

**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**

**August 12, 2010  
2:30 p.m.**

Technical Advisory Committee members Present:

---

| Name            | Representing   |
|-----------------|--|
| Jennifer Witt   | Alaska Dept. of Transportation & Public Facilities (ADOT&PF), Central Region, Planning |
| Kim Rice        | ADOT, Central Region   |
| Cindy Heil      | Alaska Dept. of Environmental Conservation (ADEC)                                      |
| Steve Morris    | MOA/Dept. of Health & Human Services   |
| Todd Cowles     | MOA/Port of Anchorage  |
| Trygve Erickson | MOA/Traffic Department   |
| Jerry Weaver    | MOA/Planning Department  |
| Jerry Hansen    | MOA/Project Management & Engineering   |
| Jody Karcz      | MOA/Public Transportation Department   |
| Lois Epstein    | AMATS Air Quality Advisory Committee   |
| Bruce Carr      | Alaska Railroad Corporation  |

Also in attendance

---

| Name             | Representing   |
|------------------|--|
| Craig Lyon       | MOA/Traffic Department                                       |
| Vivian Underwood | MOA/TD   |
| Dave Post        | Alaska Dept. of Transportation & Public Facilities (ADOT&PF) |
| Bart Rudolph     | ADOT&PF  |
| Ron Martindale   | ADOT&PF  |
| Joel Ulring      | Golder Associates  |
| Walt Parker      | Citizen  |

**1. CALL TO ORDER**

CHAIR ERICKSON called the meeting to order at 2:35 p.m. All Technical Advisory Committee members were present. A quorum was established.

**2. PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT ANNOUNCEMENT**

CHAIR ERICKSON 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**

CHAIR ERICKSON moved to approve the agenda. *Hearing no objections, the agenda was approved unanimously.*

MR. LYON state the item was brought up previously the public involvement plan and required by Federal Transit Administration the program, of projects and some discussion with ARR and wanted to be included, have language back and would like to bring it up under other business. Believe FTA wants to show this in the Public Involvement Plan.

#### **4. APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES**

MS. WITT moved to approve the minutes of April 8, 2010. MR. MORRIS seconded.  
MS. KARCZ noted a minor correction to the text on page 4. Approved as revised.

#### **5. BUSINESS ITEMS**

##### **a. UPWP AMENDMENT – LRTP BUDGET**

MR. LYON noted with the consolidated LRTP we added \$200,000 for project mgmt work and update project cost needed to be changed. It's in the obligation plan and we need to reflect in the UPWP. 7<sup>th</sup> column, funds to AMATS, \$250,000 changed to \$450,000. MS. WITT asked between DOT and the City how much are we going to approve and is this a place to show that split. Intent is that because of a tight time schedule it will be done in house for both city and state as opposed to through the consultant. Will having it shown here make it difficult for us to do that? MR. LYON responded it would probably make more sense to it split out. MR. POST stated we it reduced down \$80,313 for DOT road estimates, \$40,000 for the City, \$65,000 for project mgr, \$3,500 Central Svcs, \$and 6,500 for DOT ICAP. MS. WITT asked staff to take the total that goes to DOT and move it over.

Staff will clean up for Policy Committee meeting.

MR. CARR move to accept. MR. HANSEN second. Approved with changes discussed.

##### **b. OPERATING AGREEMENT**

MR. LYON noted a number of changes to the agreement

- main change on pg 6, current Policy Committee allows for designees other members
- the 2 Assembly Members do not have designees and presents challenge in getting quorum. This allows for a standing alternate to be appointed for the Assembly
- page 8 related to reorganization at MOA. Department title changes and Division Directors instead of department heads.

MR. RUDOLPH noted pg 13, 8.1; FHWA will review as opposed to approve languages. WITT commented about the administration modification change because it was not made and is not one to one and turning into a minor amendment. MR. RUDOLPH stated 6.5.1 and 6.5.2 new regs preclude any new projects from being an administrative modification and new language is in line with the regulations, and it happened with definitions.

