the direction from the Policy Committee to the TAC was to review the scope of the project to remove the rail and the pedestrian facilities. He indicated Mr. Niemeic with KABATA was at the TAC meeting and confirmed Phase 2 of the Knik Arm Crossing would include pedestrian facilities. MR. WILBER felt it would be wise for the Policy Committee to continue to address it in the Long-Range Plan, in the short or long term, and it be consistent and include pedestrian facilities.

MR. WILBER discussed concerns TAC had with scheduling issues. He noted the TIP is currently before the Assembly, and it shows the Knik Arm Crossing in the short range and if an amendment was to be put out proposing it into the long-range there may be some confusion from the public. MR. WILBER reminded the Policy Committee the LRTP guides where AMATS spends its dollars, and if there is some different direction on the Long-Range Plan, then changes may or may not need to be made on the TIP, and the Committee should be aware of that in the decision making.

MR. WILBER noted the Policy Committee had discussed at its August meeting it did not make sense to add a requirement in the LRTP to show a rail as part of the scope. Based on this, he felt the Policy Committee should consider in their final decision forwarding a resolution to both KABATA and potentially the Alaska Railroad suggesting they work together to include rail because he believes the most benefits are from a multi-modal project. Although not speaking on behalf of KABATA, MR. WILBER does believe KABATA has a sense a multi-modal facility would be a benefit to the community, and it would be whether or not it is their obligation to fully support the rail element. This was discussed at the TAC meeting, and MR. WILBER explained what is before the Policy Committee from the TAC is a recommendation that the Knik Arm Crossing go out for public review, which would include planning factors and the financial plan, for 30 days. Given it is a major amendment, the TAC had discussed whether or not the amendment would go back to Planning & Zoning and the Assembly, and MR. WILBER stated the planning factors and financial plan have been through that public process consistent with the public involvement plan, and he did not see the merit to doing that again. However, for the bridge itself, MR. WILBER felt there was merit in letting Planning & Zoning have an opportunity within those 30 days to look at the amendment. MR. WILBER noted the Assembly created the recommendation that was formally forwarded to this Committee to show the Knik Arm Crossing in the long-range, and he was not sure whether or not there is a benefit to going back to the Assembly to show them the same thing they recommended, but it would be left to the Committee. At a minimum, MR. WILBER thought it would be put it out for 30 days, and give Planning & Zoning the opportunity to weigh-in, and then the Committee can determine if it wants to get it to the Assembly.

MR. WILBER explained legal counsel had been consulted about the 30 days, and legal's recommendation is the Policy Committee would be on sound ground if it just wanted to separate it, and put out the Knik Arm Crossing project itself for the 30 day review. Also, given the fact the public involvement obligation previously had been met, it wouldn't need to go it again.

DR. SELKREGG felt it was important to hear the court documents related to this issue, and asked MR. OWEN to read the details from the Settlement Agreement. MR. OWEN noted this does not go so much to the question of separating some part of it so much as the question of the resolution passed before. He referenced the settlement agreement in paragraph 3 provides that committee members agree they will not vote to re-adopt the same or any substantially similar proposal including a proposal in any way amending the AMATS Long-Range Transportation Plan by moving the Knik Arm Crossing project from the Plan's list of short term projects to the list of long term projects without giving Houston, Wasilla and KABATA at least 30 days prior notice and a reasonable opportunity to comment both orally and in writing, and shall be consistent with the rights granted to other members of the public and subject to reasonable time limitations.

DR. SELKREGG felt it was clarifying. MR. KEITH indicated it is the obligation, but it goes on to reserve the rights of the parties if they do not like it, they reserve the right even within the 30 days to sue because it does not meet the process.

MR. OWEN noted this was essentially the minimum standards that all rights of all parties are preserved.

DR. SELKREGG noted the fact the courts defined an expectation we have to meet in terms of this agreement, but there still could be individuals or parties' out there believing more is required, and they're not necessarily bound to the settlement agreement. She stated there is always the threat for suit, and what this settlement agreement did not give up in this, was the threat for either side to sue. However, it seemed to DR. SELKREGG the directive is fairly clear in terms of what the Policy Committee is required to do right now, and with so much said, she wanted to sort through this as a group.

