

**ANCHORAGE METROPOLITAN AREA TRANSPORTATION
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Planning & Development Center
Main Conference Room
4700 Elmore Road
Anchorage, Alaska**

**April 9, 2009
2:30 PM**

Those in attendance were:

<u>NAME</u>	<u>REPRESENTING</u>
** Jennifer Witt	ADOT, Central Region, Planning
** Kim Rice	ADOT, Central Region
Dave Post	ADOT
Aneta Synan	ADOT
Jim Childers	ADOT
Mark Parmalee	ADOT
Kevin Jackson	ADOT
** Cindy Heil	Alaska Department of Environmental Conservation
** Bruce Carr	Alaska Railroad Corporation
** Steve Morris	MOA/Department of Health and Human Services
Mathew Stichick	DHHS
Anne Schlapia	DHHS
** Lance Wilber	MOA/Traffic Department
Craig Lyon	MOA/TD
Teresa Brewer	MOA/TD
Vivian Underwood	MOA/TD
** Jerry Hansen	MOA/PM&E
Jim Lamson	MOA/PM&E
** Todd Cowles	MOA/Port of Anchorage
** Judy Tymick	MOA/ Public Transportation Dept.
** Tom Nelson	MOA/Planning Department
* Sheila Selkregg	MOA/Municipal Assembly
Kevin Mishner	RLS
Bob Frank	Government Hill Community Council
Susanne DiPietro	Government Hill Community Council
Bill Noll	Government Hill Community Council
Walter Parker	Anchorage Citizens Coalition
Jon Spring	
MaryAnn Pease	KABATA

Dale Paulson	KABATA
Andrew Niemiec	KABATA
Vern Geidl	KABATA
Kevin Hemenway	KABATA
Randy McCain	Anchorage Daily News
Don Hunter	Anchorage Daily News
Rosemary Shinohara	Anchorage Daily News

* AMATS Policy Committee members

** AMATS Technical Advisory Committee members

1. CALL TO ORDER

CHAIR WILBER called the meeting to order at 2:41 PM. A quorum was present.

2. PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT ANNOUNCEMENT

CHAIR WILBER encouraged public involvement in this meeting of the AMATS Technical Advisory Committee (TAC). He explained that Staff would first make their presentation, followed by any comments from TAC members, and the floor would then be open to public comment.

3. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

CINDY HEIL moved for approval of the agenda. TODD COWLES seconded.

MS. WITT suggested that item 5.b be heard as an Informational Item. CHAIR WILBER felt that the item should remain as a Business Item regardless of whether the TAC's discussion yields an action. He asked that item 5.d.1 be heard first, followed by item 6.b.

There being no objection, the agenda passed as amended.

4. APPROVAL OF MINUTES – None

5. BUSINESS ITEMS

d. Other Business Items

1) Human Services Transportation Coordination Plan

JUDY TYMICK explained that this plan was written by RLS & Associates. The Public Transportation Department has worked with this consultant several times, most notably on the People Mover Blueprint. Human Service Transportation serves some of Anchorage's more vulnerable populations such as seniors, those with disabilities, youth, veterans, and low-income. Coordination involves bringing the many people behind this kind of transportation to the table in order to find efficiencies, increase capacity and quality, and reduce costs. There are several organizations in Anchorage that provide human service transportation.

In Anchorage there have been several successes with coordination. AnchorRIDES coordinates the senior transportation that is partially funded with a grant through the State DSDS. It is also a Medicaid waiver transportation provider and has a contract with the School District to provide some Title I transportation.

Since the last plan was adopted in 2007 the community of Girdwood established a shuttle system that runs every 30 minutes through the community. This service is partially funded with an FTA 5311 grant. The Governor recently established a statewide coordinated transportation task force. Challenge Alaska secured a grant from the state to purchase a vehicle; when they are not using that vehicle it will be shared with other nonprofit organizations.

