

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

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

**March 18, 2010
2:30 p.m.**

Technical Advisory Committee members Present:

Name	Representing
Jennifer Witt	Alaska Dept. of Transportation & Public Facilities (ADOT&PF), Central Region, Planning
Kim Rice	ADOT, Central Region
Cindy Heil	Alaska Dept. of Environmental Conservation (ADEC)
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)
Alton Staff	MOA/Public Transportation Department
Lois Epstein	Alaska Transportation Priorities Project

Also in attendance

Name	Representing
Craig Lyon	MOA/Traffic Department (TD)
Vivian Underwood	MOA/TD
Van Le	MOA/TD
David Post	ADOT&PF
Ron King	ADOT&PF
Dale Paulson	KABATA
Sandra Cook	HDR
Walt Parker	Parker Associates
Jamie Kenworthy	

*AMATS Policy Committee members

1. CALL TO ORDER

CHAIR KNIEFEL called the meeting to order at 2:34 p.m. Alton Staff filled in for Jody Karcz. Jody Karcz, Jerry Weaver, and Bruce Carr were absent. Lois Epstein arrived at 2:35 p.m., and Jennifer Witt arrived at 2:40 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 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

MS. HEIL moved to approve the agenda. MR. MORRIS seconded. Ms. HEIL requested a change to the business portion of the agenda to address the AMATS Air Quality Advisory Committee Appointments and the Anchorage CO Maintenance Plan first. There were no objections to this change. *Hearing no objections, the agenda as revised was approved unanimously.*

4. APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES

MS. HEIL moved to approve the minutes of September 17, 2009. MS. RICE seconded. *Hearing no objections, the minutes were approved as written.*

MS. HEIL moved to approve the minutes of January 14, 2010. MR. MORRIS seconded. *Hearing no objections, the minutes were approved as written.*

5. BUSINESS ITEMS

Due to a change in the order of the agenda, Other Business Items was heard first

d. OTHER BUSINESS ITEMS

1. AMATS AIR QUALITY ADVISORY COMMITTEE APPOINTMENTS

CRAIG LYON reported on the proposed appointments. Staff recommended the reappointment of Barbara Garner to the committee. Staff recommended appointment of two new members, Bruce Lee and Tom Grman. MR. LYON briefly discussed their background and qualifications. He noted the AMATS Air Quality Advisory Committee provides AMATS with advisory recommendations on air quality planning and facilitates public involvement in the air quality planning process. Members of this nine-member committee serve rotating three-year terms which expire in February, and the committee's bylaws limit members to two terms.

MR. HANSEN moved to recommend the appointments to the Policy Committee for approval. MS. HEIL seconded. MS. HEIL noted outgoing committee member Dr. Gordian had been a member of the Air Quality Committee for six years and chaired one session, and thought she did a really nice job. *Hearing no objections, the motion passed unanimously.*

2. RELEASE OF REVISED ANCHORAGE CO MAINTENANCE PLAN

MR. LYON reported the revised Anchorage CO Maintenance Plan public review draft is available on line, including appendices.

STEVE MORRIS briefed the committee on the revisions to the Anchorage CO Maintenance Plan making the Anchorage Vehicle Inspection and Maintenance Program a “local option” not subject to EPA approval.

MR. MORRIS said the when the Assembly reinstated the I/M Program in July 2008 they directed DHHS to work with ADEC to make I/M a local option rather than a requirement in the SIP. Our projections show that I/M is no longer necessary to meet the CO standard so we are free to remove it as a commitment in the SIP. The draft Maintenance Plan removes I/M as a commitment in the SIP. If this Plan is submitted and approved by EPA; the Assembly will be free to decide whether the Program should be continued, changed or terminated without having to prepare another SIP amendment and get EPA approval. We have worked with ADEC on a way to implement such a local option program that is consistent with State regulation. This plan very similar to the Plan approved by AMATS and the Assembly a year ago except that we’ve removed the commitment to operate the IM program. We’re asking the TAC to release the Plan for a 45-day public review.

