

**ANCHORAGE METROPOLITAN AREA TRANSPORTATION
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE**
Planning and Development Center
Main Conference Room, 1st Floor
Anchorage, Alaska

**May 28, 2009
8:00 AM**

This meeting was continued from May 21, 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
** Lance Wilber	MOA/Traffic Department
** Lois Epstein	MOA/AMATS CAQAC
** Bruce Carr	Alaska Railroad Corporation
Craig Lyon	MOA/TD
** Jerry Hansen	MOA/PM&E
** Jody Karcz	MOA/ Public Transportation Dept.
Sandra Cook	HDR Alaska
** Todd Cowles	MOA/Port of Anchorage
Suzanne Armstrong	MOA/Port of Anchorage

* AMATS Policy Committee members

** AMATS Technical Advisory Committee members

1. CALL TO ORDER

CHAIR WILBER called the meeting to order at 8:09. Mr. Nelson and Mr. Morris were absent. A quorum was established.

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. BRUCE CARR seconded.

CINDY HEIL moved to add the Policies & Procedures to the agenda as item 5.b. KIM RICE seconded.

There being no objection, the amendment passed unanimously.

There being no objection, the motion passed unanimously.

4. APPROVAL OF MINUTES – None

5. BUSINESS ITEMS

There was agreement to consider the Policies & Procedures before the TIP.

b. Policies & Procedures

MR. LYON noted a change to the Policies & Procedures (P&P) regarding the pavement replacement program in P&P No. 3. This change establishes a set-aside for Pavement Replacement at 20%-30% and changes the Road category to 40% to 50%. ADOT also recommended a change to P&P No. 4 regarding the NHS to clarify that there be an allocation of AMATS funding to the NHS. This language clarifies that the priority on the NHS is decided by ADOT, but it is permitted to be included in the Roadway portion of the TIP.

MS. HEIL asked if the trigger events should be revised. MR. LYON replied that they have functioned as intended and he did not believe any changes were needed.

MS. EPSTEIN did not understand the change to P&P No. 4 and asked how this would be implemented in the TIP tables. MR. LYON explained that AMATS has always been able to allocate its funding to Non-NHS, NHS or any of the roadways within its boundaries, but ADOT thought it would be wise to add language in the P&Ps indicating this is the case. MS. EPSTEIN clarified that this language does not change what is currently permissible or practiced.

MS. WITT added that the proposed P&P No. 4 change is consistent with the LRTP, which acknowledges this flexibility is needed between the NHS and Non-NHS because of the level of need on the NHS.

CINDY HEIL moved to forward a recommendation to the Policy Committee to adopt P&P Nos. 1 through 5. TODD COWLES seconded.

MS. WITT noted that on May 21 there was discussion in relation to the CMAQ Table 5 regarding primary control measures. She understood that these are shown on Table 5 as SIP-mandated projects and programs. MR. LYON indicated this is correct.

MS. HEIL noted that at the work session there was discussion of having something similar to the Pavement Replacement program for trails. CHAIR WILBER recalled the discussion, but did not recall direction to create such a program. MR. LYON and MS. RICE had the same recollection.

CHAIR WILBER recalled that the Policy Committee has an interest in programming 20%-30% in Pavement Replacement, but based on the draft TIP, the reality of delivering 30% of the program in Pavement Replacement is ambitious. He did not want to give guidance to Policy Committee that is not possible. He suggested an allocation of 15%-20% in Pavement Replacement for the current TIP and the balance added to the Roadway category. MR. LYON stated he has produced a TIP Table 3 that shows 20% in Pavement Replacement. When that is done, the grandfathered projects are moved out. CHAIR WILBER simply did not want to give the impression that 30% of the program can be delivered for rut repair. MS. WITT suggested coming back to the P&Ps after the TIP is finalized to see whether revisions are needed. She stated that under the proposed scenario, 40%-50% of the NHS is going to projects that improve capacity or safety, which is unreasonably low. She suggested building extra flexibility in CMAQ to be 5%-10% rather than 10%.

MS. RICE suggested adding another section how to implement these allocations, i.e. increasing Pavement Replacement over time and giving grandfathered projects priority for funding first.

There was agreement to table this item until a decision is made on the TIP.

a. Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) 2010-2013
MR. LYON noted that the TIP is not yet entirely balanced, but it is close.

Table 3: Roadway Improvements

Project G-6, Fireweed Lane is a new grandfathered project. There is no funding for this project during the first four years of the TIP, however.

