

**ANCHORAGE METROPOLITAN AREA TRANSPORTATION SOLUTIONS  
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING  
Planning & Development Center  
Main Conference Room, 1<sup>st</sup> Floor  
4700 Elmore Road  
Anchorage, Alaska**

**June 10, 2010  
1:00 p.m.**

Technical Advisory Committee members Present:

Name	Representing
Jennifer Witt	Alaska Dept. of Transportation & Public Facilities (ADOT), Central Region, Planning
Kim Rice	ADOT, Central Region
Cindy Heil	Alaska Dept. of Environmental Conservation
Todd Cowles	MOA/Port of Anchorage
Robert Kniefel	MOA/Traffic Department
Angela Chambers	MOA/Planning Department
Jerry Hansen	MOA/Project Management & Engineering

Also in attendance

Name	Representing
Craig Lyon	MOA/Traffic Department
Trygve Erickson	MOA/TD
Teresa Brewer	MOA/TD
Vivian Underwood	MOA/TD
Van Le	MOA/TD
Lori Schanche	MOA/Project Management & Engineering
David Post	Alaska Dept. of Transportation & Public Facilities (ADOT&PF)
Bart Rudolph	ADOT&PF
Gary Katsion	Kittelson & Associates

**1. CALL TO ORDER**

CHAIR KNIEFEL called the meeting to order at 2:36 p.m. Angela Chambers was sitting in for Jerry Weaver. A quorum was established.

**2. PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT ANNOUNCEMENT**

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

**3. APPROVAL OF AGENDA**

CINDY HEIL moved to approve the agenda. STEVE MORRIS seconded. *Hearing no objections, the agenda was approved unanimously.*

MR. COWLES at 2:38 arrival.

No objection approved as is.

**4. APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES - None**

**5. BUSINESS ITEMS**

**a. ANCHORAGE BICYCLE PLAN**

LORI SCHANCHE reported since the last meeting we met with Municipal Traffic Engineer and State Traffic Engineer and went through a number of issues and before you is a revised table. If there is a gray mark it was added or changed from the last meeting. CHAIR KNIEFEL asked her to start with the highlighted ones. MS. SCHANCHE comment 1 – whether use shall for bicycle improvements. The State Traffic Engineer Scott Thomas directed us to a memo from Governor Knowles and agreed to keep “shall” in. There are some instances in the bicycle plan where we’ve added clarification so if there is a project with a rut repair obviously can’t make the road wider to put bike lanes so it would be rut repair or emergency project and we would not be trying to change budget if tight.

Page 7, #46 from PZC recommended and we added 46r for explanation from our discussion with Mr. Kniefel and Mr. Thomas. Lane narrowing or shifting all bike lanes to require more extensive work than restriping. We don’t want people to expect us to come in Carte Blanc and fixing things as there are a lot of components involved.

- page 8, #51, changed needed to desirable
- few projects were added, 5<sup>th</sup> & 6<sup>th</sup> Avenue
- page 12, #83 added by PZC. There are some concerns with bicycles on routes with multi-lane roundabouts. She noted Mr. Thomas mentioned it would really stifle the bicycle network and wanted it to change to have more concerns for bicyclists.
- added by PZC. Difficult to figure out detours and how long a bicycle trip would take, so it was changed to nearest available alternative on the corridor. It makes sense to try and accommodate users on corridor rather than guess the timing.
- 86, pg 13, 86r. The original 86 talked about avoiding alternatives that were BCI of D to F. That’s something used as a planning tool and not something someone would have with them when figuring out routes. MS. SCHANCHE stated we were agreeable to that change
- 89, we missed taking of the last line - delete last sentence
- page 14, 93r, Rehabilitation, Reconstruction and New construction of bridges part was deleted in draft should stay in

- 94r fixes 94, on core routes we need to think about special consideration to improve routes
- page 15, last sentences - detours should consider nearest available alternative and striped to maintain a route on the corridor. This is the same as 85r
- 102 & 102r, rehabilitation and reconstruction (this doesn't include urgent overland rut repairs) just to clarify
- 104r, we don't want to mention sign names because they do change
- 105r, another roundabout one, design elements and improve safety based on effects measured and wasn't felt like we had specific
- 111 and 111r, another possible mistake is Title 9 is changing safety zone to pedestrian zone not sure how to say PZC add bikes. Reword to include non-motorized zone instead of safety zone. Or just say to consider changes to add bicycles. MS. WITT suggested it makes sense to her what Ms. Schanche wrote here.