MS. HEIL noted the backside of the memo has a schedule showing how long it could take to get this plan adopted by EPA. We cannot terminate IM until EPA approves the Plan. EPA is allowed 18 months to review and the clock starts on formal submittal by the Department to EPA. She noted other complications. EPA recently put out a new mobile model emission called MOVES that replaces the current MOBILE6 model and it must be used beginning in 2012. MOVES estimate significantly higher CO emissions than MOBILE6. This creates a problem because the current emission budget used for conformity analysis was developed with MOBILE6. Because MOVES estimates higher emissions we may not be able to show conformity you for future TIPs and LRTPs and move into a conformity lapse. It’s all about timing. We’ve been talking with EPA now and this SIP will probably go into October that this combine SIP 1 submittal with SIP 2 and maybe on SIP 1 time submittal and they can approve a little earlier than this. If they don’t do it then SIP 1 falls under this clock. Third SIP, spring 2011 is the emissions budget using moves, but we need to have budget approved by March 12, 2012. If we cannot this 2nd SIP done earlier then EPA faced with 3 SIPs’ and it could be possible they follow the 2nd SIP timeline and have to wait on our emission budget or an amendment until it is done. We can’t do any conformity analysis until after emissions 2012 or they choose to 3 SIP and they delay. The bottom line slight impact is chances we will know well in advance and plan accordingly with AMATS.

CHAIR KNIEFEL asked if the MOVES emissions estimates are 50% higher than MOBILE6. MS. HEIL confirmed that was the case and that MOVES emissions projections will likely exceed the emissions budget and we won’t be able to show conformity. MS. WITT asked if we are at risk in timing in what happens with EPA. MS. HEIL said she was hoping that this plan could be re-done using MOVES because this would solve the emission budget issue but it would

delay the submission of the Plan and removal of IM longer than this administration would like., AMATS needs to be aware that submitting this MOBILE6-based plan could complicate and delay the EPA approval process and our ability to do conformity. If we get this SIP amendment into EPA on schedule, EPA said they will try to do is combine this SIP review process with the one we already submitted in October. If this occurs, approval would be timely and there will be no problem. Steve will have to prepare a new conformity budget with MOVES, amend the CO Plan again and get it to AMATS at end of this year and to EPA in summer 2011. EPA could then approve a new MOVES-based emissions budget in 2012.

CHAIR KNIEFEL asked how this might affect the LRTP update in October this year. Ms. HEIL said it won't be a problem because we can stay with MOBILE6. We won't want to use MOVES until the new emissions budget is in place.

MR. MORRIS said that there was some small risk of getting into a snafu, but he thinks we have good working relationship with EPA and think any problems can be worked out. He said he is not too concerned with the MOVES issue. We should be able to revise the emissions budget in 2011 and if this new budget is submitted to EPA as part of another SIP amendment before the end of the year we should be OK.

MS. HEIL stated she supported the Muni despite these uncertainties and hoped we move forward with releasing this plan.

MS. HEIL moved to release for public comment the Anchorage CO Maintenance Plan. MR. COWLES seconded. *Hearing no objections, the motion passed unanimously.*

a. LONG-RANGE TRANSPORTATION PLAN (LRTP), KNIK ARM CROSSING AMENDMENT

Note: due to an agenda change, this item was heard after business items (c)(1) and (c)(2).

MR. LYON reported on the Assembly meeting. Deliberated and voted 6 to 5 to move it into long term and pass it on to us. Here to adjudicate any changes. No changes. Move onto Policy Committee. Updated chapter 13 provided. The Assembly Memorandum and Resolution were included. In addition, we have had questions from KABATA, and answers to those questions were included in the packet. We can vote to move it along.

MS. EPSTEIN raised one issue, and to raise it before Policy Committee before they vote. Distributed a handout on proposed KAC numbers from Wilbersmith Associates studies bridge traffic from 2007 and 2005 with regard to populations, estimated annual average daily transactions and estimated annual gross transactions/toll revenue. She compared ISER 2005 trips of 6700 for population 203,760 and then IRC of 250,700 went to 8400 trips then in ISER 2009 down to 169,000 not modeled yet but should be less than 6700. Almost 50% too high.

