

**ANCHORAGE METROPOLITAN AREA TRANSPORTATION SOLUTIONS
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING**

**Planning & Development Center
Main Conference Room, 1st Floor
4700 Elmore Road
Anchorage, Alaska**

**February 11, 2010
2:30 p.m.**

Technical Advisory Committee members Present:

Name	Representing
Jennifer Witt	Alaska Dept. of Transportation & Public Facilities (ADOT), Central Region, Planning
Kim Rice	ADOT, Central Region
Steve Morris	MOA/Dept. of Health & Human Services
Todd Cowles	MOA/Port of Anchorage
Robert Kniefel	MOA/Traffic Department
Jerry Hansen	MOA/Project Management & Engineering (PM&E)
Jody Karcz	MOA/Public Transportation Department
Jerry Weaver	MOA/Planning Department
Lois Epstein	AMATS Air Quality Advisory Committee
Bruce Carr	Alaska Railroad Corporation

Also in attendance

Name	Representing
Craig Lyon	MOA/Traffic Department
Vivian Underwood	MOA/TD
Teresa Brewer	MOA/TD
Van Le	MOA/TD
Dave Post	ADOT/PF
Tom Brooks	Alaska Railroad
Roger Purcell	Mayor, City of Houston
Mary Ann Pease	Knik Arm Bridge and Toll Authority (KABATA)
Dale Paulson	KABATA
Len Anderson	KSKA-FM
Bob Williams	Roger's Park resident
Aves Thompson	Alaska Trucking Association
Suzanne DiPietro	Government Hill Community Council
Betty Adkison	University Area Community Council

1. CALL TO ORDER

CHAIR KNIEFEL called the meeting to order at 1:09 p.m. All Technical Advisory Committee members were present with Todd Cowles and Lois Epstein arriving at 2:36 p.m. A quorum was established.

2. PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT ANNOUNCEMENT

CHAIR KNIEFEL encouraged public involvement in this meeting of the AMATS Technical Advisory Committee. He explained the 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

JENNIFER WITT recommended moving Agenda Item 5(c), Jobs Bill Funding from the Business Items to Informational Reports as it is an update, and no action will be required. She noted the title should be “Jobs for Main Street.” This was moved to Item 6(c) on the agenda.

Due to time constraints, Agenda Item 5(d) (1), Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP) will be heard ahead of the other business items on the agenda.

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

4. APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES - None

5. BUSINESS ITEMS

d. Other Business

1. Minor Amendment to 2009 Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP)

Note: The agenda was revised to hear this item first.

CRAIG LYON reported a minor budget adjustment was required because two elements, 300, AMATS Air Quality and 500, AMATS Administration, exceeded 110% of the 2009 budget. Although AMATS can be over in a task, by policy an element in the UPWP cannot exceed 110% of their budget. Staff proposed transferring \$10,000 from the budget for Element 400, Task 440, Socio Economic/Employment Data, and moving \$5,000 into Element 300, Task 330, Air Quality Conformity, and \$5,000 into Element 500, Task 510, AMATS Program Administration. It is within the TAC’s authority to approve this minor budget amendment. TAC is required to notify

the Policy Committee and the State Department of Transportation of the budget amendment, if approved.

MR. CARR moved to adopt the minor adjustment to the 2009 AMATS Unified Planning Work Program as presented by Staff. MS. WITT seconded.

MR. LYON advised the TAC this is a change from the 2009 budget, and Task 440 was under-budget in 2009 because there were fewer requests for modeling than anticipated. He indicated the changes reflected during 2009 were taken into account in 2010 resulting in a more balanced budget for 2010. He noted the 2010 budget includes sufficient funds to advance the update for the new LRTP.

The motion passed unanimously.

a. Long-Range Transportation Plan (LRTP), Knik Arm Crossing Amendment

MR. LYON noted the staff memo dated February 11, 2010 provided to the TAC on the Anchorage Bowl Long-Range Transportation Plan (LRTP) Major Amendment to move the Knik Arm Crossing (KAC) project to the long-term phase from the short-term phase was basically the same memo as provided at the last TAC meeting held on January 28, 2009. Staff's recommendation was for the TAC to reiterate their earlier recommendations with 6 additional conditions. A revised Chapter 13 was provided which included edits to show more discussions and explanations of the assumptions that went into the Financial Plan, and to show the air quality conformity analysis had been completed. An executive summary for the Air Quality Conformity Determination for the 2009 LRTP amendment was provided to the TAC.

MS. WITT clarified the TAC would be making a recommendation to forward the draft LRTP to the Assembly for their review and recommendations for the Policy Committee. She provided minor corrections to Table 8.1 as follows: Page 23, Project 206, Victor Road is fully funded though not completed. Page 25, Project 418, Dowling Road Extension, is funded. Page 25, Project 601, Lake Otis/Tudor Intersection, is fully funded and construction will begin in the spring. Project 604, 48th Ave/Boniface Parkway Extension is fully funded. Page 26, Project 306, 92nd Avenue Extension is partially funded. Project 308, Dowling Road Extension is partially funded. Project 406, Spenard Road Surface Rehabilitation is partially funded. Project 414, Arctic Boulevard Surface Rehabilitation is partially funded. If there are any other changes to the projects, contact staff.