The **Pavement Replacement** program totals 13% over the four-year life of the TIP.

Project 2, Spenard Road Rehabilitation has some funding.

Project 5, Safety Improvement Program, has funding as well.

MR. LYON reviewed a version of TIP Table 3 with 20% allocated to Pavement Replacement, which moves Project G-5, O'Malley Road Reconstruction out to 2013 for right-of-way and puts construction beyond the four-year period this TIP must be financially constrained.

MS. RICE noted that the amount in 2014 for O'Malley should be \$16 million.

MR. CARR understood there is not sufficient funding beyond grandfathered projects to increase Pavement Replacement to 20%. Therefore, increasing Pavement Replacement impacts grandfathered projects. MR. LYON confirmed this is the case. He noted that many of the grandfathered projects are high dollar amounts and they consume the AMATS allocation. CHAIR WILBER commented that the staff has shown 10% in Transportation Enhancements (TE) and 10% in Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality (CMAQ) and this is still the situation; putting 20% to Pavement Replacement affects grandfathered projects.

MR. CARR noted there is mention of economic stimulus funding under the Pavement Replacement program and asked where that is shown in the TIP. MR. LYON replied that it is not shown in this TIP. He was unsure where to reflect it except in the text. MR. CARR asked how to respond to the continuing issue of FTA thinking the TIP is a financial rather than a planning document. CHAIR WILBER asked if he had a suggestion. MR.

CARR left the solution to ADOT. MS. WITT recommended that for Roadway it could be highlighted, for instance under Old Glenn, the comment could state "supplements economic stimulus funds received for 2010 utilities and construction." For Pavement Replacement projects the text would state, "Funding supplements \$2.28 million in economic stimulus in 2010." MR. CARR explained there is an obligated grant for \$8 million for the Ship Creek improvements that will not all be spent in 2009, but will be carried to 2010; FTA will want that shown as a carry over.

MS. RICE asked if Project G-2, Huffman Road Reconstruction is an advance construct (A/C) or is it two different years. MS. WITT replied that it is an A/C. She suggested using arrows to the text saying the intent on Huffman is to have one construction project and that the money would be A/C from 2011 to 2010 as opposed to O'Malley Road and Eagle River Road where two separate projects can be done.

MS. RICE asked if O'Malley Road right-of-way is scheduled in 2012 and construction in 2013. MS. WITT stated that there is another A/C for right-of-way into 2011.

MS. WITT noted on the Table 3 showing a 20% allocation to Pavement Replacement the right-of-way phase for O'Malley Road could be shown in 2012.

CHAIR WILBER summarized that the changes to Table 3 would be: Project G-2, Huffman Road Reconstruction A/C from 2011 to 2010 and add text; Project G-4 Old Glenn Highway Reconstruction, add the text Ms. Witt suggested; Project G-5, O'Malley Road Reconstruction, A/C 2012 funds to 2011 to advance right-of-way; and in Pavement Replacement add language that the stimulus monies are supplementing the program.

MS. RICE noted that the note on Project 2, Dowling Road Extension says design funding, but that must be old language.

MR. CARR indicated that Project 10, C Street Construction Phase IV is now project "E" not project "G" on Table 8.

MS. EPSTEIN remarked that Project 1, Glen Highway to Seward Highway Connection Reconnaissance Study says additional NHS funding shown in Table 6, Project 7 and she looked and it is Project 2 on that table.

MS. WITT understood that the changes would apply to both versions of TIP Table 3. CHAIR WILBER indicated this is the case. MS. WITT stated on the 20% Pavement Replacement table it looks as though the right-of-way phase for Project G-5, O'Malley Road should be shown in 2012 rather than 2013.

MR. LYON suggested that both tables be shown to the Policy Committee, but he believed they would appreciate a recommendation from the TAC which to approve.

Table 4: Transportation Enhancements

MR. LYON noted there is no funding for Anchorage Areawide Trails Plan. The Bicycle Plan and Pedestrian Plan improvements scored highest in ranking and scoring of TE projects and both are shown with funding in 2013. Three new projects are shown as 6, 7 and 8, but there is no funding to begin them in the four-year TIP.