Discussion continued regarding trip and population numbers.

MS. WITT assumptions for population in 2030 are too high. New number 38,900 for traffic.

MS. HEIL is that a reasonable assumption.

MS. EPSTEIN numbers are out-of-date. Concerned numbers are too high. Revenue issue going to look worse.

MS. EPSTEIN can we do a memo of some sort? CHAIR KNIEFEL you could propose that after comments. MR. MORRIS did Assembly talk about the numbers. Ms. Epstein raised it, and several folks in public testimony per MR. LYON. MS. HEIL still being proposed the bridge be funded through partnership. MS. EPSTEIN bonding to guaranty that and the Mayor expects all to be paid for by tolls if there is bonding.

CHAIR KNIEFEL noted Mr. Foster at Assembly was going to provide copies of the financial plan that is being updated and what it will be and how it is going to work. Assembly interested. Revenue bonds and maybe some need for State guaranty. MS. HEIL commented we won't use any money from AMATS, and if we have good points but we are not planning this. It is the people's responsibility to get involved. Just curious if this is something outside the preview of our group. CHAIR KNIEFEL noted he thinks we have a very robust LRTP and we include H2H as example and there is a concern from public and staff on how do we fund 700 million H2H and 700 million KABATA project. Basically, the bonding at the State level is impacting funding and that is where some of the concern is.

MR. COWLES commented even if the private financing comes in they could still say private market gung-ho and want to put lot into and get it done. Still puts this other project into jeopardy because State's putting money into? CHAIR KNIEFEL stated its unknown if there will be a need for state funding beyond the current funding. There may or may not be.

MS. EPSTEIN stated the info from KABATA doesn't list debt service but does show substantially negative numbers when you do that calculation. So only info that was developed by...MS. WITT responded all numbers and assumptions into EIS and developed by IRC and ISER, all # were developed and used for what was in process at the time and so where AMATS is concerned in the LRTP using ISER forecast in doing the regional model to determine how this translates in to now in doing next LRTP.

MS. EPSTEIN asked can we ask KABATA if they are going to re-run the model. MR. PAULSON commented he hasn't been involved, but if you want to write some memo or something and put in on paper I'm sure we can send it on to Wilbersmith. MS. EPSTEIN asked what the plan is. MR. PAULSON noted when you get ready to do a financial close, and then you are going to be confident. They'll do there own traffic and revenue, that will be done at the end. MS. EPSTEIN expressed her disagreement and believes you have better information, we don't need to wait.

MR. HANSEN noted Wilbersmith is dated 2007 and IRC info is also dated 2007 at least copyrighted 2007, so those 2 go together, but when you get to Wilbersmith that is dated Nov 2005 and ISER's projections are dated December 2009. Knik base generated in 2005 and went into the numbers on page 3. MS. WITT asked the population # used for 2005 where are those? MS. EPSEIN stated in the Knik base. What they did in H2H was because ISER was a contractor to KABATA in 2005 they gave them numbers to use and then ISER was contractor to H2H...

MR. HANSEN as long as 6700 was based on 203,000 but are 4 years apart but ISER went from about 203,000 in 2005 and then upped to 250,000 by IRC in 2007 and then ISER updated in 2009 and dropped it back down 203,000 to 169,000.

MR. MORRIS asked what you suggest is we advise the Policy Committee that population numbers have changed to much lower. MS. EPSTEIN responded or can say population is much lower and that traffic numbers are going to be lower and should be factored in.

MR. PAULSON commented he is trying to track what is going on here. Population went down as far as projection. Traffic projections have not been done yet. Did H2H do tazs, has it been transferred to traffic. In the process with bridge per Ms. Witt. MR. PAULSON down to where people are going to live, how fast the Port build up and then as you go farther north traffic goes down and that would probably drive the model, I'm thinking.

MS. WITT with that big of decrease (80,000) the question would be if there is that less of population growth where is it going to be. MR. PAULSON it would make a difference and less to do with pure population and the economic analysis of what goes on.