She noted the Committee went through a set of observations about what has occurred, and she wanted to understand that really clearly. She explained what has occurred is that the Committee has been through a public process for a major amendment, and there are 3 sections to that process. The first is the actual amendment the Committee released, the second was the planning factors associated with it, and the third is the financial plan, and the financial plan has two components. She noted basically it looks at the Knik Arm Crossing costs and it looks at the LRTP. Further, she indicated if the Committee began the process again the planning factors and the financial plan would be brought forward would be different than what the public has seen, and this will provide the public an opportunity to comment and review on those two documents. Then with regard to the amendment itself, DR. SELKREGG noted it is different. The amendment was whether to put it in or out, so the question is was our decision to move it into the out years outside the construct of that conversation.

MR. WILBER explained of those three elements, just the project itself has changed. He stated the Committee had previously come up with a compromise, and he believes this committee and the TAC recognized the difference as not significant, but obviously the court believes it is. As a

result, the recommendation before the Policy Committee would keep the bridge in the Plan; however, move its construction to the outer years. He noted this is different than what the amendment originally released.

DR. SELKREGG understood the settlement agreement was the Policy Committee's decision was outside the realm of what was noticed, and adequate time was not given to our neighbors in the process. MR. OWEN indicated the agreement simply left that question open, and the parties agreed to go forward.

DR. SELKREGG wanted to be careful because KABATA has about \$60 million left to engage in court battles, and it clearly has been willing to be litigious, and there is a threat to be litigious. She does not think it is appropriate for the Committee to be altering our public commitment here because there is a well funded advocacy group threatening us, and in that context, DR. SELKREGG is happy to meet the requirements of the settlement. However, she does not feel it is appropriate for the Committee to exceed that because if there is a problem, and the next trouble comes along, it is possible the Committee won't settle, but will go to court because the right to disagree on other things was left on the table.

DR. SELKREGG noted the reason this is so important is AMATS has a Highway to Highway Project Plan, which is extremely expensive. She expressed concern KABATA is tasked with paying for itself outside of AMATS resources, but it will draw on state resources and state bonding capacity which will affect other projects and AMATS ability to do other things with the state, and there is less money coming. She felt this is an important decision for the community, and wanted to stay focused on making sure the Committee does not exceed what has been agreed to in this agreement.

CHAIR KEITH wants to do the right thing, and the right thing in his mind is the controversy swirling around about the public process that AMATS and the Committee employed before, so he would argue for the Committee to do it the right way. He noted the Committee is under no time constraint and should follow its own process all the way back through Planning & Zoning, the Assembly and everything else.

CHAIR KEITH explained he believes it is right because there is controversy about whether the Committee gave the public the chance to weigh in, so the Committee should make sure to follow its own process. He did not want to go back to court noting it is an expensive operation, and he would like to control what the Committee does here, not a judge.

MR. VAKALIS moved to approve the recommendation. MS. EDWARDS seconded.

MAYOR PURCELL from Houston agreed 100%. He thinks Houston's stance all the way through has been that you failed to give notice to Houston properly as AMATS is required, and we would probably end up being back in litigation if you go the other direction. He could very strongly say that is the way the case is going to be as the Policy Committee failed to give

Houston proper notice prior to the time, and AMATS is required to give the city of Houston notice ahead of time.

SUZANNE DiPIETRO testified she is a member of the Government Hill Community Council and a member of the public who has been following this project for quite a while. She stated she had plenty of notice and opportunity to comment, and thinks the controversy is not the public did not have notice and opportunity to comment. She noted the public was not complaining about it, but KABATA and the Mayors were complaining. She did not understand the controversy. She has heard members of the public saying they are sick of it, that it has gone on too long already. She thinks if the Policy Committee wants to focus its attention, it should focus it on the people who are complaining, which are the three and not the public.