MR. CARR asked how Anchorage Areawide Trails is being treated. MR. LYON stated that funding is shown in 2015. The P&P requires that grandfathered projects be shown first, then the Areawide Trails Rehabilitation, and then new projects. The Areawide Trails Rehabilitation is a minimum \$1 million program. MR. CARR asked how funding can be shown for Projects 1 and 2 without showing funding in Areawide Trails Rehabilitation. MS. HEIL suggested that funding could be shown in Areawide Trails Rehabilitation, \$300,000 shown in Project 1, and \$300,000 shown in Project 2.

MS. WITT asked the status of the Areawide Trails Rehabilitation projects. MR. HANSEN stated that it has not been funded, but it should be fairly easy to begin that work.

MR. CARR asked if the suggestion is to include \$1 million in 2012 and \$1 million in 2013 for Areawide Trails Rehabilitation and then \$300,000 each in the Bicycle and the Pedestrian plans in 2013. MS. HEIL indicated this is her suggestion.

MS. EPSTEIN thought the language used for Pedestrian Plan project should be the same as for Bicycle Plan and not just focused on safety because portions of the Plan are not focused on safety, but rather would facilitate transportation. She wondered whether some of the funding for grandfathered projects could be moved into out years and additional funding put to the Bicycle Plan and Pedestrian Plan. She believed there was public interest in seeing funding to the Bicycle Plan and Pedestrian Plan. Some of that work could be funded by Stimulus money. MR. CARR explained that the grandfathered projects were put ahead of new trails in the P&P because if the current system is not maintained, it does no good to add to it. MS. EPSTEIN stated that the work is striping, not new trails. MR. CARR stated there was lengthy discussion to maintain existing trails and that is not done in this TIP. He felt the commitment to the existing trail system should be shown by putting funding in the Anchorage Areawide Trails Rehabilitation projects, and then putting money toward new trails projects. MS. EPSTEIN agreed with that, but also felt there should be funding for bicycle and pedestrian activities and projects. She asked whether grandfathered projects could be funded in later years in order to do that.

MS. WITT noted that the intent with Project G-1, Muldoon Road Landscaping and Pedestrian Improvements would be to A/C money into 2010. To begin implementing either the Areawide Trails Rehabilitation or the Bicycle Plan or Pedestrian Plan, there should be commitment of some design funding in 2010. That could be taken from Project G-1. She recommended showing funding for design under Areawide Trails Rehabilitation, as well as the Bicycle Plan and Pedestrian Plan, with that funding taken from the \$3 million showing in 2010 for Project G-1. MR. HANSEN suggested allocating \$100,000 for design in each of the Areawide Trails Rehabilitation, the Bicycle Plan, and the Pedestrian Plan.

MS. HEIL noted that Project G-1 has been on three TIPs and asked if taking \$300,000 from that project would be problematic. MS. WITT stated the costs shown in 2010 and 2011 are inflated 4% per year. This project is in the design and right-of-way phase, so she did not believe reducing the funding would be problematic.

MS. COOK stated the Areawide Trails Rehabilitation is important, it is not just striping. Some of the conditions of the trails are very dangerous where roots have grown up through the trail surface, there are frost heaves, etc.

MS. EPSTEIN agreed with Ms. Witt's suggestion. She asked if it would be possible to revisit this next year to determine if more funding is needed. CHAIR WILBER replied in the affirmative.

MS. WITT noted that Project G-1, Muldoon Road Landscaping and Pedestrian Improvements, and Project G-3, Glenn Highway Trail Rehabilitation are both State facilities and the State would provide the match. Any time money is showing for municipal projects, a local match is required. Problems arise when P&R bonds are not approved for match. MR. HANSEN did not think \$300,000 to Areawide Trails Rehabilitation, the Bicycle Plan, and the Pedestrian Plan would be an issue; some money has been coming from the State Legislature for pedestrian improvements.

CHAIR WILBER summarized the changes to Table 4: Project G-1, Muldoon Road Landscaping and Pedestrian Improvements A/C funds from 2011 to 2010; reduce the funding for Project G-1 in 2010 by \$300,000 and identify \$100,000 each in Areawide Trails Rehabilitation, the Bicycle Plan, and the Pedestrian Plan in 2010, add a description about Bicycle Plan improvements, and take out the word "safety". He suggested in 2013 putting \$850,000 each in Areawide Trails Rehabilitation, the Bicycle Plan, and the Pedestrian Plan, which equals nearly 10%. He also suggested that Projects 5-8 be removed from the TIP, as there is no funding for them.