MS. WITT asked Craig it doesn't have to go to Assembly looks like it did before on pg 22. MR. LYON replied he wasn't able to find any specific language, when you amend it has to go through entire process and has to be re-signed. They are minor, it is not a redesignation of the MPO but it could go before them. Certainly it would make sense since we are talking about ability of Assembly to designate permanent alternates. There is no language that it would need to go to Assembly or re-signed. CHAIR ERICKSON asked to have the MOA Attorney comment on that. MR. HANSEN agreed that was a good idea.

MS. WITT noted page 23 looks like alternate language but is it a part of operating agreement? MR. RUDOLPH replied may have been left on from previous language. Delete that page per MR. LYON.

CHAIR ERICKSON noted we accept this document pending only a change as to whether concurrence of MOA Assembly required and signature, we'll have the attorney analyze both those topics and pending a required signature go from there.

MS. KARCZ asked if this change would constitute a redesignation. MR. LYON replied it does not. MS. KARCZ suggested a summary document of changes be prepared that would serve as an addendum that could be signed which may allow the allow the original Agreement to remain intact.

MR. HANSEN noted this seems to be a contract amendment. Original contract should be kept in tact as signed, and this is contract amendment #1 and should be signed by the new players, opening it up only the changes. MR. COWLES noted read #19; amendments are subject to approval of the Policy Committee. Those should be binding and if it needs to go before the Assembly is a matter of information.

MR. HANSEN commented possibly the original contract had to be signed by the Assembly might be as a resolution supporting this.

CHAIR ERICKSON stated we agree that all questions do require legal.

MR. CARR stated remember this is an agreement between state and local government. The role of the Policy Committee is to oversee this and section 19 is where this comes in. The two parties that should sign are the State of Alaska and the Municipality of Anchorage both original signatory signs it.

MR. COWLES noted further amendment maybe required and should be delineated in section 19 otherwise section 19 is not accurate. It says Policy Committee not the City or the State of Alaska and should read as such.

MR. CARR stated that's the law, local government and State of Alaska made the document. Whether Mayor is appropriate signature or has to get approval from the Assembly let attorneys solve it.

CHAIR ERICKSON asked should we approve this pending or bring it back.

MR. CARR asked Craig, freight advisory was a standing or just advisory committee what was resolution of that and should it be included in here. MR. LYON replied never an agreement that it should be included here. Not a bad idea. It is a standing advisory committee.

MS. KARCZ concurred with Mr. Hansen that there should be an addendum to the operating agreement and to our attorney for guidance. CHAIR ERICKSON asked should we move with amendments or return to staff and bring it back.

MS. EPSTEIN commented depending on timing what is going on bicycle/pedestrian advisory committee we should figure out if that goes in at same time. MR. LYON noted if we are still working on these changes, we can get the Policy Committee to approve. Don't know that we are in a hurry to get this done as it's already required by federal law.

**d. OTHER BUSINESS ITEMS - NONE**

MS. KARCZ requested a change to the Public Participation Plan (PPP). The PPP serves as the guiding document for public involvement. As the Public Transportation Department is using the TIP process to satisfy the public participation process requirement, we should add wording to that effect to the PPP. MS. KARCZ provided the suggested wording:

The Municipality of Anchorage's Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) process is used to satisfy the public participation process of the Program of Projects (POP) that is required in U.S.C. Section 5307. The POP as presented is the proposed Program of Projects and will also be the final Program of Projects unless amended.

MS. KARCZ moved to approve, MR. CARR seconded. APPROVED.

MR. CARR mentioned FTA is also looking for the electronic notice that the TIP was publicized. MR. LYON will look into.

**6. INFORMATION ITEMS**

**a. HIGHWAY SAFETY IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM (HSIP)**

MR. LYON explained the Highway Safety Improvement Program is federally funded and included in our TIP, and is not part of our allocation. AMATS does not decide priorities or ranking. Typically spot intersection improvements around town. Feds require that it be included in our program.