CHAIR KNIEFEL, referring to Page 2 of Chapter 13, felt Item V was not an appropriate comment to be listed under "benefits of amendment." MR. LYON noted Item V indicates a benefit of the LRTP amendment would be "delays issuances of a Record of Decision on the project while issues and uncertainties continue to be resolved." He further discussed FHWA language put on in January 2008 with regard to issuing a Record of Decision (ROD) depending

on whether a project is short-term or long-term in the LRTP. He indicated the FHWA language provides that all project phases planned within the life of the LRTP have to be included in the fiscally constrained plan in order for FWHA to sign a ROD, but it does not mean it needs to be in the short- or long- term. The FHWA language says as long as the phases that are going to occur in the lifetime of the plan are shown in the plan, the project can be issued a ROD. MR. LYON indicated this would not delay issuance of a ROD, and Item V should be deleted.

The TAC discussed the memo on the AMATS KAC LRTP Amendment Financial Plan, which was prepared by DOT and MOA staff in response to questions and concerns about the financial plan. DOT and MOA staff reviewed the financial plan to determine if the financial assumptions are still consistent and made sense. MS. WITT noted, and staff confirmed, this was in response to continued concerns expressed by the Knik Arm Bridge and Toll Authority (KABATA) on whether or not the LRTP is financially constrained. MR. LYON noted staff updated the tables originally developed by MR. WILBER when he was chair of the TAC. In response to MS. EPSTEIN, MR. LYON clarified the financial plan in the LRTP does not include KABATA because their funding is separate from the LRTP.

MR. LYON briefly discussed changes in federal regulations in 2007, which will require projects in the LRTP financial plan to be shown in year of expenditure dollars. In other words, the project dollars have to be updated with the inflation rate. Next year will be the first time AMATS will have to do this under the new regulations. However, in reviewing the financial plan to determine if the financial assumptions were still consistent and made sense in the proposed LRTP amendment, staff applied the new regulations.

DAVE POST, Alaska Department of Transportation, provided highlights on staff's analysis of the financial plan in the LRTP. He noted the biggest change from the draft is the fact there were approximately \$388 million of projects that were actually built since the 2005 LRTP was adopted. This had not initially been included in the reduction in the analysis that was in the currently proposed draft amendment. By reducing that amount in 2004 dollars of \$388.6 million, and factoring inflation over the life of the program, it basically equates to a \$523 million reduction over the life of program. Staff also compared the inflation factors with recent bid prices, and it showed the original assumptions in the analysis have been tracking well. MR. POST discussed reductions for completed projects, conservative assumptions used to determine funding from state and federal sources, and the estimated inflation rates used for each year of the plan. By 2027 AMATS would have \$637 million surplus according to this financial analysis. MR. POST reiterated the only change was \$50 million reduction in revenue for what was anticipated in 2010 for the Connect Anchorage portion, and the reduction \$388 million in costs for completed projects. MR. POST noted funds for possible new stimulus money in 2010 had not been built into the analysis. MS. EPSTEIN suggested adding a note in the Text Box as Note 11 that this makes the estimate conservative.

Additional changes built into the analysis were changes resulting from the adopted STIP for FHWA NHS and non-NHS, and the numbers reflect actual 2009 obligations, and then the TIP

and STIP amounts that we actually have programmed. Recognizing a surplus, the anticipated State infrastructure was further reduced, and an additional influx of money eliminated, bringing the surplus down to \$300 million anticipated over the 20 year life of the LRTP.

MR. POST stated this analysis was done to validate the figures in the LRTP financial plan and shows the numbers are conservative. This analysis is not intended to replace the financial analysis in the proposed LRTP, but was a review of the numbers to insure the financial constraint assumptions were correct. MR. POST believes the analysis shows AMATS proposed LRTP is fiscally constrained, and the analysis that went out for public review is very conservative.

BOB WILLIAMS from the Roger Park area discussed the over 40 hours he spent researching KABATA's project. He noted he had not yet found the information as to KABATA's expenditures, and their 2009 Annual Report online gave nothing but generalities. He indicated other people in his council area and around town with whom he has spoken, and some in State and Municipal government have had difficulty in getting this information as well. He was concerned KABATA would keep spending money until the project did not make the long-term transportation plan.

CHAIR KNIEFEL deferred to representatives from KABATA to respond to MR. WILLIAMS concerns.

MARY ANN PEASE with KABATA stated she had talked with MR. WILLIAMS and asked him to call her if he had any follow-up questions and concerns. She directed him to the website where all the documents are located, including the total funding to date. She had not heard back from him, and assumed his questions had been answered. She noted KABATA certainly wants everything to be open and transparent from what their expenditures are, KABATA is currently at \$49 million, and confirmed the project environmental and engineering work continues to go forward.