In 2006 when Congress passed SAFETEA-LU, it mandated that every community have a coordinated plan. Anchorage had a plan in 1995, which was updated in 2007. This 2009 update of the plan should be viable for four to five years. The plan must be locally developed with broad participation, there must be an assessment of needs and an inventory of available services and resources, strategies must be developed and prioritized, and the plan must be adopted by a local governing body. SAFETEA-LU also provides funding for human service transportation, including FTA 5310, FTA 5316,

FTA 5317, and there is also funding through the Alaska Mental Health Trust Authority. SAFETEA-LU requires that this money be distributed through a competitive process that is open and transparent. Eligible recipients include public transportation providers, private nonprofits, and some public transportation providers. Eligible projects must be listed in the coordinated plan and recipients must participate in coordination activities. An AMATS ranking committee ranks applications for funding and either the state or Municipality will administer those grants.

For this update RLS & Associates held a meeting in August 2008 to which 274 invitations were mailed; 60 people attended the meeting. From that meeting a volunteer working group was formed that has been meeting monthly to refine priorities and strategies. RLS conducted one-on-one interviews with meeting attendees. An Internet survey was mailed to 274 individuals with 27 responding. There are 561 vehicles in Anchorage providing some level of transportation. Not including the vehicles operated by People Mover, AnchorRIDES, taxi companies, and the School District, there are 64 vehicles owned by various nonprofits providing transportation. Those 64 vehicles are doing about 500,000 trips a year. The survey indicated the importance of AnchorRIDES expanding trip purpose, service areas, and hours. A public hearing was held on March 3, 2009.

CHAIR WILBER asked what are the significant differences in the 2009 Plan update from the 2007 Plan. MS. TYMICK replied that the Plan is more specific.

CINDY HEIL moved to forward a recommendation of approval of Human Services Transportation Coordination Plan to the AMATS Policy Committee.
JERRY HANSEN seconded.

There being no objection, the motion passed unanimously.

6. INFORMATIONAL REPORTS

a. Public Transportation Route Changes

JUDY TYMICK explained that the Mayor requested that the Public Transportation Department do a 3% budget reduction. That reduction included some cost savings in fuel, reduced printing costs, and adding four

new holidays. An additional 5% reduction was requested, which resulted in eliminating two routes in Eagle River, leaving only Route 102 that operates during peak time. Through discussions with the Administration, the Department was able to maintain fuel savings and determined that some Stimulus money could be used for capital maintenance, which allow reinstatement of 870% of the Eagle River service (a cut of 10 hours of service). A public hearing was held in Eagle River and attended by 35-40 people. There was a public hearing today and another will be held this evening at City Hall.

MR. NELSON asked what four days were eliminated and what was the basis for selecting those. He noted that the day after Thanksgiving was of particular interest to him, as it is a big shopping day. MS. TYMICK responded that the four holidays are Martin Luther King Jr. Day, President's Day, Veterans Day and the day after Thanksgiving. She was not comfortable responding to why these four holidays were chosen other than to meet the requirements to reduce the department budget.

CHAIR WILBER asked when these changes would begin. MS. TYMICK replied that the changes have begun.

DR. SELKREGG felt it was a poor decision to eliminate bus service and the assumption that people who are riding buses do not need them on those four days is ridiculous.

MS. WITT noted that there is no AMATS TAC or Policy Committee involvement in the budget decisions made.

BOB FRENCH stated he used to be able to ride the bus between Eagle River and Downtown and no longer does so because what was a 35-minute ride is now 1.5 hours. He suggested expanding service, rather than restricting it.

5. BUSINESS ITEMS (continued)

a. CO Maintenance Plan

STEVE MORRIS stated that in April 2008 a request was made to release this plan for 30-day public review. That plan has discontinued I/M. Since then, the Assembly reversed their action to discontinue the I/M program and has

reinstated it, with modifications. Those modifications are significant enough to require amendment of the current CO Maintenance Plan. The changes to the 2003 Plan are relatively modest. The revised I/M program now allows cars that are 6 years old or newer do not need to be tested. The modeling required to measure the impact of this extended “grace period” was done and the impacts were insignificant. There is a 99% chance of meeting the standard every year during the Maintenance Plan period of 2009 through 2023. Several other requirements were necessary with this update and were accomplished. The contingency measures in the Plan were examined and there is now an expanded list of measures. The TAC was asked to release the plan for a 30-day public review.

MR. NELSON asked to what age vehicle the I/M program testing is required. MR. MORRIS replied that 1968 or newer vehicles must go through the testing. There are provisions in the Assembly ordinance that exempt historic and classic plate vehicles. This has a minor impact on air quality.