MR. MARTINDALE presented a two page document as a quick outline of the process. Is a Data driven program. Prioritized on high crash locations, amount of traffic... We have in the last 4 years state spent about \$100m, and probably up to 2/3 here in Anchorage. .67 to 70% of crashes in the state and 2/3 of those are in Anchorage.

MS. EPSTEIN asked on the crash data, does it break out vehicle to vehicle. MR. MARTINDALE replied if it is a reported crash either by police or by citizens. It can be vehicle to vehicle, vehicle pedestrian, or vehicle bicycle.

MS. EPSTEIN asked assesses higher priorities is it overall or are there categories.

MR. MARTINDALE noted it was a screening process and we look at last the 4 to 5 years of crash data. Pedestrians tend to be among the higher crashes. Years ago there weren't as many pedestrian crashes, not the case anymore. Pedestrian and bicycle crash and now looking at what caused it and what we can do. The number of projects we put in is in part to provide pedestrian refuge. We have been paying close attention and projects have fairly significant bicycle components to them.

He provided a map showing 35 projects either in design, being constructed or about to be constructed and estimates construction dates. This year we have \$18m and another \$10m we are hoping to obligate for large projects. Hard to project what happens in 2011 or 2012, currently we have another \$6 or \$7m for 2011. Another \$14m out through 2012 and that is without any new projects.

- Funding level has been about \$25m over the last several years.
- MOA has just about finished putting count down timers
- APD has noticed a reduction in red light running and helped pedestrians, since installation of timers.

Quick overview and handouts show what is going on and process we use.

MS EPSTEIN commented we talked a couple years ago about making this a format that public can see. MR. MARTINDALE stated until recently he assumed crash data was public information. We don't have the information; it's thrown into our database. The public can access the highway data board. It was going to house crash data and after discussing with others, decision was made not to include crash data. It can be requested but the decision is made at headquarters and administration level. If people are pulling up this data and come back to us, make interpretations, and people interpret data differently and fix issues. Not necessarily what is

going on and we use a number of fields. If we put it out there like that, and there was a concern, plaintiff attorneys pulling it up and using it.

MS. WITT appreciates the summary of the program. It doesn't address the near misses or perception that some places are not totally safe. This is data driven and each location has to be independently analyzed.

MR. MARTINDALE noted it's increasingly controversial because of what's proposed and people are unhappy about that. We do propose unranked project, if we see a pattern of crashes in a certain road we don't have to wait until one that looks right. 2 have crash 1 doesn't but nominated all 3.

MR. MORRIS asked what the major trends are going on. Are there more, fewer, different crashes over time or what?

MR. MARTINDALE stated through 2008 it took a long time to get it all in system. We have seen a drop every year but maybe because reporting of them has gone down. They started as manpower became an issue along with budgets, they handed driver's participant forms if damage was under \$2000 and no injury and said you have to do this. Police reported accident numbers are going down and self reported accidents are going up. There were 700 more crashes in 2008 than APD did the year before. Crash of the year tends, this year it is motorcycle. In 2007 it was inebriated pedestrians. As far as patterns,

- pedestrians
- right turning vehicles at traffic signals
- crashes during the permissive phase on a left turn
- lots of red light running, moving against the timing

We have all the Ped signals, LEDs, and everything up to snuff. Trends are predominantly driver based, behavior thing more than we can find. All those something are for us to address in a safety. Overall trend on senior crashes are down.

MS. WITT asked has there been a documented increase in distracted crashes, cell phones, etc. MR. MARTINDALE commented cell phones always come up. All agree if you are texting or reaching down to get your phone or distracted that is a problem, people believe that talking on them is the problem. That is comparable to being impaired. If that were true because legislature was trying to pass legislation, cell phone use up 500% and if using cell phone talking on it but crashes have been going down. Distraction is the general term, and we've always had all that in the system. We have unreliable cell phone data. Officer has to see them do it, and if they did is that what caused the crash? He is in a general distraction category and it not just cell phone, but anything that takes your eyes off road.