DR. SELKREGG felt the Policy Committee followed the public process, but made an error when it came to the Committee. She also felt it would be inappropriate to go back to the Assembly as the Assembly has already directed the Committee to do this work. She noted the process generated took almost a year with an enormous amount of public comment, public comment on the Knik Arm Crossing came back mixed, and then what this body did was weigh that information. She felt the Committee came up with what she thought was probably a response that could stand up in any court, which is basically the Committee decided there were questions, the community was not committed to it, and decided to move it out. She felt the Committee's error was to add rail and pedestrian, which was not noticed. DR. SELKREGG is willing to deal with that separately, and believes the Committee just needs to provide time for our neighbors in the Valley to comment on what was before the Committee and voted on at the meeting. She noted the Committee has gone through an appropriate public process, and there was only one thing to do and that is to begin the process of another 30 day review period and provide our neighbors an opportunity to talk, and this was moved at the last meeting.

DR. SELKREGG expressed concern about the use of public dollars as advocacy money. She indicated KABATA had requested another \$5 million dollars and wanted to know where the money is going. She felt the public needs to understand the expense of this group in terms of our public dollars. She was disturbed because KABATA came into our last meeting and told the Committee they had spoken with the governor, basically said the fix was in, the Committee needed to get ready for what was coming. She felt this was all political maneuvering, and it was a shame because this money matters, and AMATS needs to spend it on other things.

CHAIR KEITH stated he did not say the Committee did not follow the process, and in the controversy swirling around, and even in the agreement and settlement of a lawsuit, we never admitted we did anything wrong.

MR. FLYNN thought the Committee should simply put this amendment out for 30 days and be done with it, but in light of Mayor Purcell's comments he felt DR. SELKREGG's cautious approach was probably the wiser course.

MS. EDWARDS reiterated MR. WILBER's concerns about the TIP schedule. She noted whether the Committee decides for 30 days or for the more advanced schedule, she thought the full schedule allows plenty of time to get the TIP done and avoid any confusion or problems in addressing the TIP. She noted the TIP is under a timeline and a deadline, and this gives plenty of opportunity for the public, the mayors and the communities up in the MatSu Valley to have input into this. She felt it would also give time for the other process on TIP to be completed noting it is important not to derail the effort of a product that needs to be completed in a timely way.

MR. VAKALIS provided clarification on his intent when he moved the motion for discussion purposes; he also made the motion because he thinks it is the right thing to do, not because of future threatened lawsuits or anything else. The bottom line is in his opinion extending it, all inclusive, and is the public process. He believes it is the way to go, and once it is done it is done, and whatever the outcome, at least the Committee can feel comfortable they have gone out there and gotten as much input as possible in making the recommendation and the decision.

DR. SELKREGG did not think going back to the Assembly with the amendment made sense as the Assembly had been the initiating factor. From his perspective, MR. VAKALIS believes going back to the Assembly gives another opportunity for the public to voice their opinion as part of the public process.

MS. EDWARDS noticed when reviewing the document, in the actual table itself, there was some highlighted text on the Knik Arm project that still refers to rail, and before moving it out for public comment again it needs to be made consistent with the edits that were made to the front of the document. CHAIR KEITH suggested TAC review it one more time for inconsistencies on the rail issue.

DR. SELKREGG asked if this is going out for public review based on this time schedule if staff would add to the financial factors. She noted the way the financial plan is broken into it has the KABATA project and then it's got the LRTP. She asked if staff would provide a memorandum addressing the impact KABATA would have on the LRTP if they both were to go. In other words, she clarified it is the issue between bonding and state dollars, and the expectation of bonding and state dollars in the LRTP, and there is also bonding and state dollars in KABATA. She would also like to see what the impact the LRTP would have on the Highway to Highway Project. She does not expect a lot of detail, but would like to begin to get an idea of the relationship between KABATA's impact on other opportunities in terms of projects in the area.

