

**ANCHORAGE METROPOLITAN AREA TRANSPORTATION
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Mayor's Conference Room, 8th Floor
632 West 6th Avenue
Anchorage, Alaska**

**April 16, 2009
2:30 PM**

This meeting was continued from April 9, 2009

Those in attendance were:

<u>NAME</u>	<u>REPRESENTING</u>
** Jennifer Witt	ADOT, Central Region, Planning
** Kim Rice	ADOT, Central Region
Aneta Synan	ADOT
** Cindy Heil	Alaska Department of Environmental Conservation
** Steve Morris	MOA/Department of Health and Human Services
** Todd Cowles	MOA/Port of Anchorage
** Lois Epstein	MOA/CAQAC
** Jerry Hansen	MOA/PM&E
Jim Lamson	MOA/PM&E
** Lance Wilber	MOA/Traffic Department
Craig Lyon	MOA/TD
Vivian Underwood	MOA/TD
Teresa Brewer	MOA/TD
** Jody Karcz	MOA/ Public Transportation Dept.
Sandra Cook	HDR Alaska
Robert Shipley	Self
Walter Parker	Anchorage Citizens Coalition
Joann Mitchell	USKH
Don Hunter	Anchorage Daily News
Kevin Hemenway	KABATA
Bill Greene	KABATA
Andrew Niemeic	KABATA
Mary Ann Pease	KABATA
Stephanie Kessler	Government Hill Community Council
Susanne DiPietro	Self

* AMATS Policy Committee members

** AMATS Technical Advisory Committee members

1. CALL TO ORDER

CHAIR WILBER called the meeting to order at 2:35 PM.

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

TOM NELSON moved for approval of the agenda. CINDY HEIL seconded.

There being no objection, the motion passed unanimously

4. APPROVAL OF MINUTES – None

5. BUSINESS ITEMS

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

MR. LYON stated the nomination forms and criteria were put out for public review on February 5, 2009 and the Planning and Zoning Commission made comment on March 9, 2009. He referenced a spreadsheet containing comments from the Planning and Zoning Commission, from the Freight Advisory Committee, and from Ms. Epstein. Those with which staff has agreement are highlighted in yellow on that sheet. He stated that he provided tracked changes to the Roadway and Transportation Enhancement (TE) criteria and a memorandum outlining the three Air Quality Advisory Committee (AQAC) suggested changes to the Congestion Mitigation Air Quality (CMAQ) criteria.

MR. LYON first remarked on a general comment by Ms. Epstein to initiate a peer review process to review the three scoring systems, following this TIP development. Staff agreed with this suggestion. These can be sent to several MPOs for their review and comment. Comment 2 was to add “long term

(induced traffic)” to the description in the “Reduces Congestion” criterion so there is a new highest level to measure induced traffic. Staff felt the existing wording was clear and recommended no change. Comment 3 was a suggestion by the Planning and Zoning Commission that safety issues around institutions (schools, assisted living facilities, etc) should be addressed so that projects affecting them would score higher. Staff felt this was considered in the existing criteria and that pedestrians are already considered in the HSIP program. Comment 4 is that language referring to “recent changes” might ignore long-standing issue. Staff felt this was considered in the existing criteria. Comment 5 was that the word “preserves” was used incorrectly and the suggestion was to use a word to emphasize conservation of the existing system.

CHAIR WILBER asked that Mr. Lyon only highlight those comments that staff concurred with and note those that staff felt require TAC comment.

MR. LYON next reviewed comment 12 related to the “Support of Project” criterion that point values for support should be reduced if fewer groups support the project: 6 points for only having two groups supporting would be changed to 3 points and 1 point if only one group supports; staff concurs. Comment 16 was to provide a large negative score if the project is not on an adopted plan; staff concurs. Comment 17 suggested changing “Roadway connectivity” to “connectivity”; staff concurs. Comment 23 was to reword “Funding Efficiency” to “Funding Availability” and to add a level when there are no matching funds; staff concurs. Comment 24 is to check the formula shown in “Cost/Benefit Value” as it should encourage probability of additional non-AMATS funding, not the pursuit of same; staff concurs. Comment 25 is to increase the negative score if a project does not make financial sense; staff suggests increasing the negative score to -5. Comment 30 is a criteria added at the Policy Committee level in 2004. The Planning and Zoning Commission commented on this criterion and staff has added some language on negatively impacting neighborhood integrity by promoting cut-through traffic, noise pollution, pedestrian barriers, etc.