MS. HEIL noted that it takes a major amendment to put a project in the TIP, so even if there is no funding for Projects 5-8, there is the flexibility to put money into those projects if they are included in this table. CHAIR WILBER understood this is the case, but noted that Projects 6-8 will not receive funding in this TIP and seeing it in the TIP could be misleading.

MR. CARR noted that Table 8 is an illustrative table and asked if there is value to moving these projects to that table in the event funding becomes available.

MS. HEIL asked that dollar amounts be shown for these projects, even if they are in out years or in Table 8 so that if funding is available at the end of a year, it could be put toward one of them.

MS. KARCZ asked if there was a large difference in ranking between Projects 5 and 6 because if they did not rank well, she could see Projects 6-8 being removed. She suggested that Project 6, 20th Avenue Pedestrian Improvements could conceivably be included in the Pedestrian Plan improvements. She understood Ms. Heil's comments, but thought it could be problematic to include these projects in the TIP, if funding is very doubtful.

MR. LYON explained that Project 8, Potter Section House is within a stimulus funding package from DNR. Project 7, Maplewood Access to Chester Creek Trail is in the Pedestrian Plan and 20th Avenue is not in the Pedestrian Plan, rather it was nominated by a community council. There is a scoring difference between Projects 5 and 6. He suggested leaving Projects 4 and 5 in the table because some work has been done, while Projects 6-8 have had no work. If there is funding at the end of the year, it could easily be put into Areawide Trails Rehabilitation or Bicycle Plan or Pedestrian Plan.

MR. HANSEN asked the location of the 20th Avenue improvements. MR. LYON explained that this is a section of 20th Avenue near East High. HANSEN thought these improvements could be included in a road project.

MS. RICE suggested that the description of the Areawide Trails Rehabilitation include projects, such as is done with the Pavement Replacement program.

MS. WITT thought Project 1, Bicycle Plan Improvements and Project 2, Pedestrian Plan Improvements should include a description and types of projects. Ultimately, if those projects develop, a table to show the possible improvements would be helpful.

MR. HANSEN departed at 8:57 AM

MS. SYNAN stated that Project 8, Potter Section House had a very low score of 50 points. Project 7, Maplewood was next highest at 95 points. Project 2, Bicycle Plan and Project, Pedestrian Plan got 151 out of 160 points.

CHAIR WILBER summarized the changes to the table: Project G-1, Muldoon Road Landscaping and Pedestrian Improvements A/C funds from 2011 to 2010; reduce the funding for Project G-1 in 2010 by \$300,000 and identify \$100,000 each in Areawide Trails Rehabilitation, the Bicycle Plan, and the Pedestrian Plan in 2010, add a description about Bicycle Plan improvements, and take out the word “safety” (Ms. Epstein to work with Mr. Lyon on final wording); add \$850,000 each in Areawide Trails Rehabilitation, the Bicycle Plan, and the Pedestrian Plan in 2013; look at Project 6, 20th Avenue Pedestrian Improvements to see if there are local funds and add Project 7, Maplewood Access to Chester Creek Trail into the Pedestrian Plan.; add funding in out years for projects that remain.

MS. KARCZ asked if Projects 7 and 8 would be deleted and Mr. Lyon would see if additional funding is available for Project 6. MS. WITT agreed that Projects 6-8 should be deleted.

MS. WITT added that in Projects 1 and 2 and Areawide Trails Rehabilitation the funding in 2010 is for design.

CHAIR WILBER noted there is 13% TE programmed in 2010, 2011 and 2012.

Table 5: Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality

MR. LYON the first two projects are SIP-mandated Projects and Programs. Studies & Plans Project 2, Anchorage Regional ITS Architecture Update, is a software update. Under Programs, the first project is dust control, which scored highly and improves that task. The second project is Traffic Control Signalization, and the third is the Transit Stop Enhancement Program. Under Projects, the first project is Transit Fleet Expansion/Replacement and the remaining funding goes to Transit Centers/Facilities. This makes the program balance at 10% over the four-year TIP.

MS. KARCZ asked that the narrative for Project 3 under Projects be changed to delete all language from “funding in 2007...”

MR. CARR asked who at the MOA and ADOT are contacts for the ITS project. The ARRC has research and development funds for a project to try some new luminescent advance warning at crossings that failed, so now the

ARRC will do advance warnings electronically. CHAIR WILBER suggested that he contact Ms. Ms. Underwood at the MOA and Jill Sullivan at ADOT headquarters. MR. CARR asked that ARRC be considered when crossings are considered.