CHAIR KEITH restated the motion as follows: The motion is to release an amendment to the Long-Range Transportation Plan that puts the Knik Arm Crossing in the long term part of the Long-Range Transportation Plan, release it and follow our prescribed process for a major amendment including going through the Planning & Zoning Commission and the Assembly to include both the amendment, the planning factors and the financial plan.

MR. WILBER indicated there is no disagreement among the Committee that staff will do the research DR. SELKREGG requested, but he wants to start the clock on the amendment, either Friday or Monday. Staff will make the edits, and begin their analysis, but he would like to start the process and do the analysis during the 30 days.

***The motion PASSED 4 to 1, with DR. SELKREGG objecting.***

DR. SELKREGG has talked with some people in Juneau who indicated there was a request in from KABATA for another \$5 million. She indicated she has continually asked as a member of this body for a clarification on how the money is being spent by KABATA. She has asked KABATA previously and received pie charts. She would like to know what is the expectation associated with the \$5 million, how that money is being spent, and possibly some documentation on how the \$44 million has been spent besides big pie charts. She asked the Committee to formally ask KABATA to provide information on how the money has been spent and what the additional \$5 million is for. MR. FOSTER from KABATA stated the request was not quite \$5 million, and 10% of the money went to the Municipality. CHAIR KEITH asked if this was something KABATA could prepare for the next Policy Committee. MR. FOSTER advised the Committee to present the request to KABATA, and they will see what can be done.

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

MS. EDWARDS moved for release of the Air Quality Conformity Determination Report for the 2009 Long-Range Transportation Plan amendment by the Policy Committee. DR. SELKREGG seconded. As a point of clarification, CHAIR KEITH stated the LRTP amendment and the Air Quality Determination Report should be joined in one release. ***The motion PASSED unanimously.***

**d. Other Business Items - None**

**1. Highway to Highway Statewide Transportation Improvement Project Resolution**

MR. LYON reported the Highway to Highway project is listed in the TIP, and there are some funds in the TIP for a Reconnaissance Study. He noted the current draft STIP does not have this project in it, and this is the discussion before the Policy Committee. The public comment period for the STIP closes on October 16. He explained there are federal regulations requiring projects be in the STIP in order to utilize federal funding. AMATS staff has drafted a resolution recommending inclusion of the Highway to Highway project in the STIP.

CHAIR KEITH noted the Committee has discussed this issue previously, and he thinks it is important to have this project in the STIP. He indicated there was reason to believe there might be some congressional high priority money coming there, and the importance of the project should be reflected by including it in the STIP.

MR. VAKALIS moved to approve the resolution. MR. FLYNN seconded. *The motion PASSED unanimously.*

MR. WILBER briefed the Committee on the issue of ADOT allocation factors and whether the Municipality is getting its fair share of allocation dollars. The direction from the Committee had been for the TAC to address this and work directly with ADOT. MR. WILBER noted staff is coordinating with our counterparts in Fairbanks because the criteria the State is using on the STIP to allocate project dollars is the concern, and with the way the criteria works, those criteria under which urban areas scored the best are weighted the least, and the Municipality does not benefit well. Also, the Municipality has a local area tax base to draw from to support our program, and that also counts against us, and that is not good from a technical perspective. MR. WILBER indicated Fairbanks is in the same situation. Anchorage and Fairbanks are going to work collaboratively to have a stronger voice. CHAIR KEITH indicated a vote would not be required to release the comments on behalf of the Municipality. MR. WILBER advised the Committee the comments are due to the State by October 16, and the goal is to turn it in before the end of next week to provide the State with extra time to consider our comments. A copy of the comments will be provided to the Committee.

## **6. INFORMATION ITEMS**

### **a. HSIP Status Report**

RON MARTINDALE, the Highway Safety Improvement Program Coordinator from the State of Alaska, Central Region, reported on the Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP). This is a new report required by the Public Participation Plan. MR. MARTINDALE explained he reviews all the crashes in the State every year looking for high crash locations, then goes out and looks at those locations and prioritizes his work.