MR. WILLIAMS referred to financial information requested by ASSEMBLY MEMBER SELKREGG, and asked if this had been addressed. MS. PEASE stated the issues were addressed at a joint public work session with the Assembly, the AMATS Policy Committee and the TAC, and all those presentations are online and available to the public.

MR. WILLIAMS thought a lot of the public heard and maybe paid attention to the initial reports, but felt at least the people in his neighborhood are not understanding why the pedestrian, bike and rail facilities were moved out of Phase 1 and into Phase 2. He felt everything he found indicated there is no way people are going to take that bridge in sufficient numbers to make it pay for itself. He felt if you look at the projects the State of Alaska has, and what funding sources the State has, and particularly now that the State does not have all the federal money coming in, this project should be back-burnered. He felt the money could be better spent elsewhere, and indicated others in his council area agrees. He mentioned the Port of Anchorage and military both have concerns about the current KABATA plan.

ROGER PURCELL, Mayor of the City of Houston, discussed the new census noting the Valley has a population of over 120,000 now. He indicated the City of Anchorage is losing 4.4% of its population, and it is moving to the Valley according to the U.S. Census survey. He spoke about the Port of Anchorage, and indicated commercial truckers do not like driving from the Port of Anchorage through Anchorage because Anchorage's roads are not suited to commercial traffic. He felt the Bridge would make it easier for northern traffic to move from Anchorage, the port and north to Fairbanks. He felt by having this bridge, the Municipality's port authority would continue having your commercial truckers. He implied if the bridge were not built, it would almost guarantee Point McKenzie would eventually take away Anchorage's port, and Anchorage would lose all that income from the port. He felt the truckers were still not going to want to come out through Anchorage's narrow streets and congestion, and so this bridge actually helps Anchorage in a lot of different areas. He spoke about the building the bridge in the long-term or now, and noted there is growth in the area, heavy transportation coming through for Anchorage's commercial, and the bridge is the key. With the bridge, there will be a way to move easily to the core areas, the fastest growing areas. MAYOR PURCELL indicated without the bridge, Anchorage would lose the economic ride that it has for the City.

AVES THOMPSON with the Alaska Trucking Association stated the Alaska Trucking Association supports the Knik Arm Crossing. They think it is a vital link in our future transportation network. He noted it provides some alternative routes to and from the Port of Anchorage, particularly the north bound routes. He felt this project is a once in a generation opportunity, and if it is not done now, it probably won't be done for another 50 years, and by that time, it gets away.

MS. PEASE stated if anyone wants additional information, KABATA is going to be out talking to all of the community councils in a grassroots type effort trying to get the message out. She noted there have been numerous polls done, and they are on the website. She stated by far the majority of folks do want the Knik Arm Crossing to go forward. She indicated it is a viable and critical infrastructure link in our transportation plan, and it does provide an alternate corridor for the Glenn Highway. She noted KABATA's phone numbers are posted, and if anyone has questions, she encouraged them to contact her. She reiterated KABATA's willingness to give presentations to keep the discussions alive and well.

SUZANNE DIPIETRO spoke on behalf of the Government Hill Community Council. Her understanding is the decision before the TAC is not bridge or no bridge; the decision before the TAC is now or later. She thinks later is the obvious answer. She does not believe the number of workers coming in from the Mat-Su Borough will really be served by this bridge. She thought 50 years from now might make sense, but it does not right now because most of workers are Wasilla and closer. She believes the obvious choice is to put the bridge off to the long-range to see how it looks at that point. She supports the proposed amendment. She also commended the addition of Condition G that encourages or requires the Municipality of Anchorage be involved in development of the proposal of the public/private partnership. She thinks the exposure the

City faces is a very real financial exposure, and it is going to be decided in the structure of that public/private partnership. She felt it was really important for the Municipality to have representation in the process to insure the allocation of risk is not weighted in a way that exposes Anchorage to unnecessary risk. She supports public review and comment on an RFP as well. She stated the more open and transparent we can make this the better.

MR. WEAVER moved to move the Knik Arm Crossing to the long-range plan as outlined by staff for the six criteria in the memo with an additional requirement that Knik Arm Crossing project will address all the issues presented by the Planning & Zoning Commission Resolution 2009-053. MS. EPSTEIN seconded.

MR. WEAVER clarified his motion was to include conditions 1-6 from page 4 of the Staff Report, plus an additional Condition 7 for the project to address all those issues raised and outlined by the Planning & Zoning Commission acting in its capacity as the AMATS Citizens' Advisory Committee (PZC) when they addressed the issue per Resolution 2009-053. He noted there were a number of issues they brought up that are not in the 6 conditions as outlined in the staff report. MR. LYON noted there were 36 findings in the resolution.

MS. WITT was not sure how to advance an LRTP to the Assembly that would require as a condition of approval for KABATA to address all of the PZC's concerns.