CINDY HEIL moved to release the Anchorage CO Maintenance Plan for 30-day public review. JENNIFER WITT seconded.

MS. HEIL asked that the 30-day period begin when this plan is posted.

There being no objection, the motion passed unanimously.

b. LRTP Amendment – Knik Arm Crossing

CHAIR WILBER commented that this item and the next item could involve lengthy discussion, therefore, he would be mindful of the length of individual comments. He stated the TAC conducted a work session to discuss the proposal to remove the Knik Arm Crossing from the Long-Range Transportation Plan (LRTP). There has been discussion of the new requirements involved in this amendment and the financial elements of the entire LRTP. At the end of the work session, KABATA representatives shared updates on the project and he felt that information might affect how the TAC would recommend to the Policy Committee. He asked for a brief project update from KABATA.

ANDREW NIEMIEC stated that KABATA is concerned with removal of the project from the LRTP. Today the KABATA Board met and adopted a

resolution in strong opposition of efforts to do so; he read this resolution into the record. He explained the Board is comprised of the Commissioners of Revenue and Department of Transportation, three public members from the Mat-Su and Anchorage. He offered to answer questions from the TAC.

CHAIR WILBER stated that at the work session the TAC had received an internal draft of the amendment for its review. The review involves what assumptions have changed and how this amendment will be presented to the public. He asked Ms. Underwood to summarize the text of the amendment.

MS. UNDERWOOD explained that the Policy Committee gave direction to begin the process to delete the Knik Arm Crossing (KAC) from the LRTP. In October, the TAC met to discuss questions about expanded environmental consultation requirements, air quality requirements, and new SAFETEA-LU requirements. The draft amendment before the TAC is the culmination of the effort to address those questions. The purpose of the amendment is to propose deleting the KAC from the LRTP and to document how the LRTP meets the new federal planning regulations. She distributed two pages from the 2007 LRTP that added the KAC to the LRTP citing several special conditions listed as the basis for approval of adding the KAC to the LRTP. A multi-agency air quality meeting was held on Monday before the work session where the assumptions to be used in the model were discussed. Deleting a project from the LRTP triggers the requirement for a new air quality conformity analysis. The group decided to use the 2025 assumptions extrapolated to 2027. Mr. Morris developed a draft that can hopefully be released coincident with the public review draft of the LRTP amendment.

MS. UNDERWOOD noted that at the Monday work session the question was asked why the environmental impact statement (EIS) was being belabored, to which she replied that one of the conditions to add this project to the LRTP was that the final EIS be completed and that it address the concerns of the MOA, the Railroad, Mat-Su Borough, and the public. Therefore, it is appropriate for the TAC to address the EIS. The MOA has been in support of the KAC, but with conditions. Twice the Assembly passed resolutions to this effect. There was a sense that the final EIS did not address all concerns. There was concern that the FHWA might issue a record of decision (ROD) and the project might not meet the purpose and need of the document.

Another question during the work session was what is new since 2007. There is a worldwide, unprecedented economic downturn that is a new circumstance. The language in the Assembly's resolution is that "spiraling costs for construction projects, together with the current national and international economic downturn posed a high risk to the KAC revenue stream and financial feasibility." One of the two short-listed construction consortiums to build, operate, and maintain the KAC appears to be having financial difficulties. A KABATA representative mentioned at the work session that state General Obligation funds would be sought for this project. Another condition for inclusion of the KAC in the LRTP is that if any other state funds are to be added, the LRTP has to be reconsidered to see if it affects other projects in the LRTP. The cost estimate recently released by the ADOT/PF says that the design and construction risk for this project are extraordinarily high. She did not believe that the cost estimate includes the Ingra/Gambell extension, when another requirement of including the KAC in the LRTP is that the extension be built by 2017. The reconnaissance study for that project should have begun in 2008 and she did not believe it has been done.

Governor Palin has often said that she supports the concept of the KAC, but in 2008 heard that it could cost the state \$1 billion, which would result in huge financial risk allocated to the State and it may not be worthwhile for the State to pursue the project. She also has expressed concern over the maximum damages that KABATA or the State would be forced to pay to the concessionaire if government permits are delayed or not issued or if the traffic falls below a guaranteed floor. There are other issues of controversy about the contracting not being transparent and that affected communities are not required to sign off on the final contract or on scheduled toll increases.