The Highway Safety Improvement Program consists of federal funds, and there is a process associated with spending those funds. There is a crash based program where you look at locations that have actual crash histories. The projects nominated under the program have to be cost beneficial. This means for the crash problem you are trying to fix and the solution identified, the solution is cost effective in reducing the crashes you are trying to reduce. Emphasis is placed on the higher severity, fatal and major injury type crashes. Although he does this region wide, within the Municipality the HSIP is a cooperative effort between the State and the Municipal Traffic Department, and this report is developed jointly every year.

MR. MARTINDALE reviewed state-wide statistics from 2007. He noted there were about 10,600 crashes in the State in 2007 of which 52% happened in the Municipality of Anchorage. The bulk of the State's work, funding and projects happen in Anchorage. Another 30% of the fatal crashes and 40 to 45 % of the major injury crashes state-wide also occur here in the Municipality simply because Anchorage has all the volume and congestion compared to other regions of the State.

Under the HSIP in 2007 and 2008, there have been 14 locations done. Currently, there are 17 locations funded that are either under construction now or will be by next spring, and that is about \$16.5 million worth of projects. For the next federal fiscal year, the State is looking at a plan totaling approximately \$14 million in our region which is mostly the Municipality. In the future, there are another 18 projects proposed with a total cost of \$20 to \$25 million. If some of the projects are moved into 2010, the number of projects may be reduced to 14. State-wide the safety program has received an average of \$20 to \$27 million dollars every year. The central region, primarily in Anchorage, has generally received \$17 to \$20 million of that total, approximately 2/3 of the funding.

CHAIR KEITH discussed highway safety corridors, and the difference between nodes and links. Safety corridors like the Seward Highway are links, and lend themselves to a corridor analysis. These are spot areas where MR. MARTINDALE reviews all the accidents, and if there have been, for example, 10 accidents at an intersection, they determine what to do to correct the problem.

CHAIR KEITH felt the HSIP is a good program because not only does it identify accident spots, but there has to be a solution that is going to fix it. More importantly, he likes that after a site has been fixed, the State goes back and tests the site to see how well it did. MR. MARTINDALE confirmed the State is required to do and does follow-up on every project completed. An after analysis is performed to see if we achieved what we thought we would. Ideas that work continue to be used, and those that do not work might not be nominated in the same fashion in the future.

As far as being able to fix an identified crash site problem, there is a process of ranking to be done, looking at crash severity and proving that the fix is cost beneficial and fixes the problem. The rules have gotten much more complex since the 1980s, and the kinds of projects nominated now are pretty much ones that have to really prove themselves, that we're trying to address this pattern of crash, and this particular counter measure has been shown either nationwide or through our own data to have done well. The State has analyzed approximately 50 or 60 past projects, and some have done well, but in some instances the State has tried to fix the same intersection 2 or 3 times, and the problem still has not been fixed.

The Committee briefly discussed critical accident areas in East Anchorage and along Tudor, as well as the "be prepared to stop signs" on the highway where you approach your first signal at that intersection, one at the Seward Highway and one at the Glenn Highway. MR. MARTINDALE noted these signs could fall under the HSIP. MR. FLYNN asked about installing a sign for the north bound lanes on Minnesota as it approaches Tudor Road, and whether it would fall under the HSIP. MR. MARTINDALE indicated it could, and in fact the State has been asked almost every year to look at that location. He explained on the north bound approach to that intersection there are some static signs now that flash 24 hours a day, 7 days a week to say there is a signal ahead at the crest of that hill. He noted one of the reasons or

justification for installing such a sign would have been a high number of rear-end crashes or some severe right angles involving running the red light, but in a study just finished the data over the years has not supported it. The rear-end crashes are actually higher in the southbound direction than in the north bound direction.

The State had a consultant do a study of the effectiveness of various devices, including those advance flashers. The State's own local data has shown we have not seen that much improvement. As to the reason for lack of improvement, MR. MARTINDALE suggested possibly people get used to the signs, or may use them in a way not intended, but whatever the case is, the effectiveness of the signs has not been as great as the State would have thought when the signs were first installed. As for actually reducing the types of crashes the State is targeting, that has not been found to be the case.