MR. LYON noted that an overarching comment at the Planning and Zoning Commission and by Ms. Epstein is that the criteria utilized in Roadway and TE, and sometimes in CMAQ, have different point values. Staff’s original

response was that the funding sources for each is different and because they are not cross-scored, the points in each category were appropriate.

There were no public comments.

CHAIR WILBER asked for a motion on Roadways, followed by comment.

CINDY HEIL moved to recommend approval of the staff recommendations on the Roadway Criteria to the Policy Committee. BRUCE CARR seconded.

MR. MORRIS concurred with the Staff recommendations.

MS. EPSTEIN asked to discuss comments 2, 33, 34, and 35.

LOIS EPSTEIN moved to amend to adopt comment 2 to amend Roadway Criterion 1.a. to insert “long-term” after “Significant reduction of existing congestion, and...” STEVE MORRIS seconded.

MS. EPSTEIN understood that this was previously discussed and included. MR. LYON noted that the previous copy of the criteria had simply inserted all suggestions, but they were not adopted. MS. EPSTEIN stated that she believed induced traffic is something of concern. She felt that project decisions should take into account mitigating not only short-term, but also long-term, congestion.

MS. HEIL asked what this would mean in terms of scoring. MS. EPSTEIN gave the example that if the road extends into an area that is likely to be developed as a result of the road, it would induce long-term traffic. MS. WITT asked if an example would be the extension of C Street from Dimond to O'Malley. MS. EPSTEIN explained the primary reason for this criterion is to reduce sprawl.

MR. MORRIS noted that even amongst the TAC he could see debate about whether or not a project induces long-term traffic; he felt it was problematic to determine whether a project induces long-term traffic. MS. EPSTEIN believed that other MPOs do this. MR. LYON stated that he had reviewed the criteria used by eight other MPOs and did not find any similar criterion in his review. MS. EPSTEIN explained that the intended analysis is whether

connections are being developed that primarily benefit high-density population areas.

MR. NELSON noted that another category deals with that issue. He interprets this to mean that if a road is being built that connects two nodes in the system, it is different than extending to a node that is outside of the system. MS. HEIL stated that if the interpretation of this criterion is ambiguous, it is problematic. MS. WITT noted that it is difficult on a statewide basis to apply such a criterion because sometimes what is being done to reduce congestion has the unintended but real consequence of inducing development. She did not think she could apply it and did not favor the amendment.

MR. NELSON used the C Street extension from Dimond to O'Malley as an example and noted that, while that extension might induce traffic, it is also providing relief elsewhere.

MS. EPSTEIN explained her concern is to prevent sprawl. MS. WITT indicated it would be helpful to have a specific example of a project in the LRTP to which she would see this apply. MS. HEIL did not think that Anchorage could sprawl much because of physical constraints. MR. NELSON noted that there are roadways that dead-end, but there may be a need to upgrade them based on the growth in that area and the function of the road, such as Eagle River Road.

CHAIR WILBER understood Ms. Epstein's remark is that a project that addresses both short-term and long-term is a good project, where one that addresses only short-term is not as appealing.

The amendment FAILED with Nelson, Epstein and Wilber in favor

LOIS EPSTEIN moved to amend to add a new criteria to evaluate projects for how much they increase greenhouse gas (GHG) production using vehicle miles traveled (VMT) and that AMATS undertake a comprehensive review of the scoring systems to ensure GHG emissions are reduced over time, normalized for population growth, through transportation project selection. KIM RICE seconded.