MR. WEAVER noted some of the issues in the staff recommendation, including Item 6 specifically, actually came out of the PZC's recommendations. However, he indicated there were a significant number of other issues the PZC raised that KABATA should address before the project takes place in the future.

MR. LYON noted the initial staff memo on the PZC's recommendations had been included in the memo to the TAC. He noted KABATA had looked at the recommendations as well, but as far as he knew, KABATA had responded back to the PZC on the issues raised.

With regard to the PZC Finding 29, staff suggested the TAC send a resolution to KABATA suggesting their support for the rail. MR. LYON felt the idea of having KABATA address all findings could be in that resolution as opposed to including it as something that has to be done before the passage of this LRTP amendment is accepted as opposed to it being one of the 6 or 7 conditions.

MR. COWLES noted the resolution was statements the PZC considered facts leading to the conclusion the project should be deleted entirely. He expressed concern as to whether it was reasonable to expect addressing each one of those is going to be consistent with a motion to move this amendment forward.

Although this was a good point, MR. WEAVER noted it raised a significant number of subsequent issues he felt should be addressed with the project, which will still need to be

addressed if the project is moved to the long-term range. He did not think all the issues presented by the PZC had to do with elimination of the KAC. He referenced prioritization, funding, Highway to Highway, and impacts to the Central Business District, neighborhoods, traffic and air conditions noting those were all pertinent issues that need to be addressed whether the KAC is in the short-term or long-term. He was open to suggestions on the appropriate place for those concerns.

CHAIR KNIEFEL asked KABATA staff if they would have a problem in preparing responses to those 36 statements made by the PZC in its resolution. MS. PEASE thinks the question is when AMATS wants them by. She noted KABATA has provided that on numerous occasions, as well as in testimony responding to each and every one of those issues during the session. She stated KABATA sent a letter documenting their responses to numerous questions, and it was never entered into the record as part of the consideration. However, MS. PEASE stated this time KABATA did not respond because they were the same questions brought up last time.

MS. EPSTEIN stated she attended the Planning & Zoning Commission meeting on this issue, and noted there were a number of things KABATA had not responded to. In particular, she noted one being a request to KABATA to provide a 2-page financial statement laying out each of the costs, revenue and debt service similar to what had been prepared by JAMIE KENWORTHY, and one of the findings in the resolution was they had requested information, and it was not given to them. MS. PEASE noted she did not have a problem doing a 2-page summary. She reiterated it was provided in KABATA's response to the PZC. MS. EPSTEIN indicated it was a very thick document and not presented in the manner that was accessible, which is why a 2-page version of it had been requested. MS. PEASE stated she has no problem doing that.

MR. CARR referring to staff's memo was unsure whether Item 29 was trying to add additional weight to Item 2, or whether Item 29 was taking a little bit of weight away from Item 2. He noted there had been fairly consistent testimony from a number of organizations, including the Municipality and the Mat-Su Borough, that a multi-modal structure is part of the vision for the future. He was not sure what adding a separate resolution to KABATA for a rail-ready bridge does when AMATS is already going to be recommending the KAC project should incorporate heavy rail and bicycle and pedestrian facilities as multi-modal.

MS. WITT'S recollection was the proposed LRTP amendment specifically eliminated the reference to heavy rail, bicycle and pedestrian facilities. She did not understand why staff recommendation on Condition 2 would recommend incorporation of heavy rail, bicycle and pedestrian facilities when it was expressly eliminated from the text that went out for public review. She thought it could read the TAC prepare or submit to KABATA a resolution supporting continued evaluation.

MR. LYON thought language could be added suggesting this be done in the form of a resolution. The idea as stated is not in the text of the amendment now, but if the Committee or staff still felt it was important and that it would come in the form of a resolution, the language can be changed.

MR. CARR indicated the question is what is staff recommending on these 6 conditions? Are you saying that you want the Policy Committee to adopt these 6 recommendations? MR. LYON responded affirmatively. MR. CARR asked if there was something that changed your perception from the Policy Committee November to February. MR. LYON noted we got the sense the TAC supported the idea still of the bridge having rail and pedestrian, but not in the actual text, due to the discussion from KABATA that it would require redoing the EIS, and the cost would not be something they had calculated in when they were working on their original costing, but the TAC wanted to continue to support the idea of making it multi-modal via a resolution. MR. LYON would change the language there to make sure it is clear there will be a separate resolution. The language under staff response for discussion item 29 from P&Z talks about that in a resolution. "TAC discussed the opportunity and approach for a separate resolution to KABATA in support of the desire to build a rail-ready bridge."

MR. CARR noted again 29 is just addressing rail-ready not addressing multi-modal. Item 2 addresses the multi-modal concept of a bridge with a generational future and infrastructure of the future. He was reluctant to say the TAC should split out rail and not include bicycle and pedestrian. He noted the TAC from this aspect feels that rail, bicycle and pedestrian facilities are still important for the crossing. He reiterated from the technical viewpoint the TAC could see a multi-modal structure is what is needed from the perspective of moving the transportation system forward for the next 50 or 60 years.