MS. KARCZ noted that for both Projects 3 and 4 under Projects, the amounts in 2013 and 2012 need to be reversed. Money will not be needed in 2015.

In response to a request to explain the Arterial Roadway Dust Control project under Programs, MS. HEIL explained that several years ago Anchorage was having problems with dust in the spring, so measures were put in place to clean the streets earlier. Water cannot be used during freeze/thaw cycles, so magnesium chloride (MgC12) is used to suppress the dust while sweeping. This is a proactive measure to ensure no violation of PM-10 standards in the spring.

MS. WITT asked if \$6 million is needed to complete the transit fleet replacement. MS. KARCZ replied in the affirmative. MS. WITT asked if funding can only come from this funding source or is there another FTA source or national discretionary funding. MS. KARCZ replied that there are other funds, but there is a high level of competition and Anchorage has not been successful applying for them. Anchorage will apply, but has not been successful in the past. MS. WITT asked if the funding in 2010 and 2011 is for buses. MS. KARCZ explained that buses are \$365,000 each. She had requested \$3 million in 2010 and \$3 million in 2011, but Mr. Lyon balanced the program. She stated a funding request would also be put to the State Legislature. She stated about one bus a year will be purchased with FTA dollars. CHAIR WILBER asked if buses could be bought in 2010 and, if so, would it be appropriate to A/C funding from 2011. MS. KARCZ replied in the affirmative. Because the 2009 CMAQ funding is available it would be best to do a large purchase in 2011.

MS. WITT asked what is the amount of funding between ridesharing and transit marketing. MS. KARCZ replied that \$200,000 is for marketing and the majority is rideshare.

Table 6: National Highway System

MR. LYON stated these are NHS projects.

MR. CARR asked if Project 3, Glenn Highway Rut Repair is Stimulus money. MS. WITT replied that it might be; this table is illustrative at this point. She suggested adding to the text in red "May be advanced with Economic Stimulus funds" and it might actually be completed in 2009.

MS. WITT commented that Project 6, Glenn Highway Lighting should indicate that \$12 million of the \$15 million is Economic Stimulus funding. She stated that Project 4, Glenn Highway/Muldoon Road interchange improvements should be deleted, as it is duplicative of Project 5.

MS. KARCZ asked if the project phasing plan for Project 5 should say 2013 is P/E. MS. WITT replied in the affirmative. MS. KARCZ recalled that Mr. Nelson was concerned with the types of lighting in Project 6. She asked if that has been resolved. CHAIR WILBER replied in the negative. MS. WITT stated that is a Stimulus project. She indicated that ADOT staff is available to discuss how ADOT does lighting. MS. KARCZ asked that this presentation be scheduled within the next month.

MS. EPSTEIN noted that the FTA is now part of Project 2, Highway to Highway Connection (H2H) and perhaps the text should be changed to reflect that. MS. KARCZ agreed that narrative should be changed to indicate this is the case. CHAIR WILBER suggested using the language of the purpose and need statement. MS. WITT remarked that what is reflected in 2010 is existing State funding, which should be indicated in the text. Until the financing plan for H2H is available, there is likely not to be additional STIP funding shown in 2010 through 2013. There are over \$750 million in construction projects underway with the prospect of declining federal funds; there is a question how to reasonably and responsibly advance those projects without other funding sources.

MS. KARCZ asked whether State funding should ever be shown in the TIP. She suggested it be shown in the narrative, not in the funding columns. MS. WITT agreed.

CHAIR WILBER summarized the changes: revise the text for Project 2 to reflect the draft purpose and need statement for H2H and reflect \$10 million in 2010 is existing State funding, not new funds; insert in the text for Project 3 insert “may be advanced with Economic Stimulus funds”; delete Project 4; edit Project 5 to show programming in 2013 with P/E; add to the text for Project 6 that \$12 million is Economic Stimulus funding. MS. KARCZ added to change the \$15 million shown in 2010 to \$3 million and MS. WITT suggested adding to the text “supplements \$12 million in Economic Stimulus funds.”

Table 7: Transit Program Funding

MR. LYON explained that the first chart is FTA money for the MOA. The ARRC project phasing information needs to be updated. MR. CARR noted that Project t is finished and will be removed. The status of Project o, the passenger maintenance facility, is still uncertain. The text for Project p, the Ship Creek Intermodal Facility should perhaps say that Economic Stimulus funding would supplement. MS. HEIL asked if the \$8 million would build phase 1 or the entire project. MR. CARR stated it is phase 2 of a 5-phase project and will fix mechanical, upgrade electrical, and rehabilitate the exterior of the facility. The total project cost is \$60 million and \$25 million has been spent to date to improve the tracks.