MS. EPSTEIN explained that this criterion would be used to evaluate projects for increases or reductions of GHG. A percentage can be chosen as a measure for points awarded. MR. MORRIS stated that transportation modelers could anticipate VMT growth based on the transportation network, so there is a way to measure how a particular project might affect VMT. MR. LYON explained that the staff comment was related to measurement of GHG, not VMT. MR. MORRIS felt that VMT is a good surrogate for GHG. MS. RICE stated that she attended a course specifically about VMT given by FHWA with a panel discussion with representatives from EPA, someone from Atlanta Georgia who did this, and with the exception of one individual they said that VMT is an assumption of an assumption and mathematically it is boundary based and insensitive, so trying to measure GHG using VMT is not a good idea.

MR. CARR stated the information he has reviewed is that VMT appears to be a reasonable surrogate until the composition of the fleet is examined. The variable of alternative fuel vehicles being brought into the fleet has to be considered.

MS. WITT stated that VMT is national data that is collected and ADOT does that for Central Region. There is good data on large roads, but the majority of VMT on local roads is not captured. There is not a good way to estimate traffic on local roads. Using this as a criterion puts credence into a measure that is meant for larger facilities and its applicability to smaller projects is difficult and subjective. In addition, GHG is the subject of national debate and it is likely that AMATS and other MPOs will have to find ways to address it.

MR. MORRIS noted that the model is limited and does not take into account induced growth, rather it assumes that the demand for travel is the same regardless of the network. The model does not assume that a person would take a trip they would not normally do under congested conditions, so there is an argument that there is a plausible way to measure impact using VMT. MS. RICE noted that the people scoring the projects would not have that information. MS. EPSTEIN felt that many criteria are imperfect and tough to score.

CHAIR WILBER agreed with Ms. Witt's comments that this is an issue that AMATS and other MPOs will need to deal with in the future. It is a difficult measure at a project level, but a necessity at a planning level.

MS. EPSTEIN *withdrew her amendment.*

LOIS EPSTEIN moved to add a new criterion to link land use and transportation projects by scoring based on promotion of projects in high density areas as defined by the Anchorage Bowl Comprehensive Plan. TOM NELSON seconded.

MS. EPSTEIN felt this is not covered in the existing criteria because the population served by a large project may be a large number, but it does not necessarily cover the high density/high employment areas. She felt there should be new language that explicitly incorporates the Comprehensive Plan into decisions.

MR. NELSON stated that this is an area of concern. The issue of connectivity is fundamentally important and he would give criterion 9 a higher score than 10 points. He felt it is important that if a project is clearly identified in an adopted plan, it should be given high priority. He also wished to link the criteria to the policy map of *Anchorage 2020* and the *Eagle River-Chugiak Comprehensive Plan*. Relative to Criteria 8, he noted that the Anchorage Comprehensive Plan is more than *Anchorage 2020*, it is all of the elements, including the LRTP, OS&HP and other plans. There are specific policies in the *Anchorage 2020* and the *Eagle River-Chugiak Comprehensive Plan* that he wanted to use as guidance to ranking the TIP criteria. He wished to amend to up the point value and add a criterion referencing the two comprehensive plan maps. MS. EPSTEIN felt it was appropriate to link the policy maps to the criteria.

MS. HEIL asked whether Criterion 9 could be changed to add a description of the two comprehensive plan maps, which would address Ms. Epstein's concern and avoid having another criteria. *This was accepted as a friendly amendment.*

MS. WITT asked if the Comprehensive Plan policy maps are consistent with the LRTP. MR. NELSON replied in the affirmative. Based on this statement, MS. WITT supported the amendment.

There being no objection, the amendment passed unanimously

TOM NELSON moved to amend Criterion 9.a to increase the point value to 20 points. JERRY HANSEN seconded.

MS. WITT asked if this change would have a disproportionate impact on the scoring of projects. MR. LYON noted that this suggestion is to double the points in this criterion, but the Comprehensive Plan is the guide to these decisions. MR. NELSON indicated that the points for 9.b, 9.c and 9.d would be increased proportionately. MS. WITT asked if projects like repaving would then be non-competitive, or is the intent to have a pavement preservation funding allocation. CHAIR WILBER explained that using this criterion, of two pavement projects, the one that favors connecting Downtown to Midtown, for example, would score higher.