MR. MARTINDALE explained the State uses a 5 year rolling average of data using the latest 5 years. The crashes are ranked state-wide by each region using a safety index which takes into account the number of crashes, the amount of volume that enters the intersection, and how high the rate of that intersection is above what we would expect for an intersection like that.

In response to DR. SELKREGG, MR. MARTINDALE noted the intersection at Boniface and Northern Lights was the site of a highway safety project a couple years ago, and is actually improving. He just completed an analysis of the site. The after analysis of the south bound where a right turn lane was put in and the left turn lane was lengthened showed a significant benefit in that particular crash pattern.

MR. MARTINDALE confirmed as part of the program the State looks at all modes of transportation involving any type of vehicle/vehicle, vehicle/pedestrian, and vehicle/bicycle. He noted several of the projects in the HSIP, particularly the ones in the 5 lane sections with the median work are proposed solutions for pedestrian problems. One of the major purposes for the median work is pedestrian refuge. For example, Tudor Road at the rescue mission would be a project where, though we do not want pedestrians crossing at these locations, we are not going to stop them from crossing. MR. MARTINDALE indicated what needs to be done on roads that were designed as 5 lanes is to provide 6 to 8 foot refuge islands allowing the pedestrian to cross 2 lanes at a time, and then there is somewhere to stand before crossing the rest of the road.

**b. Municipal Capital Improvement Program (CIP)**

JIM LAMSON with Project Management and Engineering (PM&E) briefed the Committee on the Municipal Capital Improvement Program. He explained the Municipality approves a Capital Improvement Program every year. Two of the chapters deal with roads, one is PM&E's chapter, and the second is the Statewide road section. The Statewide road section consists of projects generally matching what is in the proposed TIP, and any anticipated grant requests for State road projects. In the PM&E section, the focus continues to be fixing deteriorated roads, congestion relief and safety. As far as funding, the proposed CIP is focused on road bonds in the mid-40's

level per the year, and State grants in the mid-50's level. Funding is dependent a lot on what happens with the legislature and the price of oil. As far as municipal roads, the federal funding for the TIP programs for municipal infrastructure is down quite a bit, and the information shown in the CIP related to federal funding matches what is in the TIP, and is really informational in that regard.

During last 5 years, MR. LAMSON indicated PM&E has been very successful in proposing matching programs with road bonds and state grants, and the proposed CIP the Assembly will see in October/November continues that matching funding strategy. PM&E has also been working with DOT Planning staff to take another look at consensus priorities to revisit, for example, the Connect Anchorage Initiative to see how those projects are doing, and where from a city-wide standpoint, whether City or State owned roads, what are the needs that really need to be funded in the next few years, and when is the funding needed to advance the priority projects.

MR. LAMSON will be meeting with JENNIFER WITT and DAVID POST with ADOT next week. Currently, PM&E has 194 open projects valued at about \$632 million, and of those, 100 are in design and 52 are in construction. Next year PM&E expects to be ready to build another 40 projects valued in the \$100 million range depending on what kind of funding becomes available for mainly congestion relief and fixing local roads and arterial streets. He noted the capital program has been developed with a lot of community input from Assembly representatives and legislators, and PM&E has worked very closely with the community councils each year. PM&E also works with Traffic on accidents, road maintenance and the condition of city roads. MR. LAMSON stated PM&E is using a similar prioritization method as AMATS, and has revised their criteria this year to more closely match what AMATS uses.

MR. FLYNN asked whether any of the projects funded were within LRSAs meaning projects outside of ARDSA, what the criteria for adding a project outside of ARDSA was, and how the funding source is determined. MR. LAMSON explained if a road project is outside of ARDSA it is not bond funded. PM&E focused in the Eagle River area with the money the Chugiak/Birchwood/Eagle River Rural Roads Service Area (CBERRRSA) will have to match Eagle River's mill levy. He noted there are some LRSAs that provide matching funding. PM&E proposes matching funding wherever available. There are other projects that service areas without matches, and state grants are requested. PM&E has had some success in the past with grant requests of this type.