MR. LYON stated that Projects u-x are reflective of Table 5 and FTA says it is fine to not show them in this table as well, so they will be deleted.

MR. LYON noted that for some reason these projects have letters rather than numbers and he would change their designations to numbers. He would do the same for Table 8.

MS. KARCZ asked to reference at the bottom of Table 7 that transit CMAQ projects are on Table 5 and in Table 5 say “for additional transit projects see Table 7.”

MS. WITT asked how Table 7, Projects d and m relate to Table 5, Project 2, the transit stop enhancement program. MS. KARCZ stated these are totally different projects. She noted that Project m is an ARRC project. Project d is heavy construction. It is very similar to what PM&E does; each project goes out for bid. The CMAQ project is what had typically been the youth crew.

MS. KARCZ asked to add a Project j entitled “transit replacement” because one or two buses will be purchased out of one of the FTA funding sources. The text for this item could say, “supplements buses shown on Table 5.” The funding amount is approximately \$240,000.

MS. KARCZ stated the State Transit Office has asked AMATS to rank and list the Human Services Transportation as 5310 funding. MS. WITT felt it was beneficial to add this into this table.

CHAIR WILBER summarized the changes: add 5310 funding to the bottom of the table; add Project i, transit fleet and Project k Human Services Transportation with a description; existing Project k on the second page of this table, change the phasing with guidance from Mr. Carr; add text on Project p to say it is phase 2 of 5 phases and noting the amount of Stimulus funds this supplements; delete Project t; and delete Projects u-x.

Table 8: Other Federal, State, and Local Funded Projects within AMATS Area

MR. LYON stated this table contains updated information on the Port. The phasing on Project C, Knik Arm Crossing Access Connection and Project D, Knik Arm Crossing Toll financed Bridge Facilities were also updated. He stated he would double-check the dollar amount of those projects. He stated he would change the letter designations of projects to numbers.

MS. HEIL suggested including Project M, Providence Hospital Public Access Road and Project N, Construction & Road Improvements at APU in the air quality conformity determination. MR. LYON believed they are not far enough along for that analysis. CHAIR WILBER added that they are local access streets. MS. HEIL suggested taking out the language, if this is the case.

MR. CARR asked if half of Project G, Ship Creek Improvements is completed. MR. LYON stated he has not updated the phasing and funding on these projects because ADOT tracks them. MR. CARR thought that Project H, Ship Creek Improvements is completed. MR. LYON indicated he would follow up on this. MR. CARR asked regarding Project M what is left to do on Piper Street. MS. WITT believed that earmark had been renamed and the money

was put to something else. She said she would work with Mr. Lyon to correct this table. MR. CARR asked to change Project B, Rail Extensions to reduce 2010 through 2012 to \$1 million per year and add \$1 million in 2013.

MS. EPSTEIN asked if anything is remaining in Project F, Kincaid Park Trail Connection. MR. LYON offered to double check all the projects in this table to be sure it is up to date. MS. EPSTEIN noted that Project W is the Glenn Highway hightower lighting that was discussed earlier. MS. WITT stated this would be checked. MS. EPSTEIN asked why the Port is shown twice. MR. COWLES explained this follows the precedent established with other projects using State General Funds. The Port has questioned whether it is necessary to list any of the State GF funds on this table, when others do not.

MS. EPSTEIN stated regarding Projects C and D that there is new FHWA analysis she received on Friday that significantly increases the numbers of phase 1 and phase 2. She asked if phase 2 is included in this chart. MS. WITT had not seen the report referenced by Ms. Epstein. She stated that the numbers are taken from what ADOT Headquarters had for the TIP. MS. EPSTEIN stated the LRTP includes phase 2. She noted that the numbers are \$1.5 billion with a 90% probability and in the out years the numbers are very high. CHAIR WILBER indicated he would forward a copy of the report to Mr. Lyon to send to all TAC members. MS. EPSTEIN stated that the issue of the lack of a firm finance plan has been discussed, similar to the H2H, and maybe it should be treated similar to the H2H where \$0 was shown in future years until there is some certainty. CHAIR WILBER noted there are unspent FHWA funds for Project C and those should be reflected in this table. He asked that KABATA ensure that the total dollar amount remaining in the FHWA account is not more than what is shown in this table. MS. WITT explained that the figures in these tables came from Headquarters and they received it from KABATA.