MR. NELSON amended his motion to increase the point value for Criterion 9.a to 15. *This was accepted as a friendly amendment.*

MR. COWLES noted that a project would score 25 on Criteria 8 and 9 combined, and questioned whether there is a need to increase the point value for Criterion 9. MR. NELSON explained that he was attempting to avoid redundancy. He favored either increasing the point value for this criterion or for Criterion 8, "Consistency with Adopted Plan."

MS. EPSTEIN suggested that the language in this amendment is clearer than changing Criterion 8.

The amendment PASSED with Witt and Cowles objecting

LOIS EPSTEIN moved to amend to add a new criterion to provide points for projects that do not impact hydrologic integrity and which include safe wildlife crossings. She wanted a criterion that would encourage proposals that incorporate design and costs that would minimize impacts on wildlife,

such as bridges rather than culverts. She disagreed with staff that this is covered through the NEPA process. JERRY HANSEN seconded.

MR. NELSON asked if a project should specifically indicate how this is addressed. MS. EPSTEIN replied in the affirmative. She noted that a project might have five water crossings and only one requires a bridge, but that should be part of the evaluation.

MR. CARR noted that new planning regulations require more environmental discussion and planning, but because most projects have a federal component, the federal agency would discuss and address about mitigation. He was reluctant to have a pre-selection of projects based on something that will be the purview of the federal agency.

MR. HANSEN did not know how someone scoring a project would be able to identify these issues because many times while a project is in a NEPA process the approach can change and be very different than what was assumed. MS. RICE stated that if there is a Corps of Engineers requirement, the NEPA process is required, so there is no way to avoid NEPA if there is water or wildlife passage. She thought the projects that would be affected by this are mostly those that would not be scored through this process.

MS. EPSTEIN noted that for her it is easy to compare a project with several water crossings to one with none. The purpose of the criterion is to encourage projects that are the most protective in terms of wildlife design and routing strategies.

MS. WITT did not support the amendment primarily because to establish in a project scope an assumption that a road would include features to accommodate wildlife is more detail than is typically reviewed in addressing transportation need. Including those assumptions could put a project out of the running financially.

CHAIR WILBER did not favor a new criterion, but agreed that issues of hydrology and safe wildlife crossings are important issues and are related to quality of life.

The amendment FAILED with Epstein in favor

MS. RICE supported comment #1, but suggested waiting until the new federal process is in place before implementing initiation of a peer review process of the three scoring systems. MR. CARR noted that the new authorization might take two to three years. CHAIR WILBER remarked that the next set of review criteria would be available to undergo this peer review.

MS. KARCOZ had no changes primarily because of her involvement in one of the largest ranking processes at ADOT, which took three to four hours and was not an exact science. She was not sure the new criteria are better than the previous criteria. She noted that, even with the criteria, reviewers have to look at the list to see if a project makes sense.

MR. CARR saw no difference between Criterion 7, "Support of Project" and Criterion 8 "Consistency with Adopted Plan." He noted that all of the parties mentioned in Criterion 7 would have been contacted through the process associated with an adopted plan. He wished to move to delete Criterion 7. CHAIR WILBER agreed that there would not be a project on the list that is not in an adopted plan. When nominations are sought, there may be two projects in the same area, one nominated by the community council and an Assembly member and the other by both of those and others. The project with the greater support would score higher. MR. CARR asked how "some support from community council" would be scored against "mixed support from community council" in Criterion 7. MR. LYON explained that the criterion is not only support from the community council, but from others as well. MR. CARR remarked that one project might have two groups that represent only 10 people while the other has one group that represents the entire community council, which should score higher. MR. LYON responded that the staff that score these projects generally have that information. MR. CARR commented that the criteria tell the public one thing, while the actual scoring involves something else.

TOM NELSON moved to amend to reduce the total point value of Criterion 4 "Economic Benefits" from 20 to 15 to match Criterion 6 "Improves Quality of Life" and adjust the points of the Criterion 4 elements. JERRY HANSEN seconded.