CHAIR WILBER asked for summary of the requirements in Chapter 15 that have changed since December 11, 2007. MS. UNDERWOOD replied that there are new planning regulations through SAFETEA-LU. Every three years AMATS certifies that it is doing what is required. In 2007 a matrix was developed showing what must be done to meet SAFETEA-LU requirements. She reviewed the items in that matrix and in particular noted the new standalone factor for safety and for security, both of which she addressed in the amendment. There are new requirements for environmental consultation

that involve request for input by environmental agencies on specific environmental mitigation activities. She has initiated that process and received response from EPA and others. There is also a new Public Participation Plan that was recently adopted and the amendment meets the requirements therein.

CHAIR WILBER noted that there must be an update of the LRTP financial plan to reflect all costs and revenue projections for all projects in the LRTP. This is simple except that the inflation rate must be decided. At the recent work session there were reservations about the plausibility of some of the future revenue projections. The State can likely not rely on the same level of funding from the federal government, which affects AMATS. Reliance on historic revenue trends, and assuming a reasonable rate of inflation through 2027, the LRTP cannot be financially constrained. In order to constrain the LRTP, either projects must be eliminated or there must be reasonable assumptions for revenue streams in addition to current revenue streams. There were suggestions about a statewide transportation initiative and nearly \$1 billion would be needed to show financial constraint. He has spoken with those involved with financing and has been told that revenue projecting beyond 10 years is very difficult. He has reviewed the STIP, which also recognizes the problem that traditional FHWA revenue will not be sufficient to meet needs. The State proposed a statewide transportation fund, which he felt should be included in this amendment. There needs to be either a statewide transportation plan to fund transportation improvements inside of Anchorage or the MOA will need to assume ownership of roads and take that responsibility. Removing projects from the LRTP affects air quality conformity and he has asked Mr. Morris to assume that nothing is removed. KABATA has said their revenue would be through a public/private partnership using tolls. He was not sure that the public or the Policy Committee is ready for toll roads in Anchorage in the next 20 years.

MR. NELSON noted that one of the conditions under which the KAC is in the LRTP includes a condition that “no funding currently planned ... will be used to support construction and maintenance of any element of the KAC.” He stated the KAC is not part of the AMATS funding. CHAIR WILBER stated it is not part of the financial constraint requirement for the LRTP because of the Policy Committee’s decision to keep them separate. MR. NELSON

understood that the requirement to do a financial constraint analysis is based on the fact that it must be done for other projects in the LRTP.

MS. EPSTEIN noted there is a decision to list the Beluga whale as an endangered species. March 12, 2009 Commissioner Paulson issued a letter to the National Marine Fisheries Service that says there are some problems with the existing KAC design and it may not be approvable because of the Beluga whale. If the causeway is not approvable and the bridge must be longer, it would be significantly more expensive. Given that one of the conditions is approval of the environmental requirements, she did not know where the project stands.

MS. HEIL asked if FHWA must agree with methodology that results in the financial constraint determination. CHAIR WILBER stated that in other jurisdictions where methodologies were different from the state's, FHWA said one approach was needed. There must be a reasonable basis for the determination based on the region, etc. MS. HEIL thought a cost of \$500 million in 2013 is excessive. CHAIR WILBER remarked that he would be working on the issue of reasonableness. He noted that the LRTP must be financially constrained for 20 years. For the first 10 years, the inflation rate must be identified and for the second 10 years it can be a range.

MS. WITT stated there has been an understanding that there would ultimately be other revenue sources needed and that is being addressed now as part of the Highway-to-Highway (H2H) project. The timing of that will be an important element in the decision whether or not to advance the LRTP amendment and in the development of the new 2011 LRTP. Information about potential revenue sources and funding options for H2H can be incorporated into this and bolster some of the assumptions will be available before the end of 2009. Better cost estimates for the H2H will be developed in the Fall and a team of professionals will then develop a financing plan for the project, which will be built in phases. MS. WITT stated the State and MOA are committed to pursuing non-traditional funding as part of the Connect Anchorage agreement, which includes H2H.

MS. RICE noted that KABATA had mentioned new ideas at the work session and asked if they would elaborate on that.