MS. KARCZ thought a large portion of this table was to identify earmarks that had already been given and, with the new authorization, the dollar amounts for years 2011, 2012 and 2013 have not been done. She thought there should not be an earmark unless the MPO knows it is being requested. She felt this should be expanded to show who is asking for earmarks and what are they; and the out years probably should not show funding.

MR. COWLES noted that the funding in Project S, Intermodal Parking Facility at the Port of Anchorage should be \$0 in years 2011, 2012 and 2013.

MS. WITT asked what is the status of Project Q, Dimond Center Intermodal Parking Facility. MS. KARCZ replied that project has \$3 million in funding at this time. FTA has asked for a feasibility study/implementation plan that will go on the streets next week. That work will analyze the need for an intermodal facility at this location and what is a phased approach to developing one. She was hesitant to show out year funding for this project without knowing what it would be. MS. WITT suggested that the dollar amounts for all earmark appropriations should be shown as carry over and funding should be taken out of 2010-2013. MR. CARR noted concern that FTA wants to see a financing plan for the carry over funds and conceivably they could say nothing is shown in the 2010-2013 TIP.

MS. WITT stated Project U, East Dowling Extension and Reconstruction would need updated language.

Table 9: National Highway System and Non-NHS Improvements

CHAIR WILBER noted that this table is illustrative. MR. LYON stated Project 1, Whittier Maintenance and Operations has existed and the others have been there in some form, but the phasing and dollar amounts are updated.

MR. CARR noted a typographical error in Project 3 to correct the spelling of Potter Marsh.

MS. KARCZ asked how NHS or federal dollars could be used for operations of a tunnel in Project 1. MS. WITT stated there is some provision that allows for these types of facilities to be operated using capital dollars. MS. KARCZ felt it would be helpful for AMATS to know how a project can use capital funding for operations. MS. RICE stated there is a funding category that allows for operations on the NHS. MS. KARCZ wondered whether operations of buses would be an eligible expense.

MS. WITT noted that the \$32 million in the out years for Project 4, Seward Highway is State General Funds for construction of Windy Corner. She offered to provide an update on this project to Mr. Lyon.

Table 10: Pavement Replacement Program

MR. LYON explained that this table is the list of projects in the Pavement Replacement program shown in Table 3.

MS. WITT suggested the title state “Non-NHS Pavement Replacement Program.” She suggested removing the priority column to allow for flexibility to do projects as funding and readiness permits. MR. LYON suggested stating the numbers do not denote priority order, but leave them for reference.

CHAIR WILBER asked whether DeBarr could be done in two pieces: DeBarr to Boniface and Boniface to 15th Avenue. MS. RICE indicated this is possible. MS. HEIL suggested sectioning the project.

MS. WITT suggested that the Pavement Replacement item in Table 3 indicate that some of the 2010 funding would start design for some of these projects and, if needed, to supplement the Stimulus money in order to ensure that all of Jewel Lake is done from Dimond Boulevard to 63rd Avenue.

MS. SYNAN explained that Project 9, Birch Road is O’Malley to Lore. MS. RICE noted it would be either Abbott or Huffman because Birch does not connect to Lore.

MS. RICE asked why none of the city bond projects are shown in the TIP. CHAIR WILBER explained that in the past the TIP was more than tables and included those bonds. Additional information on bond funds being spent in 2010 to 2013 can be provided in the final TIP. The Policy Committee will have that information. MS. RICE noted that the tables include GF but not GO or local bonds. MS. EPSTEIN agreed with this comment.

MR. CARR asked what is the deadline to provide information to Mr. Lyon. MR. LYON indicated the tables must be prepared for the Policy Committee meeting on June 2, 2009.

JODY KARCZ moved to forward the TIP Tables 1 through 10 as revised to the Policy Committee for adoption. CINDY HEIL seconded.

JENNIFER WITT suggested sending both of the Table 3 drafts forward to the Policy Committee and recommend the 20% Pavement Replacement program allocation and use the two tables to demonstrate the impact of that allocation. MR. LYON offered to include the 20% table in the total TIP and show the other separately. *This was accepted as a friendly amendment.*

MR. CARR suggested that the TAC carefully consider whether it believes the 20% allocation is appropriate for the city.