CHAIR WILBER supported the amendment noting that it is difficult to measure economic benefit in comparison with Criterion 5 “Population Served” and Criterion 6 “Improves Quality of Life.”

The amendment PASSED with Rice, Morris, Carr, and Cowles objecting

TOM NELSON moved to amend Criterion 4.f to read, “Project adversely affecting neighborhoods to the benefit of commercial development or freight mobility.” CINDY HEIL seconded.

MR. NELSON explained that if a new project will have the significant impact of fragmenting the neighborhood, or if a truck route is run through an area, resulting in an adverse impact, it should receive a negative value.

CHAIR WILBER asked what was the Planning and Zoning Commission remarks relative to comment 7 that Criterion 4 “Economic Benefit” is biased toward projects that benefit commercial development. MR. LYON stated that the discussion is as Mr. Nelson has said.

MR. NELSON stated there is a recognition that economic benefit is a viable criterion, but not at the expense of neighborhoods.

MR. MORRIS suggested increasing the negative score under Criterion 6.f instead.

MS. RICE noted that C Street was an economic development/freight project and, while it enhanced economic development, it split the neighborhood.

MR. CARR believed that the issue is covered in Criteria 6 “Improves Quality of Life” and Criterion 15 “Neighborhood Integrity.” He stated that he would remove Criterion 4.f “Adversely affects economic development or freight mobility” entirely. He did not understand why a project would be proposed for economic benefit that adversely affects economic development. He remarked that a project might be necessary, but would affect a neighborhood that is located in its path.

MR. NELSON withdrew his amendment.

MR. NELSON felt there was redundancy between Criterion 5 “Population Served” and Criterion 11 “Functional Class in OS&HP” since the basis for population served is ADT and the functional classifications are determined by ADT. He suggested that Criterion 5.a could be 40,000 ADT (freeway), 20,000 ADT (arterials), etc. MS. HEIL noted that Criterion 11 is somewhat different because it looks at a project as an integral part of the network where Criterion 5 measures benefit. MR. NELSON felt the result is the same and essentially the criteria are the same.

TOM NELSON moved to amend to delete Criterion 11 and include language in Criterion 5 to indicate the categories of roadway by population in parenthesis after the AADT count. JERRY HANSEN seconded.

MR. CARR asked if the elements of Criterion 5 would be reduced from six to four. MR. NELSON replied that the lower AADT would simply be local roads.

MR. MORRIS felt that there are arterials with greater than 40,000 ADT and, therefore, facility types should not be included in the criterion. *This was accepted as a friendly amendment.*

MR. MORRIS noted that by removing a criterion, there are fewer points available. MR. NELSON moved to amend his motion to begin Criterion 5.a with 20 points. *This was accepted as a friendly amendment.*

There being no objection, the amendment PASSED unanimously

MR. NELSON agreed with Planning and Zoning Commissioner Phelps regarding Criterion 8 that if a project is not on an adopted plan, it should not be considered, but it is difficult to consider weighing one plan over another. There are different functional plans that are elements of the Anchorage Comprehensive Plan. The criterion seems to imply that some elements or plans are more important than others. He felt that not being in an adopted plan should score -25, not -3. He moved to amend to delete Criteria 8.a-e and simply assign -25 points if a project is not in an adopted plan. JENNIFER WITT seconded.

MS. HEIL noted that this criterion gives more weight to short-range projects and less to longer-term plans.

MR. CARR did not support the amendment because there may be an instance of a project that is nominated outside of a plan, but that has tremendous benefit and sensibility. In addition, if a project is shown as long-term, but funding becomes available, he felt it should not be penalized. He felt a single score for being in a plan is appropriate.

MR. HANSEN thought that if a project is not in a plan, perhaps it should receive -10 points, but did not agree with -25 points.

MS. EPSTEIN noted that plans are snapshots in time and other projects might come forward that are worthwhile and should be funded.

MR. NELSON suggested amending the amendment to change the point value of Criterion 8.f to -10 rather than -3. This was accepted as a friendly amendment.