MR. CARR asked if the KAC is the sole reason for the LRTP amendment. CHAIR WILBER replied in the affirmative.

MR. NIEMIEC stated the potential revenue stream of the KAC is beneficial to projects considered in the LRTP. To what extent those revenues are available is unknown at this time. There is a great amount of information on how to finance a project such as the KAC. There are many things related to the project that are not final and final design cannot be done. He suggested caution in expressing personal opinions, given that this project is in development and the TAC needs to look at what is within its purview.

MR. PAULSON with KABATA stated that a letter of authorization was requested from NOAA before the Beluga whale was listed. KABATA met with NOAA and revision will be done to the design as it moves forward. MS. EPSTEIN noted that the letter speaks to withdrawal of authorization. MR. PAULSON stated that KABATA withdrew the request for a letter of authorization that was submitted before the Beluga was listed. MS. EPSTEIN asked if, now that the Beluga is listed, it would be addressed. MR. PAULSON replied that the design would change.

MS. PEASE clarified that KABATA is working closely with the resource agencies to develop parameters and criteria that they would find acceptable. They are the agencies that will have to agree that they are acceptable. She stated when she heard the technical review given today she felt she must draw attention to some of the statements made. She hoped the TAC is not basing its technical evaluation on media reporting. She heard a statement today that the Governor's office has reported that maybe it is a \$1 billion project. There have been several independent cost estimates done and the facts should be the basis of statements, not media reporting. She heard at the recent work session that the environmental process has failed, which is prejudging the outcome. There was also a statement that the MOA's parameters on the KAC have not been met. She stated that the Section 106 process has been highly favorable with all required signatories affirming that they agreed with conditions. The MOA was one of the authorized signatures, as were the State Historic Preservation Office, the FHWA, the military, and the advisory council in Washington DC. She questioned the capability of the group to examine the financier's capabilities.

DR. SELKREGG asked about the Ingra/Gambell connection, what is the strategy to pay for that project, and whether it is appropriate to build the KAC if the associated structure around it cannot be done. She also thought the issue of total cost is foggy and it is essential to understand that. It is important that there is confidence that the financial structure proposed for the KAC is proposed by a viable organization because there is much failure of financial institutions and there is a risk. She agreed that AMATS are not experts in evaluating that. She recalled one of the first TAC meetings she attended where the members were trying to determine how to adjust AMATS priorities in light of the fact that the KAC had come into the funding structure as an earmark, but did not increase the total AMATS allocation, therefore displacing projects that would have otherwise received AMATS funding. She felt it was important for the public to understand that and for the public to understand what projects were deferred. The idea that the KAC is being paid for by the State was clearly addressed at that meeting.

DR. SELKREGG remarked that it is difficult to keep up with the complexity of the conversation when the topic changes from the KAC to the H2H. There must be an understanding of the viability of going back to a national level with the H2H and other projects to find resources and what are the priorities within the system for those resources. The KAC is an extraordinarily expensive project and if public/private partnerships are desirable, is it best to use that mechanism for this project or for the H2H. She stated she would be asking these questions at the Policy Committee level and at the Assembly.

MR. FRENCH, a 27-year resident of Anchorage, was glad the Assembly voted unanimously in September to adopt a resolution to withdraw support for the KAC and request the AMATS Policy Committee begin the process to remove the KAC. He felt that much had changed in Anchorage, in Alaska, and in the world since 2007 when this project was added to the LRTP. KABATA's optimistic projections of growth and the financial feasibility of the project were based on 2003 ISER data that was extrapolated 15 years beyond the normal end-date of that projection. Those data were taken from a period when Alaska was in an unprecedented 21-year period of uninterrupted growth. That includes a large influx of population to build and run the natural gas pipeline and he was unsure whether that pipeline project would come to fruition. More recent ISER data shows 25-30% less growth in the Anchorage and Mat-Su region. In April 2008 Deputy Commissioner Frank