SANDRA COOK Jennifer is right. It is in process. When you do EIS you have a base year and it takes a long time to do Environ Impact Statement and things do change and when it comes to record of decision and final EIS sometimes those things are addressed if that drastic.

MR. POST reported the Mat-Su-Borough population is about 85,000, which is a useful number because it relates to population under the ISER numbers and really we're dealing with the delta here. Traffic projections on bridge will depend on growth occurring because not a lot of growth in area which would be served by bridge now. IRC report said there would be twice the growth, not existing population now and would impact.

JAMIE KENWORTHY responded inside 07 estimates is 2030 is 250,700 and we have some view whether it is reasonable that Matsu would add the population of the City of Palmer every year for the next 20 years.

MR. MORRIS stated he support passing this on a recommendation on to Policy Committee and highlight the population projections from ISER to show much slower projections has changed

and should be aware of that when they make a decision and this further supports. Moved by MR. MORRIS, seconded by MS. EPSTEIN.

MS. WITT stated this is 2 separate actions, one on forwarded, and second on memo on the - friendly amendment. A lot of work has gone into this and lot of compromise has been made, but she will be voting no about new condition G, which states the feel it is inappropriate for a condition to the LRTP.

MS. RICE concurred with MS. WITT.

MS. HEIL commented the Policy Committee is the one who initiated this effort and they are one who needs to make decision and we could forward on comments form Wilbersmith that points to their relooking at G and letting them make policy call on that language. Don't think there is anything binding with that language but more of a policy call. We put it there because we got comments but really it is a policy call as well. I think it would behoove us to call out to Policy Committee that there are issues with G to look at that.

MR. COWLES suggested that could accompany the population narrative.

MS. HEIL noted she thinks it could be pointed out that. MR. COWLES expressed he would like to move this forward with these positions articulated right off the bat, as to moving document forward before agreeing to these conditions. First would be agmt moving forward, and then a second motion set the year population the potential further description on this. I prefer original motion and will vote no on current one.

MR. COWLES noted Steve agreed to amendment and you seconded first one and agreed with that all. All we are voting on now is moving forward as it and he is voting no.

MS. EPSTEIN moves this forward and then a second memo addressing your concerns to MS. Witt and she would vote for the second on and not the first one. MR. MORRIS asked would you support if we call out G in that memo as well. MS. WITT replied no.

MS. EPSTEIN commented what's the difference? MS. WITT responded her position on this clause remains the same. Vote last time was to advance to the Assembly they did not approve it. Now we need to approve and move to Policy Committee and she will vote no.

Role call – Main:

MR. COWLES - no

MS. EPSTEIN – yes

MS. RICE – no

MR. MORRIS – yes

MS. HEIL – yes

CHAIR KNIEFEL – yes

MS. WITT – no

MR. HANSEN – yes

STAFF– yes

6 to 3 to approve to move towards Policy Committee.

CHAIR KNIEFEL commented next on the population staff to motion...

MR. MORRIS reintroduce a motion when we forward the motion to the Policy Committee that we clear up the LRTP and that it be accompany by a memo explaining on of the reason we support the idea of the Knik Arm Crossing is the second half of LRTP because the projections for valley are much lower than first analyzed.

MS. EPSTEIN suggested a friendly amendment to be accurately the population numbers are less now but they were also increased by a KABATA contractor and now they are below the data used in the chart.

MS. HEIL thinks it is good to get information but don't necessarily agree with strong language that said this was the only reason why this is going forward because the process was supported and passing on. Uncomfortable with saying this is why I moved this forward was because of this information. It should be written here is this information and we shouldn't draw conclusions as they desire. I will base my vote on if intent is the original wording of amendment, then vote no. MR. COWLES relay on staff to develop before we vote or hope it comes together. See staff draft and see if that is how we want to pass it forward.

MS. WITT noted she presented to PC as summary of changes that has occurred over time and this is something they should be aware of, if they are leaning toward it and AMATS must address to a degree as we move forward with LRTP. MS. EPSTEIN concurred just show population not trip numbers.

MR. HANSEN asked what is our timing on this to get this to Policy Committee. MR. LYON replied next Thursday is their meeting.