The amendment FAILED with Cowles, Witt, Heil, Carrs, Karcz, Rice, and Morris objecting

MS. WITT had concern that, as the TAC balances preservation of the existing system with addressing safety, capacity, congestion, quality of life and the other criteria, the only place preservation of the system scores well is "Preserves Existing Facility." She cautioned the TAC that, especially as it addresses the Policies & Procedures, it keep this in mind. Unless preservation of the existing system is weighted high, it often does not compete well. She noted that this body controls the program that is, at this point, the sole source of funding for DOT to repair roads. She had concern that pavement replacement may be jeopardized without raising Criterion 3 to 25 points. MS. RICE suggested that the total score for Criterion 12 "Operation and Maintenance Budget Impact" could be raised. MR. COWLES noted that a project in the existing system would receive a high score on Criterion 16 "Project Certainty." MS. WITT concurred.

There being no objection, the main motion PASSED unanimously, as amended

CHAIR WILBER noted that there was one-half hour remaining in the meeting time. He asked if the TAC could meet next Thursday morning. Mr. Hansen and Mr. Nelson indicated they would be out of town. Ms. Witt and Ms. Heil suggested that perhaps someone could fill in for those members.

MS. HEIL asked if the Policies & Procedures could be released for public comment in order to conform to the schedule.

MS. EPSTEIN noted the recreation and trails conference is next Thursday. She preferred to have the LRTP discussion today and the criteria discussion next week as a courtesy to individuals attending today's meeting for the LRTP discussion.

MS. WITT stated it is critical to get the criteria finalized and to the Policy Committee. She questioned whether final action could be taken today on the LRTP. MR. CARR agreed that more time is needed to discuss the LRTP.

CHAIR WILBER asked for a motion on the Policies & Procedures, that public comment is then allowed on the LRTP amendment regarding the Knik Arm Crossing, and then the TAC return to its discussion of the criteria.

CINDY HEIL moved to release Policies & Procedures 1-5 begin for 30-day public comment with the start of the period to begin with posting on the web.
KARCZ seconded.

MR. LYON noted that the only change in the Policies & Procedures is the flexible TE percentage allocation, which changed some time ago.

There being no objection, the motion PASSED unanimously.

b. LRTP Amendment Memo: Knik Arm Crossing

CHAIR WILBER explained there has been a work session discussing staff's preparation of the LRTP Amendment to remove the Knik Arm Crossing (KAC), new planning requirements that must be addressed, and a new financial plan for the entire LRTP. There was a presentation at the TAC meeting on April 9, 2009. Staff is working on an internal draft review to see how requirements are being met. The Policy Committee has directed the TAC

to prepare an amendment to remove the KAC based on new assumptions and new information. Staff has identified issues raised through the planning process and what has occurred since the LRTP was amended. The target is for the Policy Committee to release an amendment on April 23, 2009. He asked for public comment.

STEPHANIE KESSLER, member of the Government Hill Community Council, referenced her past testimony in regard to the presence of the KAC in the LRTP. She emphasized that Phase 2 of the KAC was not included the RFP that KABATA let for the public/private financing; the RFP was only Phase 1. The financial constraints for the KAC and LRTP state that there will be no additional Federal or State funding for the KAC. There is inconsistency with that constraint and removal of the Phase 2 from the RFP. The current financial situation and the ability to get public/private financing makes this project questionable from a financial point of view. The building of the bridge is a bad idea for many reasons, and particularly that Phase 1 would dump traffic into downtown Anchorage. The traffic projections are very optimistic. Phase 1 alone is a damaging proposition and without any hope of building Phase 2, the project is not sensible.

MS. EPSTEIN asked what is included in Phase 2. MS. KESSLER replied that Phase 2 is to bring the access route through Government Hill to C Street at 3rd Avenue across the Ship Creek railroad yard to connect to the Highway-to-Highway project through another viaduct across Ship Creek. MS. EPSTEIN believed these references were to chapter 12 items E and B.

MR. NELSON asked what was included in the RFP. WILLIAM GREENE emphasized that there was a draft RFP that is not authorized for release and it has not been issued; there is little chance it will be issued in the near-term. The RFP Ms. Kessler refers to does not include Ingra/Gambell but there is a written agreement between KABATA and DOT that it will be built at KABATA's expense.