Richards with ADOT sent a pointed letter to KABATA outlining their concerns about the financial risks to the state and to the Municipality for cost overruns, cost increases, guarantees of revenue to the concessionaire if the tolls do not meet expectations. They were also concerned with financial risks associated with delays or conditions imposed by governmental permits, such as the Beluga whale. The letter from KABATA to National Marine Fisheries says, "We would like to be able to provide some assurance to the P3 proposers that if specified conditions are met there is a reasonable likelihood that the project will be allowed to proceed." This indicated to him that the present design would not be allowed to proceed. He asked whether Marine Fisheries has told KABATA that they would not be able to permit the existing design that is in EIS. The costs would be higher for a different bridge. There have also been discussions with the Corps of Engineers, who have said in private conversations that they could not permit the bridge in the current design. They have said they cannot release that data because they do not have the permit application before them because KABATA does not have a design to put forward in order to ask for a permit. He stated the independent cost estimate from 2009, released in February, said "without an equitable risk-sharing agreement the project will not be economically feasible if proposals are received wherein all the risks are passed on to the contractor." This statement makes it clear that the assumption is that the costs and the risks will be borne by the State, and he felt it was clear that the costs would be borne by the Municipality to make the connection roads, such as Ingra/Gambell.

SUSANNE DiPIETRO stated she participated on behalf of the Government Hill Community Council in the Section 106 consultation process with the national commission and the State SHPO and one of the things she learned during that process is that the decision to sign or not sign the Section 106 agreement does not rest on whether or not there is agreement with what the agreement says, but rather on whether you feel you have been appropriately consulted. The Government Hill Community Council did not sign because it felt the process did not take its interests into account. The Mat-Su Borough also did not sign and she believed they would say they do not feel the consultation process was adequate. The Municipality signed because they felt they had been appropriately consulted, not necessarily because they agreed with everything in the agreement.

RANDY McCAIN, Anchorage resident, voiced support for the KAC. He stated he manages a freight company that moves perishable products from Alaska to the Lower 48. In-state he moves another half million pounds from Anchorage to Fairbanks and to the Kenai Peninsula. He stated that Anchorage does not realize how precarious the supply chain is to the rest of the state. He stated he moved to Alaska in 1992 and he could not imagine a place with one way in and one way out, but that is the case for access to the Kenai Peninsula, the Mat-Su Valley, and Fairbanks. He thought it was absurd to not proceed with the KAC. He felt the process should not be derailed based on some technicalities. He stated that while Anchorage is a large stakeholder in this project, it is small when it comes to servicing the population of the state and this is a state project that is publicly and privately funded. The service being provided is to the statewide community.

WALT PARKER former highway commissioner, former chairman and AMATS and FMATS, referred to Resolution 209 submitted by KABATA. It states that the “board of directors encourages AMATS to communicate its concerns to the State of Alaska under a dialogue directly with the KABATA.” This confused him because AMATS was and is a part of the State of Alaska and the Municipality of Anchorage and a direct dialogue would have to avoid AMATS and that would get the attention of the FHWA. AMATS was created to conduct the kind of dialogue that is now occurring.

BILL NOLL, Anchorage resident, stated that the idea of building infrastructure is an idea that has appealed to many Alaskans, of which he was one. He asked whether there is an advantage to AMATS in removing this project from the LRTP. He stated he has not been present for this process and he understood there was more process before a decision is made.

CHAIR WILBER explained that the Assembly passed a resolution including issues regarding changes in financing and the assumptions for the KAC since it was added to the LRTP. The TAC is attempting to ascertain what are those changes and, before something is presented to the Policy Committee, more work is required in that regard. If the Policy Committee feels comfortable that those changes are significant, it may decide to move an amendment process forward. He stated there are those that favor and those who do not favor this project, but he believed that everyone in the room favored infrastructure. The questions are which, when, and how much. MR. NOLL

stated that his last paying job was Commissioner of Commerce for the State and when he left that office he advised people of big economic movers that affect the state: military, transportation of any kind, and the advent of China and India as powerhouses in the world economy. He stated he would like to discuss this in more detail at a future meeting.

MS. RICE asked whether a reconnaissance report has been done, specifically for Ingra/Gambell. MR. PAULSON stated the EIS has a 30% proposed design, so that is the reconnaissance design. That design is not necessarily, nor was it meant to be, the only design considered during the design period. This is a design/build projects and other designs might work. He thought the Ingra/ Gambell project is as far along as possible at this point. There is a proposed crossing and footing locations are identified. MS. RICE noted that at the last meeting there was mention that the EIS process had failed. Other things mentioned were that rail is being considered on the bridge. MR. NIEMIEC stated that generally the discussions are of many things and rail is one of those. KABATA does not believe a crossing should be built that does not allow future rail. KABATA is looking into the cost and what would be involved in design.