MR. COWLES noted that there is still a motion on P&P 3 on the floor. He asked if the TAC would be adopting a motion on the TIP that dictates what would be done on P&P 3.

MS. HEIL suggested recommending the 15%-20% allocation for Pavement Replacement with language to try to increase it over time. She thought with this TIP the amount should be lower. She preferred the 13%-15% allocation to the 20% allocation.

MS. WITT noted that the TIP with a 20% allocation to Pavement Replacement does that at the expense of other Roadway projects and there has not been discussion of whether there might be flexibility in TE and CMAQ. She agreed to the 15%-20% allocation for Pavement Replacement, but thought there should be discussion of the percentage dedicated to CMAQ and TE, especially since there will no longer be a set aside for CMAQ from the State and AMATS is in maintenance status.

MS. WITT withdrew her suggested amendment.

MS. EPSTEIN felt it was sensible to have taken the Pavement Replacement percentage from Roadways and that is in line with maintaining existing infrastructure before promoting new infrastructure.

There being no objection, the motion passed unanimously.

The motion on the Policies & Procedures was back before the TAC to forward a recommendation to the Policy Committee to adopt P&P Nos. 1 through 5.

CINDY HEIL moved to amend to modify the Pavement Replacement figure to 15%-20%. JODY KARCZ seconded. CHAIR WILBER suggested that the balance be added to the Roadway program. *This was accepted as a friendly amendment.*

The amendment passed with Mr. Carr objecting

JENNIFER WITT moved to amend to change the CMAQ allocation from 10% to a range of 5%-10%. BRUCE CARR seconded.

MS. WITT felt this change would be prudent, given the demonstrated needs to maintain the existing system and to move forward with construction projects. It also reflects that AMATS is in a maintenance status for air quality and recognizes there will be no additional CMAQ allocation from the State.

MS. HEIL stated that AMATS has been proactive in this area and 10% is not much to maintain air quality; the projects are intended to help maintain basic minimum air quality. MS. KARCZ concurred with this comment. She noted that this allocation decision was made long ago and, while funding has changed, the AMATS CMAQ portion was significantly higher in the past and the total funding was more than 10%.

CHAIR WILBER also did not support the motion, feeling that 10% is a small amount and there is significant benefit from the expenditure.

MS. WITT withdrew her amendment.

JENNIFER WITT moved to amend to change the allocation for TE to 10%-15%. BRUCE CARR seconded.

MS. HEIL stated that TE has been kept at a lower amount for this TIP, so she did not object to the motion.

MS. EPSTEIN felt this area has been under funded for years.

MS. WITT noted that the community continues to vote to not support bond funds to do TE, which provide 10% match to federal dollars. She noted that this is a difficult funding source to implement these projects.

MS. EPSTEIN felt there was a mixed record on voting for municipal bonds. MS. HEIL stated that for years many bonds have failed.

MS. KARCZ did not support the motion, feeling that the existing allocation of 10%-20% is an appropriate range, although the total has not reached 20%.

CHAIR WILBER supported the motion, but favored an allocation of 10%-20% if the remaining was targeted toward trail pavement preservation. Because this is a draft TIP, he supported the change to a 10%-15% allocation. He was sensitive to the inability to match federal funds.

The amendment passed with Ms. Epstein and Ms. Karcz objecting

MS. WITT noted that the total Roads percentage would be 55%-65% with this change in TE to 10%-15% and in Pavement Replacement to 15%-20%.

There being no objection, the main motion passed unanimously.

c. Other Business Items – None

6. INFORMATIONAL REPORTS – None

7. Scheduled AMATS Meetings

Policy Committee, June 2, 2009

Technical Advisory Committee, June 11, 2009

MS. HEIL asked that the CO Maintenance Plan be put first on the Policy Committee's June 2, 2009 agenda.

CHAIR WILBER introduced Jill Graves who will begin providing recording services for AMATS in July.

MS. WITT noted she had provided a “time traps” table because any project that is 10 years or older is subject to action by FHWA. Problematic projects are Eklutna River Bridge, Abbott Road Rehab, and Fireweed Lane. These projects are not funded in the TIP.

MS. EPSTEIN believed it is possible to ask for extensions. MS. WITT explained that mechanism is possible if a project is founded in an out year, but none of these projects are funded in out years. MS. RICE explained that if the project is not progressing, it is problematic.

8. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 10:18 AM