ANDREW NIEMEIC stated that KABATA came prepared to react to what the TAC proposes and he wondered what is the plan to continue this discussion. CHAIR WILBER explained that the TAC plans to continue the TIP criteria discussion today and it is possible that the Policy Committee will not have an LRTP recommendation from the TAC. MR. GREENE asked if the

TAC would have another meeting to discuss this topic. CHAIR WILBER stated this would be decided at the end of this meeting.

SUSANNE DiPIETRO asked whether it could be possible to release the draft to the public so they know what is being discussed and considered. CHAIR WILBER explained that typically the TAC does not release a draft that they do not feel is technically sound and that is the case at this point in time. The TAC wants to be sure the document is accurate. MS. DiPIETRO understood there were no comments from the TAC. CHAIR WILBER stated that some members have had concerns and those have been voiced at the work session and the April 9, 2009 TAC meeting. MS. DiPIETRO urged the TAC to move the process along as expediently as possible. CHAIR WILBER stated that the issue is not technical accuracy, rather it is whether or not the information in the amendment is relevant to be issued in an amendment.

5. BUSINESS ITEMS

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

MR. LYON reviewed the CMAQ criteria noting that Staff agreed with all three suggestions from the AQAC.

CINDY HEIL moved to recommend approval of the CMAQ Criteria to the Policy Committee. JERRY HANSEN seconded.

There being no objection, the motion PASSED unanimously.

MR. LYON reviewed changes to the TE criteria to which staff agreed. He noted that Criterion 1.a should show 15 points. Comment 38 is that the “size of Area Served” and “Preservation of the Existing System” should be split into two criteria; staff concurred.

MR. LYON noted that Ms. Epstein suggested three new criteria that are the same as those she suggested in the Roadway criteria with which staff did not agree. Comment 39 speaks to the “Pedestrian Potential Index” in the Pedestrian Plan and that there may be something similar in the Bike Plan that could be used. He talked to the Non-Motorized Transportation

Coordinator Lori Schanche and she said there is not. Comment 40 is that the “Economic Benefit” criteria could be combined with the “Cost Benefit” criteria and staff felt they should be kept separate. Comment 43 was that a project should get points if it is a viable alternative to vehicle travel and staff felt is addressed in other criteria. Staff did not agree with comment 48 to give a higher point value for “Connectivity”. Comment 50 was simply a comment with no recommended change.

CINDY HEIL moved to recommend to Policy Committee the staff recommendations. TOM NELSON seconded.

MR. CARR noted there are inconsistencies between the language for the same criterion in Roadway and TE and asked that they be consistent. MS. KARCZ noted that the projects are different. MR. CARR explained his intent is to change the language for criteria such as “Consistency with Adopted Plans” so the reference is to the Comprehensive Plan. MS. EPSTEIN noted there are elements of bike improvements that are roadway related, so she felt that making this change is not the best policy decision. MR. CARR felt that if plans are going to be listed, that language should be consistent. MR. COWLES suggested just saying “Comprehensive Plan,” since all plans are elements of that document.

MR. NELSON stated he reviewed the changes made to the Roadway criteria and found that the point values were proportionately the same.

MR. GREENE stated there is one Comprehensive Plan for the MOA and within it are many other plans, so when there is reference to the Comprehensive Plan his experience is that people only go to *Anchorage 2020* and do not understand that and other plans are components of the Comprehensive Plan.

There being no objection, the motion PASSED unanimously.

CHAIR WILBER offered to make comment to the Policy Committee at its April 23, 2009 meeting regarding the TAC’s work to date on the LRTP Amendment to remove the KAC, given that it seemed the TAC will be unable to meet before the next Policy Committee meeting.

- c. Other Business Items – None**

- 6. INFORMATIONAL REPORTS – None**

- 7. Scheduled AMATS Meetings**
Policy Committee, April 23, 2009
Technical Advisory Committee, May 14, 2009

- 8. ADJOURNMENT**

The meeting was adjourned at 4:37 PM