MS. WITT recommended suggesting a revision to Item 2 and then a proposal on how to address moving this project forward. MS. WITT proposed amending Item 2 to indicate the TAC pass a resolution supporting the bridge as a multi-modal facility. MR. CARR suggested if she was going to do that, she should put in there you want heavy rail, bicycle, and pedestrian. MS. WITT stated Item 2 be addressed as a resolution by the AMATS TAC and not be incorporated into the text. CHAIR KNIEFEL clarified the amendment would delete Item 2 from this motion, and then the TAC would do a separate resolution.

MR. MORRIS noted all of these things except Item 2 are already addressed and incorporated in this draft. Referring to the items MR. WEAVER brought up, MR. MORRIS thought both the pedestrian and rail facility question and the PZC questions could be addressed by KABATA in the future. He thought the TAC is fine with it in this draft as reflected by those 6 conditions, except 2 and 7, which could be addressed in a separate resolution.

CHAIR KNIEFEL restated the amendment on the floor is to delete Item 2. MR. WEAVER objected, and discussion followed. He confirmed if the items were deleted, a resolution can follow.

MS. WITT clarified her proposal would be to modify Item 2 to say this is to be done as a resolution. She suggested Item 6 be advanced under Item 1, and then the TAC could take each item separately as discussion and approve each one, Items 1-7, separately.

MS. WITT withdrew here amendment to delete Item 2 from the motion.

The TAC proceeded to address each of the conditions Staff recommended in the staff report on page 4.

Item 1. The Knik Arm Crossing project remains in the LRTP, as Chapter 12, and it be moved from the list of Short-Term Projects (2007-2017) to the list of Long-Term Projects (2018-2027). A roll call vote was taken. No objection – Rice, Cowles, Epstein, Witt, Kniefel, Morris, Hansen, Weaver, Karcz. Objection – Carr. *This condition was accepted.*

Item 2. The Knik Arm Crossing project shall incorporate heavy rail, bicycle and pedestrian facilities to the planned vehicular bridge.

Item 2, if approved by the TAC, would be forwarded to the Assembly for consideration as part of the plan, and not as a separate resolution. MR. CARR expressed his continued concern with Item 2. CHAIR KNIEFEL indicated the TAC could take action for the resolution after this action on a recommendation to the Assembly has been completed.

MS. KARZ felt there was confusion on whether the TAC wanted Item 2 to be written into Chapter 13, if it should say the KAC should incorporate heavy rail, bicycle and pedestrian facilities, or if there should be a separate memorandum by the TAC recommending the Assembly approve the TAC recommendations with other parts. MS. KARZ thought a resolution should accompany Chapter 13.

MR. LYON suggested the TAC either delete Item 2, or change it to say the AMATS pass a resolution supporting the KAC incorporating heavy rail, bicycle and pedestrian facilities. The TAC could say in its condition AMATS will pass a resolution supporting that. MS. KARZ moved this as motion, and MR. HANSEN seconded.

CHAIR KNIEFEL restated the motion, which is to strike Item 2 and add the wording that the AMATS pass a resolution supporting incorporation of heavy rail, bicycle and pedestrian facilities on the planned vehicular bridge.

Hearing no objections, Item 2 was accepted as revised.

Item 3. Support the inclusion of Chapter 13, as amended, to include the new planning factors and revised financial plan.

MS. WITT recommended the TAC take action on Item 6 before Item 3 because, if accepted, Item 6 would actually be incorporated into Chapter 13. Item 6 would provide the MOA a meaningful role in the agreement, and MS. WITT noted this has been already incorporated into the text of Chapter 13, on page 1, Item 5, for a new condition G.

CHAIR KNIEFEL clarified Chapter 13, on page 1, already includes all the recommended conditions from the staff report except Item 2. The only issue outstanding is the inter-modal aspects of the bridge, and whether or not to include it in Chapter 13.

MS. KARCZ proposed rewording Item 3 to read “support the inclusion of the new planning factors and revised financial plans.” CHAIR KNIEFEL noted this was already in Chapter 13, page 1, Item 2. MS. KARCZ clarified if the wording were changed, we would not need to swap as MS. WITT had suggested.

MR. LYON clarified the TAC has a Chapter 13 before it, there are changes made to Chapter 13, and the TAC wanted to review each change individually so the TAC could take action on each part as opposed to reviewing all of Chapter 13 and making changes to parts here and there.

MS. KARCZ moved to support the inclusion of the new planning factors and revised financial plan. MS. WITT seconded.

There was some confusion on which financial plan was being discussed. MR. POST indicated there is no need to revise the financial plan. MR. LYON clarified the financial plan being included is the financial plan revised relative to the original LRTP. CHAIR KNIEFEL stated the plan be referred to as the 2005 Financial Plan as revised.