DR. SELKREGG noted there is a lot of road work being done in terms of patches and fixes. There are a variety of places in her district where just laying down a small piece of asphalt fixed a portion of the road, and these patches improve the whole road system. She is pleased with the efficient way the work is being done, noting the money is not always available to reconstruct the road, and it is easier to go in and do these corrections before losing the entire road. DR. SELKREGG mentioned the coordination between the TIP and STIP and these pieces are what we have been talking about doing for a long time, and it is great to see it come together.

MR. LAMSON noted he regularly drives our roads with the Municipality's maintenance people, and hopes in the next couple of weeks to do the same with Central Region DOT. CHAIR KEITH reminded the Committee there was approximately \$75 million worth of very bad pavement that belongs to the State, but is funded only through AMATS, and DeBarr is one of those, and the Committee needs to do something about it. He suggested in the next couple months before the legislature starts that the Committee and AMATS start looking at some of those roads. He noted the Committee has had good luck working with the Municipality and the State. He felt *Connect Anchorage* is a testament to that and shows we are building an east-west system paralleling Tudor Road that is already starting to pay off. CHAIR KEITH stated if we work together and compile a list everyone can agree on, then he suggested submitting the list to the legislature and/or the Governor's Office. CHAIR KEITH indicated AMATS needs to advise the legislature that the funding source is not near enough for what needs to be done.

CHAIR KEITH invited everyone to the *Connect Anchorage* ribbon cutting on September 30 for the Dowling East from Elmore to Lake Otis. Mayor Sullivan will be there to cut the ribbon. He noted this project is another continuing part of the *Connect Anchorage*, and 15,000 cars a day are already being taken out of Lake Otis and Tudor just with Elmore, and when Dowling East is completed, and next July Martin Luther King, there will more changes. He noted when the whole corridor is finished, it will go from Boniface to the Old Seward Highway without going on Tudor Road, and will continue on with Dowling. Eventually, you will be able to go into Raspberry and tie into the Minnesota extension. CHAIR KEITH stated good work is being done, and if we work together we can get more funding and patch our roads.

In response to DR. SELKREGG's question, MR. WILBER confirmed the maintenance piece was identified as a priority for the TIP. He indicated we have a pavement management program, and he believes it is something that may complement what MR. LAMSON discussed. There may be an opportunity where AMATS would want to create that as a matching program with the legislature. AMATS targets the amount of dollars in its federal dollars, creates that as a matching program, and then could double its money on that element of the federal portion just to deal with rut repair. CHAIR KEITH reminded the Committee when adding federal dollars, there would also be federal rules, and it can slow things down.

DR. SELKREGG is appreciative of the road system and what is happening in terms of the north-south movement, but along the curve at Tudor, and from Boniface to Lake Otis there are a whole set of new lights. She noted looking at the number of people living in East Anchorage and how important these east-west corridors are, and from traveling this route herself, she can tell Tudor at peak hours you cannot always get through the lights in one shot. She expressed concern we don't start punching through Northern Lights with a variety of new strategies because Northern Lights still works pretty well, but Tudor has really slowed down for east-west.

**c. Upcoming Planning/Design Status – Postponed**

**d. Committee Comments**

DR. SELKREGG requested the Policy Committee consider meeting earlier at 12:30 p.m. due to issues with her teaching schedule. CHAIR KEITH requested staff check schedules to determine if DR. SELKREGG's request could be accommodated.

**7. SCHEDULED AMATS MEETINGS**

Technical Advisory Committee, October 8, 2009

Policy Committee, October 22, 2009

Technical Advisory Committee, November 5, 2009

Policy Committee, November, 19, 2009

Technical Advisory Committee, December 3, 2009

Policy Committee, December 17, 2009

**8. ADJOURNMENT**

The meeting adjourned at 2:04 p.m.