CHAIR WILBER noted that the TAC could continue this meeting to April 16 to discuss the LRTP and the TIP. MS. HEIL felt there were several items of discussion in relation to the LRTP, including who would be releasing the LRTP. (Sorry, but there was tremendous interference in the recording and I couldn't make out what she said.) CHAIR WILBER understood that the Policy Committee chair wants that body to be the one to release the amendment. He felt it was appropriate for this to be the process. MS. HEIL wanted it to be clear to the public that the decision on the LRTP amendment dealing with the KAC would be made at the Policy Committee level.

CHAIR WILBER asked for comment from the TAC whether to continue the LRTP discussion today or to continue the remaining discussion to April 16, 2009. MR. CARR preferred that the discussion be continued. He wanted the TAC to have a good technical reason as the basis for a recommendation to the Policy Committee. He believed there is still work to be done on this amendment. MS. HEIL preferred that discussion on the LRTP be continued,

in particular the discussion on fiscal constraint. She also wanted to at least begin the discussion on the criteria because much could be done in the next week on those in order for action to be taken. MS. EPSTEIN stated that the TIP criteria have been put to the end of the agenda at several meetings and have not had sufficient discussion, so she felt that discussion should not be done today, with the limited time remaining.

MR. LYON asked that the presenter on the annual air quality report for EPA be permitted to give that report today.

MS. WITT asked whether the LRTP amendment could be postponed for one month in order for the focus to be on the TIP criteria, which is time sensitive. She felt it would be difficult to finalize the discussion on the LRTP amendment to the point of making a recommendation to the Policy Committee by April 16.

CHAIR WILBER suggested that the TAC continue this meeting to April 16. At that meeting the first topic will be the TIP, and then the LRTP. He asked that the annual air quality report for EPA be presented at this time.

There being no objection, the motion passed unanimously.

c. Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) – Criteria and Project Nomination Forms

POSTPONED TO APRIL 16, 2009

6. INFORMATIONAL REPORTS (continued)

a. Public Transportation Route Changes

HEARD EARLIER

b. Annual Air Quality Report for EPA

MATT STICHICK with the municipal DHHS stated that the Department currently monitors for carbon monoxide (CO), PM-10 and PM-2.5 and this year lead monitoring and ozone monitoring will likely be added. He reviewed information on the earlier CO penetration study. He noted that CO is colorless, odorless, and poisonous and approximately 70% comes from automobiles. There are four CO monitoring stations in Anchorage and Eagle

River. It was surprising to learn in the study that concentrations of carbon monoxide are higher in older neighborhoods than in busy intersections. CO is produced when vehicle engines are cold and most is released before the vehicle leaves the driveway. After five minutes of operation, CO production is significantly reduced. Plugging in a vehicle helps substantially. Trends in concentrations, which are used for determination of compliance, show that the last violation of national standards was in 1996. Anchorage ranks in the upper 2% for CO concentrations nationally. Anchorage compares relatively well in terms of PM-10 and PM-2.5. PM-10 sources are primarily pulverized road materials and silt. PM-2.5 sources are primarily combustion products, such as wood smoke or vehicle exhaust. There are PM-10 monitoring stations in downtown, at Tudor Road, Airport Heights and Eagle River. Anchorage sometimes exceeds the EPA PM-10 concentrations during windstorms or due to volcanic activity. PM-2.5 increases do not occur as often, primarily due to wood smoke and during forest fires, but the standard has not been exceeded to date. PM-10 is highest during break-up and freeze-up. (I couldn't hear a word. That recording system is horrible!!) A substantial reduction in PM-10 in Eagle River was achieved as a result of paving. The effects of volcanic eruptions can last for years.

Nationally Anchorage ranks in the middle for PM-10 concentrations. Eagle River would have been lower had it not been for an exceptional event in December 2007. Anchorage is well within the yearly and four-hour average standards for PM-2.5 and ranks in the lower 2% nationally in this area.