Hearing no objections, Item 3 was accepted as revised.

Item 4. Concur with the removal of pages 22-35 (Table 8.1) from the Public Review Draft of Chapter 13 and recommend it be included as revised Chapter 8 for purposes of updating project status and costs.

MS. WITT asked Staff to fully update the chapter.

Hearing no objections, Item 4 was accepted.

Item 5. The existing condition (A-F) in the 2007 LRTP, Chapter 12, and Page 13, remain in the LRTP.

VIVIAN UNDERWOOD briefly discussed the conditions for including the project in the LRTP related to comments from the public and Municipality be addressed, financial constraints for the bridge, if there is any public money or State money to be spent that would affect AMATS

allocations, and the Ingra-Gambell connection be built as early as 2018 if it is required. MS. KARCZ noted these were the Assembly's conditions.

Hearing no objections, Item 5 was accepted.

Item 6. ADOT&PF, KABATA and FHWA will provide the Municipality of Anchorage a meaningful role in the development and/or review of the negotiated P3 agreement, and provide a public review and comment period for the agreement.

CHAIR KNIEFEL reiterated although this is already addressed in Chapter 13, the TAC wanted to reinforce its support for each of the conditions.

MS. WITT, understanding this may be something the Municipality would like to pursue, found it awkward for AMATS to be promoting this as a condition of the LRTP. She suggested if the Assembly wanted to pursue this issue, the Assembly should make the recommendation. She felt if AMATS is asking as a condition that another entity be involved in what is basically a financial transaction between KABATA and those other parties, in her opinion, it is inappropriate, and she would not be supporting this condition.

MR. CARR agreed with MS. WITT it should not be a condition of the LRTP. He suggested it would probably be best handled as a resolution, and maybe incorporated with the other multi-modal resolution that moves forward.

MS. EPSTEIN noted KABATA had already agreed to the public review and comment period.

The TAC asked for feedback on this issue from DALE PAULSON, KABATA's representative.

MR. PAULSON was not sure how including the Municipality in negotiations could be handled. He compared this problem to the Municipality negotiating with a State contractor or the State negotiated with a contractor the Municipality. He did not know how this would work.

MR. CARR thought a document or strategy of some form would need to be created under which you would expect the P3 to move forward under. This is where he would see the Municipality liking an opportunity to see how that is structured, and then move forward. He noted since KABATA had already agreed the public can review and comment on the agreement, you can see the Municipality could be in at least an equal or stronger position than to be able to respond to that. He did not foresee the Municipality in negotiation with KABATA's financial team and possible investors, but before going into those negotiations there would need to be a financial strategy or an outline of how to move forward, and he thinks that is what is being asked here. He agrees with MS. WITT this should not be a condition of the LRTP, but could certainly be in the form of a resolution. MR. PAULSON stated there would be an RFP that would go out containing most of this information.

MS. EPSTEIN does not see what is being discussed being as complicated as laid out by MR. PAULSON. She thinks the Municipality would have to sign off on the contract, and that means there are conditions that would affect the Municipality, for example, such as dates for the conditions of the bridge, the connection to Ingra-Gambell being made, and the Municipality does have an interest in what is signed off on by the private investors. She thinks the Municipality has standing to be able to weigh in, and this is a good recommendation from PZC. She supports its inclusion in chapter 13, and will vote to support it to emphasize it here even though it is redundant, but a good idea.

A roll call vote was taken on Item 6. No objection – Epstein, Kniefel, Morris, Hansen, Weaver, Karcz. Objection – Rice, Cowles, Carr, Witt. **6 members had no objection, 4 members objected. This condition was accepted.**

Item 7 - proposed by MR. WEAVER as part of the initial motion - an additional requirement that Knik Arm Crossing project will address all the issues presented by the Planning & Zoning Commission Resolution 2009-053.

MR. WEAVER indicated his proposed Condition 7 would not need to be in the LRTP if a resolution supporting the PZC's findings would be appropriate. MR. WEAVER proposed a friendly amendment to his original motion by withdrawing additional requirement (Item 7) related to the Planning & Zoning Commission Resolution 2009-053. The withdrawn portion, Item 7, will be considered as a separate resolution with those issues as outlined in Planning & Zoning Resolution 2009-053. The second, MS. EPSTEIN, concurred. ***This was accepted as a friendly amendment.***

The TAC returned to discussion on Chapter 13. MS. WITT moved to delete Item V from page 2 of the proposed LRTP Chapter 13 as recommended by Staff. MR. MORRIS seconded. ***Hearing no objection, this motion passed.***

MR. CARR referred to inconsistencies in using “Regional Transportation Authority” versus “Regional Transit Authority.” He noted the Assembly request is based on the newly formed Regional Transit Authority on Page 9 under “Background and Amendment Process” in the third bullet. He noted entity has not yet been formed.

MR. CARR moved to insert the word “proposed” and delete “newly formed.” MS. EPSTEIN seconded. ***Hearing no objection, this motion passed.***

The TAC noted Staff needs to be consistent when using regional transportation authority or transit authority.