**b. AMATS FUNDS DISTRIBUTION**

MR. LYON noted this topic came up a couple years ago. Every other MPO like AMATS around the country uses a specific formula and this is how the breakdown is and how you get your funds, but AK and HI are exempted. In years past DOT headquarters in Juneau, statewide planning, and if you use federal formula than statewide plan then we would get a lot less money. See letter from Lance Wilber in 2009, several things pointed out that we don't agree with how we are doing it now. Single sheet shows criteria and allocation factors with percentages and weights. Trick part is the things we felt were important, should have the most weight, and benefit Anchorage have a smaller weight are only getting population weighting by 10%. Brought up for discussion purposes to see if we want to write another letter to state wide planning at DOT. STIP is out right now this is a good an opportunity. MR. RUDOLPH noted the next STIP is being developed now and is a good time to send letter like this. MS. WITT noted she doesn't see any recommendation on how those numbers are adjusted. Not to say we don't like what you are doing, and another to say here's what you should do.

MR. CARR noted couple generations ago we did. MS. RICE noted bottom of second page it says 28%. MR. LYON replied that is the overall amount, but doesn't say how should you weight population and should be looked at.

MR. CARR mentioned a couple years ago there was one we created that raised it 33% and recommended how state could get there. It probably was 2006 or 2007. 07. This is not the first time we have written a letter.

MR. LYON noted it's for information purposes because STIP is developing right now and good opportunity to make our case to suggest to statewide planning what the specifics are that might help us out when we look at population in Anchorage and see it is 50% and we're only getting 28%.

MS. WITT stated this is like a double whammy. Yes, AMATS should perhaps be happy with what it has in reality but compounded with another funding sources we have a shrinking pot of money to address.

MR. CARR asked have you calculated what we would get under federal program. MS. WITT stated around 12%.

MS. KAR CZ made a motion that staff go through and look at the calculations. MR. HANSEN second.

MS. EPSTEIN suggested now that we have ped/bicycle looks like sidewalks were not included in criteria at all. Friendly amendment to add bikes and peds. Accepted.

MS. WITT motioned to craft a proposal to the State that would look at securing additional funding for AMATS through their allocation and weighting criteria incorporating bike and ped plans. MR. HANSEN seconded.

MS. WITT stated it's not going to work, they have sidewalks and trails because we don't have the data specific to AMATS and Statewide to have to come up with this formula, and it is not going to happen, but we don't have the data to support it. MS. EPSTEIN you have to have some of the data because of the transportation uses...

MS. WITT commented you are aware of data that we don't collect or report on. We can make that a proposal but...

CHAIR ERICKSON stated nothing precludes staff from analyzing that and Lois could work with them if it is available, if not it shouldn't make a difference.

MR. CARR noted be careful for what you ask for if you think trails, don't really want to bring in statewide trails. CHAIR ERICKSON stated we are authorizing them to analyze this.

MS. WITT stated nominations are open to September 23 and staff could have something for next meeting.

MS. EPSTEIN asked nominations open but only for 2010 to 2013. MR. RUDOLPH replied correct. *Hearing no objections, it was approved unanimously.*

### c. PORT RESOLUTION

MR. COWLES commented Tiger II Discretionary Grant Program offered by U.S. DOT. Project we have identified that best meets criteria is completion of our barge berth facility, including dry barge berth and wet barge berth with roll on-off capability and also part of project would be extending the rail spur to the barge berth area to provide that intermodal connectivity. Emily Cotter in house project manager and Kim Stalder consultant assisting in grant writing process, and ISER group at UAA for benefit cost analysis and Scott Goldsmith is leading that effort. Preparing to do as we did with Tiger 1 project is presented to the Policy Committee a resolution asking for their support for that application and project. It's a \$30m project and we're asking Tiger for a contribution of about \$13m. Significant 60/40 split contribution from the Port.

CHAIR ERICKSON asked are you asking to pass a motion in support of this motion. MR. COWLES responded we are coming to the end of the application period and even now the Policy Committee can pass a resolution. We'd add a link in future from our application and is not a formal business item, but open to anything.