Anchorage is involved in an ambient air toxics study for VOCs and PHs. Elevated concentrations of benzene are being seen. Anchorage ranked high in this area because gasoline is higher in benzene here than in other locations at two to ten times higher than what is typically found elsewhere in the nation. Current regulations allow benzene concentrations exceeding 5%; effective in 2011 a new regulation will limit that to an average of 1.3%. Anchorage is doing a baseline study to see the effectiveness of that 2011 regulation. There are higher concentrations indoors than outdoors, if the home has an attached garage. This is thought to be due to evaporative emissions and the high benzene content of gasoline. Indoor concentrations can be ten to twenty times the concentrations of outdoors.

MR. CARR asked if a strategy might be for everyone to have a garage. MR. STICHICK suggested that it is best to get gasoline out of the garage because evaporative emissions will come into the home. If there is the option of a detached garage, that makes sense from an indoor air quality standpoint. MR. CARR asked if a carbon footprint is required for plug-ins if people are being encouraged to plug in, noting that doing so uses electricity. MR. STICHICK stated that people are encouraged to plug in to reduce CO emissions. He supposed a carbon footprint benefit could be realized from that.

MR. NELSON stated he has noticed micro-climates in Girdwood and Anchorage. He asked whether it is possible to have monitoring stations in areas where a micro-climate may result in higher concentrations. MR. STICHICK replied that in the 1990s a CO saturation study was conducted where concentrations throughout the city were examined. The location of the monitoring station is based on highest exposure and greatest impact to the community. Maps of those locations are contained in the trend report and locations are listed in the report.

MS. PEASE asked why the benzene level in Anchorage gas is because of what is added. MR. STICHICK replied that it is because of what is being sold. MS. RICE stated the State has an exemption. MR. STICHICK replied that elsewhere in the nation it is .5% to 2% of volume.

d. Other Informational Items – None

5. BUSINESS ITEMS (continued)

d. Other Business Items (continued)

2) Quarterly Obligation Report

ANETA SYNAN stated that two projects need additional funding. An additional \$270,000 is needed for Huffman Road, Old Seward Highway to Pintail, including an extension that was made in the Administration Modification approved earlier in 2009. She noted that Project G-6, Old Glenn Highway, should be corrected to state an additional \$100,000 is needed to address additional design, utility coordination, stormwater concerns, and right-of-way support. This additional \$100,00 has been approved by staff. Under Transportation Enhancements, the Muldoon Road Landscaping and Pedestrian Improvement project, requires an additional \$300,000 for the

right-of-way phase. She noted that the amount of the obligation is within 4.2% of the budget.

KEVIN JACKSON, project manager, explained that \$300,000 is needed for Muldoon Road. There is \$150,000 for Phase 2 design funding. The increase need is \$1,140,000 for right-of-way while the estimate was \$850,000.

CINDY HEIL moved to approve the amendment for Muldoon Road. KIM RICE seconded.

There being no objection, the motion passed unanimously.

JENNIFER WITT moved to approve the amendment for Huffman Road. CINDY HEIL seconded.

CHAIR WILBER asked the status of this project in the municipal process. He understood the additional funding is needed to complete the design for final PS&E. MS. RICE stated that the portion from Old Seward to Lake Otis is in the right-of-way acquisition phase. A couple of weeks ago the Lake Otis/Pintail section was added, so design will now begin.

There being no objection, the motion passed unanimously.

6. INFORMATIONAL REPORTS (continued)

c. Air Quality Public & Business Awareness Education Campaign

MR. MORRIS noted that ADOT has some concerns that this project may not be eligible for planning money. He explained that a small amount of money in the block heater program that is used to purchase timers and about 600 timers are given away in the community. Surveys have shown that the plug-in rate among timer users is three times higher than the general populace. This campaign is typical of other public awareness campaigns that have small give-aways. He indicated that this program would not proceed if FHWA determines it is ineligible for the funding, but he asked for concurrence from the TAC that it is in the spirit of the public awareness campaign.

There were no objections to this give-away aspect of the program.

7. Scheduled AMATS Meetings

Technical Advisory Committee, April 16, 2009 *Continuation Meeting*

Policy Committee, April 23, 2009

Technical Advisory Committee, May 14, 2009

8. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was recessed at 4:40 PM