MAIN MOTION

Returning to the main motion, MS. WITT clarified this is a recommendation to move this forward to the Assembly, the TAC is not actually taking action to adopt the proposed LRTP amendment.

The TAC will be voting on the main motion with all the changes to Items 1 through 6 agreed to above, the withdrawal of MR. WEAVER'S condition 7, the change to delete Item V on Page 2 of Chapter 13, and MR. CARR'S change in wording in IX on page 2.

CHAIR KNIEFEL stated with this vote the TAC would be recommending Chapter 13 be revised as per amendments just made, and they be forwarded to the Assembly for their consideration.

A roll call vote was taken on the main motion. Ayes - Rice, Cowles, Epstein, Witt, Kniefel, Morris, Hansen, Weaver, and Karcz. Nays – Carr. *With a vote of 9 in favor and 1 opposed, the motion PASSED.*

The TAC moved on to the issue of a proposed resolution concerning multi-modal facilities for the KAC and MR. WEAVER'S proposal for a separate resolution with those issues as outlined in Planning & Zoning Resolution 2009-053.

MR. WEAVER moved to support a resolution from this body supporting Planning & Zoning Commission Resolution 2009-053 albeit it proposed deleting the KAC. He noted the substantive reasons within the resolution have validity and are comprehensive and part of the record. He thinks it is important the Policy Committee support what the PZC did, and even if the TAC did not put it in the LRTP itself, it should be voted up or down with respect to the substantive aspects of that resolution. He supports it and thinks it should be part of the record the TAC sends to the Assembly.

MR. KNIEFEL restated the motion would be the TAC have a resolution from the Committee to the Assembly supporting the 36 recommendations or findings in Planning & Zoning Commission Resolution 2009-053, and MR. WEAVER clarified support where applicable considering the resolution was to delete the KAC, and as such, there were a couple of items in the resolution that have to do with the deletion. MR. CARR seconded.

It was noted Finding 29 of the resolution speaks to a multi-modal facility, including rail, bicycle and pedestrian facilities.

MS. KARCZ noted she had read through all of the PZC issues, as well as staff responses and some are certainly appropriate for the TAC to take a position on, but without that before her, she was not comfortable with advancing a resolution at this time. She suggested considering this at a later meeting.

CHAIR KNIEFEL noted there may be other times to address this issue as the proposed LRTP amendment will be back before the TAC after the Assembly hears it, and before it goes before the Policy Committee. The TAC has the ability to address another approach at that time.

MR. HANSEN stated he would feel more comfortable identifying which issues are to be addressed in the proposed resolution. MR. WEAVER indicated he could do this before it comes back to the TAC.

MR. WEAVER withdrew his motion. The second, MR. CARR, concurred.

MS. WITT asked Staff to develop an issue/response summary specifically on KABATA'S concerns about the air conformity determination, and to work with Municipal and State staff to address those concerns.

b. Obligation Report

DAVE POST, Alaska Department of Transportation & Public Facilities, presented an update on the AMATS 2010 Project Obligation Report for the first quarter for approval by the TAC. The two items he needs formal action on are:

Project G-2, Huffman Road Reconstruction, Old Seward Highway to Pintail
Requires an additional \$400,000 due to cost increases in the design phase.

Project G-5, O'Malley Road Reconstruction
Requires an additional \$1.5 million in design because when the TIP was adopted the money for the design phase had inadvertently been omitted.

MR. POST briefly discussed the Pavement Replacement Program noting the \$2.4 million normally anticipated using AMATS funds in part because of the economic stimulus funds, is at \$690,000 level in terms of TIP funds. As informational items only, he noted the Eagle River Loop Road reconstruction is essentially done, but there was additional design phase funding that was needed during the construction phase in order to go ahead, get the permitting and finalize some of the design elements. The Old Glenn Highway construction cost has an increase of \$1.4 million. No approval is required for this change because there is a policy adopted by AMATS that approval is automatic if the project is in the construction phase.

He noted a few minor changes to Transportation Enhancements including \$150,000 increase for Muldoon Road in design and funding, an increase for reevaluation of the environmental document, and \$100,000 on the potential for right-of-way needs on the Glenn Highway Trail Rehabilitation project. Congestion Mitigation Air Quality (CMAQ) is tracking consistently to the adopted TIP.

Due to an error in the spreadsheet, Mr. Post noted there is approximately an additional \$1.9 million because costs for the pavement replacement program had been counted twice.

To recap overall, the difference between the \$27.178 million and the \$28.749 million AMATS now anticipates obligating, there is a \$1.57 million difference amounting to between 5 and 6%. The Quarterly Report is well within the 15% margin of error AMATS is required to maintain at this point in the year. He asked the TAC for endorsement of the obligation report and a recommendation to the Policy Committee for approval.

MR. CARR moved to recommend approval. MS. EPSTEIN seconded.