MR. LYON explained we had instances in past when TAC and Policy Committee have given the sense of an item that is not a business item. Minutes could discuss the committee was broadly in favor or opposed.

MS. EPSTEIN responded she was uncomfortable one way or another at this point.

MS. WITT asked is our intent to forward on to Policy Committee as a business item. Chair ERICKSON noted not taking formal action.

MS. STALDER responded for our purposes we do want to be able to provide a link to an AMATS resolution and our deadline is the 23<sup>rd</sup> and it would be helpful to get at least a sense of the committee is in support of the resolution.

MR. COWLES asked does anything preclude Port from presenting this at Policy Committee 2 weeks form now.

MR. LYON noted we can continue to next Thursday and have as business item. Poll membership or Port could have this as a business item in 2 weeks for action. They'll ask what TAC thinks.

MR. COWLES stated he supports project. MR. HANSEN too. MR. CARR too. MS. WITT replied and then add a link on the website. MS. RICE, MS. WITT no objection.

Information poll.

MR. MORRIS asked does this direct link to rail spur and preclude trucking going on now. MR. COWLES responded no, just one additional option. This simply gets rail to the barge berths at the far north part of the port. MR. CARR it opens the opportunity for the shipper to decide which mode to use. MR. COWLES noted no barge service at Port now so this is a new venture, and highly encouraged by tiger grant criteria so stimulating the economy by providing new barge berths at Port. Currently, there is no trucking associated with barge operations at the port and it won't interfere won't interfere with other operations.

CHAIR ERICKSON asked how about a resolution on the minutes and get a sense of the committee.

MS. EPSTEIN stated she was uncomfortable because the public doesn't know about it.

CHAIR ERICKSON asked was the committee opposed to doing a raise of hands of in support – okay.

MS. EPSTEIN suggested everyone who doesn't object based on what we know.

MR. CARR, MR. HANSEN, MR. COWLES, opposed none

MS. RICE, MS. EPSTEIN, MS. WITT abstained

MS. WITT commented she generally thought it was okay but ....

MS. STALDER explained the resolution that AMATS passed for Tiger 1 a year ago and it was supported by AMATS. This is a piece of what that original application was. We did not get funding for it. So there is actually Policy Committee support for this.

MR. COWLES stated he don't think we are really asking for anything from this body. MR. CARR supported. Sense of the committee only.

**d. OTHER INFORMATIONAL ITEMS**

MS. EPSTEIN noted last week she held with assistance from Jennifer a workshop with members from the public about transportation funding, very basic, to help people understand what the Muni and State goes thru, it was a brown bag.

MS. EPSTEIN commented she is switching her position. She is going to be working with the Arctic Society beginning next week and would like to stay on AMATS as a voluntary thing. The Mayor appointed her as member of Air Quality Advisory Committee.

MR. COWLES announced tours of the Port on Sunday and departing from railroad headquarters.

MR. HANSEN noted last week we opened Dr. Martin Luther King Jr Avenue over here. Excellent road, good looking road expected eventually to carry 20 to 30,000 people. MR. CARR stated good # of people where there. You see new crime lab, good access to Bicentennial Park, and sure has improved intersection at Tudor and Elmore and with the improvements at Lake Otis and Tudor improved this area a lot. Just opened bids for 48<sup>th</sup> Avenue off Lake Otis going over to Providence to replace 42<sup>nd</sup> as an arterial is not an official arterial off Lake Otis.

MR. MORRIS announced the EPA is looking at air quality standards again. Are going to take a look at carbon monoxide standards and finalize next year.

MS. EPSTEIN asked if it would affect the IM. MR. MORRIS stated they are in the consideration stage and would require a big reduction in what we have to do to meet the standards. Right now our design value 5 parts per million currently.

MS. WITT asked for status of LRTP getting advertised. MR. LYON replied almost through in purchasing and ready to put on the street.

**7. SCHEDULED AMATS MEETINGS**

Policy Committee, August 26, 2010

Technical Advisory Committee, September 9, 2010

**8. ADJOURNMENT**

The meeting adjourned at 3:56 p.m.