MR. COWLES stated if we agree it is simply that chart and nothing more I am comfortable with that.

CHAIR KNIEFEL stated the motion before us is to send additional information to PC showing changes to in the population figures in accordance with the numbers on the board. MR. MORRIS withdrew and restated a new motion of forwarding the population numbers showing the changes in population to the PC, seconded by MS. HEIL.

MR. HANSEN noted we're using 2005 and 2009 can we make sure we are doing 2005 that we have 2005 numbers. Just forwarding population numbers for 2030 and make sure that it is apples to apples.

APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY.

MS. HEIL move that we also send to the PC a note that on condition G was controversial and ask that they review that language specifically discussed at technical with different opinions and was from PZC acting as AMATS Citizens' Advisory Committee. UNANIMOUSLY.

b. JOBS BILL FUNDING – BIKE NETWORK

MR. LYON added in case they got far enough along in congress but we don't have a dollar amount of what exactly we can spend. MS. WITT stated Ron King has info on bill and we could ask him for brief summary.

MR. KING stated he was Chief of Dept of Trans and Public Facilities. HIRES was signed this morning and through Dec 2010 extension only funding at the 2009 level minus the rescission and they have returned the deductive earmarks and other funds. Translates to Alaska in approximately increase from 300 to 400. We might have estimate available by next Thursday. This is coming at a point after we have already done the take downs in our funding of our core transportation funding of which AMATS is funded out of STIP. This is not stimulus money, no 90 to contract or 90 day obligation but it must be obligated by September or we lose it and can be used for normal federal aid projects. \$100 million has to be obligated by September or we lose it. So project has to be submitted to regional headquarters by the end of August in order to them to make it. FHWA is dealing with new staff as we are. 100 projects backed up on their desks.

MS. WITT reported it's not limited to construction. MS. RICE stated we cannot do anything until we find dollar amount and then do a TIP amendment. MS. WITT mentioned with the bike network we would be able to advance design phases on projections.

MR. POST stated we are anticipating \$15 million for Huffman so we already have a 2010 funding and freeing up 2011 funds. MS. WITT responded it's tough when but we still have 6 months of the fiscal year to obligate money and with Huffman we may not need to ac as much.

No action.

c. AIR QUALITY CONFORMITY DETERMINATION

The Air Quality Conformity Determination for the LRTP Knik Arm Crossing Amendment had already been through public comment.

MS. HEIL moved to forward to the Policy Committee for approval the Air Quality Conformity Analysis for the Long-Range Transportation Plan Amendment moving the Knik Arm Crossing from the short-term to the long-term. MR. MORRIS seconded. *The motion passed unanimously.*

c. OTHER BUSINESS ITEMS

These items were heard under business action items on the agenda.

6. INFORMATION ITEMS

a. COMMITTEE COMMENTS

MR. HANSEN mentioned tomorrow at 1:30 joint meeting with DOT and all utilities to go over what is going to be constructed this year. Also, if you look at Muni website we have some maps, one for Muni projects for construction (PM&E) and then get further information about contacts and we have one for pre-construction and design projections and then link to approve road closures too.

MS. WITT announced we made an offer to fill our AMATS planning position and we're looking forward to having someone in that position. MS. WITT commented it's tied into a senate transportation committee on the Regional Transit Authority and fiscal note issues and why DOT isn't out there. How Muni views such an entity operating.

MR. MORRIS announced Bike-to-Work is May 21, and the week before is bike to work week.

MS. RICE reported this year for DOT they are going to put down more asphalt than ever had in one year.

MS. EPSTEIN noted that last week new federal non-motorized transportation policy was announced where they tried to elevate biking, walking for the League of American Bicyclists to statement policy.

CHAIR KNIEFEL announced next Tuesday night the Assembly has the Bike Plan up for adoption. HDP that has transportation component in it at same time.

d. OTHER INFORMATIONAL ITEMS - None

7. SCHEDULED AMATS MEETINGS

Policy Committee, March 25, 2010, at City Hall at 10:00 a.m.

Technical Advisory Committee, April 8, 2010

8. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 3:58 p.m.