MS. WITT thanked her for getting the pdf yesterday and helped allay concerns on shall. Only change suggest is removing #1, think there was some misunderstanding about our intent and use of shall and even as we do it at DOT. Precluded from doing so on a number of fronts and one side the Legislature, even though she has a better understanding and thinks we should move it forward to Policy Committee to eliminate that. There have been no formal revisions to that in operational policy and we look to fully implement projects to clarify the intent for accommodation of bicycles and pedestrians.

MS. RICE responded she to wants the Plan to go forward.

MS. WITT made a motion to accept the plan with all the changes as modified by MS. SCHANCHE except for #1. Seconded by MS. HEIL. CHAIR KNIEFEL noted on word shall, he thinks that discussion is more of the Policy Committee and let them take it forward to let them make a decision. MS. WITT responded she doesn't think there are issues about where it is. MR. MORRIS noted the only change Ms. Witt was omitting was to take comment #1 and leave the document as is. *Hearing no objections, the Anchorage Bicycle Plan was approved unanimously.*

**b. OTHER BUSINESS ITEMS - None**

**6. INFORMATION ITEMS**

**a. AMATS OPERATING AGREEMENT**

This is the agreement between DOT, State and not the Feds on how AMATS functions and the issues are changes in function and personnel how to maintain.

MR. LYON stated the main issue that comes up in the operating agreement is where it talks about how the members of the TAC are Directors of the Municipal departments. The

reorganization occurring in the Municipality is going to change two of those departments into divisions. Minor wordsmith thing with editing to be done. The chair of the TAC shall be the Director of Traffic. That might work out okay. If we can agree with minor changes we are probably good with that. If we have to do something substantive we may need to open up this whole agreement, and it was created before SAFETEA-LU and there are provisions we do not have to abide by because we are grandfathered. If we open it up we have to conform to SAFETEA-LU. If minor changes then we're good to go; about to not have Traffic and PM&E Departments and if we can agree on that then minor edits are okay.

MS. WITT asked if the reorganization, will it change members on the Committee such as you would have a subordinate boss relationship. MR. LYON explained Transportation Planning is moving to the Planning Department. Traffic and PM&E are moving under Public Works and MR. HANSEN and CHAIR KNIEFEL don't see there is a problem with subordinate.

MS. HEIL stated if it's the same number of people on and representing the same area of expertise it would just be an edit. Title is not as important as expertise.

MR. LYON noted currently the Director of Traffic has the traffic engineering division, transportation planning division and the communications division and that will change to Traffic Engineering Division with those still under them. It's going to change to a Traffic Division with traffic engineering group and Transportation Planning under Planning; I'm not sure where Communications will change to but Mr. Erickson might not even be sure if he knows. And the Traffic Engineer would be a Division Manager and the expertise still is there.

CHAIR KNIEFEL asked what the best way to accomplish that is, just do a letter to the Policy Committee says. MR. LYON confirmed the change from department to division that says this and the language saying the Traffic Director is the chair of the TAC leave that in. Change departments to division and we are probably okay. Some other language that talks about 3 year cycle on TIP and LRTP and those are now 4 years and could probably be done.

MS. WITT stated the other thing is the Major and Minor Amendments can be changed to administrative modification and Major Amendment and still remain functionally the same. She would suggest a letter to the Policy Committee just noting these changes with proper titles. Everyone concurred. Mr. Lyon will prepare letter and make changes and create a letter and pass it along.

MS. UNDERWOOD regarding approvals by FHWA for RFPs. MR. LYON noted the language in the operating agreement for any contract using federal funds we get approval from DOT and FHWA and we haven't, but we haven't always gotten that approval from FHWA prior to letting the contract. They are okay with us taking that out and taking out language that FHWA is required to sign off on. MS. RICE we're not required to do and as long as we let them know. FHWA cares about final report, not quarterly report. Not required by FHWA rules to sign off on

RFP but in operating agreement. CHAIR KNIEFEL agreed we should take that out. MS. WITT suggested we shouldn't take out the quarterly reports requirements though.

**b. STATUS UPDATE OF PORT, WATERWAYS and AVIATION**

MR. COWLES, the Port's Engineer presented. The most excitement at the Port is our expansion project. The Port, as a department of the Municipality, has an operating agreement with the U.S. Maritime Administration, a department of the U.S. DOT, to construct an expansion project that meets the forecast needs of the Port. The most important aspect is to replace the aging and deteriorating infrastructure. We are at our useful lifespan on the pile support loading docks and there is an urgent need to have a new facility. We put a lot of money into band-aid repairs of the existing facility and are not getting a lot of return on that investment. The other aspect of the project provides for future growth at the Port and that is a very good thing in terms for Anchorage, and the rest of Alaska.