MS. EPSTEIN reminded the TAC of previous discussions on funding for the Trails Plan, the Bicycle Plan and the Pedestrian Plan, and she thought the outcome was the amount of money was going to be divided into thirds between the plans. However, she noted the Obligation Report shows zero for the Bicycle Plan in 2010. MR. POST noted this was consistent with the TIP funding. There is \$100,000 for Trails and the Pedestrian Plan in 2010, and \$100,000 shown in 2011 for the Bicycle Plan. He also noted at the last TAC meeting, there had been an inquiry on whether or not there was a need to decrease the funding for the Eagle River CBD with only one remaining public meeting left to introduce conclusions, analysis and recommendations.

MR. POST confirmed if the TAC were to add \$100,000, AMATS would still be within the required 15% margin. In 2010, there is \$100,000 obligated for the Anchorage Areawide Trails Rehab, and \$100,000 obligated for the Pedestrian Plan. There is \$100,000 shown in 2011 for the Bicycle Plan which could be a/c through into 2010 upon adoption of the Bicycle Plan.

MR. POST noted staff has the ability to add money for an additional meeting for the Eagle River CBD study if TAC supports the change.

MR. WEAVER moved to amend the motion to add \$20,000 to the Eagle River CBD Plan to go out provisionally. MS. KARCZ seconded. *The amendment passed unanimously.*

MAIN MOTION

Hearing no objections, the motion as amended was approved unanimously.

c. Jobs Bill Funding

Note: The agenda was revised, and this item was moved under Information Reports as Item 6(c).

d. Other Business Items

1. Minor Amendment to 2009 Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP)

Note: The agenda was revised to hear this item out of order and prior Agenda Item 5(a).

6. INFORMATION ITEMS

a. Alaska Railroad Update

TOM BROOKS with the Alaska Railroad provided a presentation on the fundamentals of the Alaska Railroad. He noted the Railroad has 600 miles of track, over 150 bridges, 50 locomotives, 1,200 rail cars and 650 year round employees. In 1985 the State's investment in the Railroad was \$33 million, and now the Railroad does not rely on State funding. Current assets total \$863 million. He discussed freight and passenger service, Southcentral depot traffic, and the freight revenue mix. MR. BROOKS provided a preview of 2010 noting it will be a tough year with expectations of decreases in both freight and passengers, and expense reductions to offset revenue declines. He reviewed projects for 2010 including track rehabilitation, the Knik River Bridge project, and the Ship Creek Intermodal Center. He also discussed alternatives for improving capacity and reducing congestion in Anchorage, the historic freight shed renovation, and new and renovated passenger train equipment. He concluded his presentation with a discussion of the Positive Train Control Collision Avoidance System which is an \$80 million unfunded mandate from Congress.

b. AMATS Freight Advisory Committee Update

TERESA BREWER provided an update on freight mobility. She noted the Freight Advisory Committee (FAC) was re-established in 2009 and meets quarterly. She briefed the TAC on the projects undertaken by the FAC in 2009 as follows:

- Update of the 2001 Freight movement Problem Areas map and identification of transportation/road improvement projects that would assist in freight mobility and movement.
- Freight Survey developed and underway in conjunction with UAA.
- Site Plan/Road Design Reviews.
- Grant Seeking Opportunities including discussions with Port of Anchorage on potential partnering on federal grant opportunities to improve access/egress at the Port of Anchorage.
- Participation in the Alaska World Trade Center Transportation Conference and tour of new Port expansion projects with Governor Sheffield.
- Coordination – coordinated with and provided information on FAC activities, events and organizational structure with the Fairbanks Metropolitan Area Transportation Solutions (FMATS).

MS. BREWER also discussed the tractor/trailer driver simulator at Carlile Trucking which includes scenarios for driving into shopping malls, or on-ramps, or city driving that would be

similar to other situations the drivers might face here in town. Municipal engineers, DOT and others were invited to try the simulator.

c. Jobs Bill Funding

CHAIR KNIEFEL noted there was a proposal for stimulus funding if there is a second stimulus bill. Requests for bicycle projects and DOT projects for stimulus funding were included in the meeting materials. This is for information only and hopes by the March meeting there will be a better idea from Congress on what the status will be. MR. CARR indicated the Railroad would have something to add in the AMATS area as well, but they are still working on it.

d. Committee Comments

MS. EPSTEIN discussed the possibility of an AMATS Bicycle/Pedestrian Advisory Committee. People interested in joining a discussion about this and implementation issues should contact her. She noted it would come through the TAC as well.

e. Other Informational Items

CHAIR KNIEFEL noted on February 16 the Assembly will be tentatively scheduling March 2 for the public hearing for the proposed LRTP amendment.

7. SCHEDULED AMATS MEETINGS

Policy Committee, February 25, 2010

Technical Advisory Committee, March 11, 2010

8. ADJOURNMENT

CHAIR KNIEFEL adjourned the meeting at 4:44 p.m.