75% of the State of Alaska's consumer goods come through Port of Anchorage. We serve the rail belt and also villages in western Alaska that receive cargo and fuel through the distribution network. We serve a very important role to the military as well. We look at ourselves as a project with statewide significance. We are moving existing tenants to the north and south so we can demolish existing dock facilities. We are using an earth fill system to build new land. Not as much progress last year as hoped, gray area to left on phasing plan, wet barge berth, north extension still have some sheet pile bulkhead to do this year. Then focus developing the uplands. We'll move Totem Ocean Trailer Express first with Horizon Lines following that. We are happy to announce that our dry barge berth is fully functional right now. We have a barge customer today and expect them to be there all summer and next summer with shipping quarry rock to construction projects on the Kenai Peninsula. Focus is on next 4 years and being able to move existing container customers into northern area. Weren't successful in getting Tiger 1 Stimulus Grant. We're working through plan, reevaluating long term focus and shift to south to be able to accommodate our POL and cement customers while we go through that phase.

Cruise ship calling on port now. In long term future hope to accommodate cruise ships at southern end and makes sense for passenger logistics getting them through security as soon as possible.

Summer tours starting back up June 27 to Aug 29 invite public meet at ARR headquarters bldg and we run buses every 30 minutes into port. 1 hour tour round trip with hot dogs served in the middle.

MS. WITT asked where cruise ships are coming in at your center place. MR. COWLES replied under blue where [the phasing plan] says demolition. MS. WITT asked what are the dry barge areas.

MR. COWLES replied they are a berth where a barge could sit dry during the low tide cycle whereas a wet barge berth is designed to be operational during the full tide cycle.

MS. SCHANCHE was involved few years ago in discussions regarding the mitigation efforts because all this work is in wetlands and her understanding is there was going to be something built down here and the trail would be extended to connect ship creek and the coastal trail. MR. COWLES responded he was not up to date on status of that. A Committee was formed to identify the potential mitigation projects in Ship Creek Area and extending coastal trail out around the marsh area up to the Ship Creek boat area, think it rose to top of project list. Falling in place, he think. The Corps of Engineers has work to do and engineer design has to take shape. The committee tasked with prioritization and identification of projects has culminated in the analysis. MR. COWLES stated he was not involved personally but think that is where they are at right now.

The aviation report was presented by MR. LYON. Main stuff is rehab on runways so that will not effect the ground transportation. Putting guard base back into airport there may be some commercial development on that far side of the airport. It may impact us at some point, but right now main focus rehabbing runway.

CHAIR KNIEFEL we have seen south air park, 3 modules that they are planning and seen a TIA on that. We requested a 20-30 year development plan. Airpark with taxi off runway and buildings around it for various providers and seen it through TIA review process and in final discussion on mitigation.

**c. STATE CAPITAL BUDGET**

MR. LYON handed out a project snap shot of budget. One of the requests to Juneau was matching program that would match with a state grant. We originally had \$26 million and legislation approved about \$24 million and after the Governor's veto, we got \$10 million. Where are we going to put it? Second page, if full funding not provided anticipate Anchorage priorities accelerated as a result would be provided below and it starts out with Anchorage Rut Repair but not positive they are in priority order, but they are in there. Money coming through Dept of Commerce grant coming to AMATS, not Municipality of Anchorage and DOT, so not sure exactly how that is happening and we need a discussion at some point on how we want to prioritize. Need to come together on what use \$10 million on. MS. WITT suggested it would be good for staff to get together, go through and come up with a recommendation. Some of these things it will make sense to use only Federal funds like Huffman Road and some like trails rehab it may make sense to use nothing but state funds on. And both pedestrian and bicycle plan both are in here and looking to staff for recommendation on percentage allocations and also to transit. MS. HEIL asked if there were some projects that were funded that weren't vetoed. MR. LYON responded this is something that was AMATS matching funds.

MS. HEIL asked if there was anything in the TIP and the review of the TIP amendment for realigning of stuff. MR. LYON replied he don't think so.

CHAIR KNIEFEL asked to have staff come back with recommendation on projects and money. MS. WITT suggested the expectation was the legislation expected things to move very quickly.

**d. OTHER INFORMATIONAL ITEMS**

MS. WITT noted this is Chair Kniefel's last Technical Committee. It was a pleasure of working with him 25 years ago when he came back to work with Municipality. We're going to miss you. Thank you. MR. HANSEN commented he's had the pleasure of knowing him longer than that.

**7. SCHEDULED AMATS MEETINGS**

Policy Committee, June 24, 2010

Technical Advisory Committee, July 8, 2010

**8. ADJOURNMENT**

The meeting adjourned at 3:18 p.m.