

**ANCHORAGE METROPOLITAN AREA TRANSPORTATION SOLUTIONS  
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING**

**Planning and Development Center  
Main Conference Room  
4700 Elmore Road  
Anchorage, Alaska**

**December 02, 2010  
2:30 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 (ADEC)
Todd Cowles	MOA/Port of Anchorage (POA)
Steve Morris	MOA/Dept. of Health & Human Services
Trygve Erickson	MOA/Traffic Department (TD)
Jerry Weaver	MOA/Planning Department (PD)
Jody Karcz	MOA/Public Transportation Department (PTD)
Lois Epstein	AMATS Air Quality Advisory Committee
Bruce Carr	Alaska Railroad Corporation (ARRC)

Also in attendance

---

Name	Representing
Craig Lyon	MOA/TD
Van Le	MOA/TD
Lori Schanche	MOA/Project Mgmt & Engineering
Alton Staff	MOA/PTD
John Tolley	Highway to Highway
Mark Parmelee	AOD&PF
Anne Brooks	Brooks and Associates
John Tolley	MOA/H2H representative
Lora Reinhold	Trails
Cindy Heil*	ADEC
Bart Rudolph	ADOT&PF
Jennifer Witt*	ADOT&PF
Gary Katsion	Kittelsohn & Associates
Loran Frazier	Knik Arm Bridge and Toll Authority (KABATA)

**1. CALL TO ORDER**

CHAIR ERICKSON called the meeting to order at 2:36 p.m. All Technical Advisory Committee members were present with the exception of Mr. Hansen who was absent. A quorum was established.

**2. PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT ANNOUNCEMENT** MR. LYON 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. BRUCE CARR seconded.

*Hearing no objections, the agenda was approved unanimously.*

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

**5. BUSINESS ITEMS**

**a. 2011 UNIFIED PLANNING WORK PROGRAM**

MR. LYON explained this was adopted previously and asking for approval of the UPWP budget. It's the same dollar amount for several years and a few changes with moving monies around and is the same as the 2010 budget. The difference from the previous year was \$120,000 in the LRTP, Task 130. We beefed that up a bit as we'll be doing a lot of work there. The certification of the planning process, which is Task 140 we had more money in it last year because we had the triennial certification. We expect the feds will come up in the first quarter and tell us how we did. 200 Element we moved monies around, we finished the bike plan, areawide trails has more than last year because we didn't quite get some stuff done and there is more work is needed this year, we added \$25,000 more. Some other plans like the others Mid Town Plan more last year, but efforts by Muni on Title 21 slowing down our effort on other projects and we're not expecting to get much done this year.

MR. LYON noted that Freight Mobility is up a little bit more from last year as we guessed at how much we'd need. We have a very active freight committee and so we put a little bit more to match what was spent last year. The rest of the tasks are about the same as last year. Again, we adopted 2010-2011 UPWP in November 2009 with the 2010 budget. This is 2011 budget. There are changes to the Transit section but will wait for Ms. Karcz. It's not what we are asking you to approve today. We are asking for approval of the FHWA PL funds, the \$840,138, which is what we utilize for the AMATS staff. The Transit items are further out in the spreadsheet and the feds want us to reflect the FTA, FHWA money.

MS. WITT noted that although this amendment dealt with changes to and other public transportation that need to be changed Ms. Karcz requested the consistency between them stated there were no footnotes on the one posted and they need to be added back in with overhead rate, etc. She asked to change footnote 2 and add footnote 5. DOT Central

Region pending estimates on based on information from prior year, just a minor change. Footnote 5 acknowledges the budget is based on assumption that the funding levels stay the same as FY10

Table 1 totals should read: Task 150 Transit Planning - \$383,982, Task 160 Transit Marketing - \$284,138, and Task 170 Rideshare - \$416,441. – Travel Options not have funding identified as there are carryover funds for the project. MS. EPSTEIN asked about the potential for Non-Motorized Transportation Advisory Committee. She asked about freight mobility wonder if the money was just for the committee work. MR. LYON noted it's mostly staff time. He briefly reviewed the committee activities. MS. EPSTEIN mentioned in near future if it creates the Non-Transportation Advisory Committee. It would not necessarily be that cost but there is something in the budget to cover it. MR. LYON noted this task has been in the UPWP for awhile. Normally when we do committee meeting we'll charge administration, which is Task 510. We had a Task 260 for Freight Mobility based on the Freight Mobility Study that was done in 2000 or 2001 so we kept the task and have been doing the work and charging to it. It could easily have been charged to 510 or 530.

MS. EPSTEIN asked what Task 230 is. MR. LYON responded in the UPWP that usually encompasses all the ped, bike and areawide trails plan. There hasn't been money there for a while if there is it could be a remnant of some previous plan. MS. EPSTEIN noted there was \$5000 there. That's the match replied MR. LYON.

MR. LYON replied 230, 231, 233, ped, bike, trails. Nothing in ped because it's already adopted and no funds in 230 as catch all. We could probably take that line out of there because it doesn't have any funding. This is funding for staff to do their work starting in January. The Muni pays staff time and each quarter we ask for reimbursement.

Mr. Morris arrived at 2:47 pm.

MR. CARR move to approve the 2011 Unified Planning Work Plan budget as presented. MS. HEIL seconded. *Hearing no objections, the motion was approved unanimously.*

MS. WITT noted footnotes that did not print out should be returned. Friendly amendment approved

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

MR. LYON stated changes from SAFETEA-LU from 3 to 4 years time frame, taking out major amendment and adding in administrative modification.

MR. RUDOLPH commented 2 changes made from the version online was section 2 wording changed from previous transportation legislation to what is in SAFETEA-LU

(pg 2) and throughout document changed major amendments to amendments. We have amendments and admin modifications consistent with regulations and what is in the Public Participation Plan.

MS. WITT noted pg 21, section 19, it talks about amendments and understands that Muni legal said PC can amend this, said amendments and subject to approval by the PC, FHWA and FTA. There is a statement missing as FHWA and FTA do not approve maybe stated with copies submitted too. Suggest we insert "by AMATS Policy Committee," with copies provided to FHWA and FTA.

MR. CARR asked doesn't state have to approve too? MS. WITT responded initial agreement was approved jointly by the State and City, the mayor and the governor and then state is part of the body. We're just talking about amendments.

MR. CARR noted section 23 should be changed too.

MS. WITT talked about not having this re-signed and have addenda and errata sheet approved and that would be my recommendation have them sign off on that the PC. MR. CARR mentioned he had some reluctance to change signatures as there were issues of state prior to trying to modify the components of PC. This doc is now 8 years old and don't see why State would be reluctant to update it. Why wouldn't we want to keep it up-to-date?? It is still going to reflect first day of October 2002. MS. WITT responded if we approach it as an amendment to be approved by the PC.

Ms. Karcz arrived at 2:54.

MS. WITT asked if AMATS signs and opens up to major overhaul if that is what body wants to do. MS. HEIL agreed with Ms. Witt that approving with errata sheet is appropriate.

MR. COWLES asked is there a term that expires on a certain date. He agrees with Ms. Witt regarding the amendment and referred to amendment section approval of PC, FHWA and FTA (amendment section).

MR. MORRIS noted pg 11, 6.32 is that true that existing language has a 23 year horizon? MR. RUDOLPH responded original agreement is 23 year and we changed that to 20 years.

MS. HEIL commented a motion that takes all these changes and puts into errata sheet so it doesn't cause the PC...see errata for approval so question does not come up of where signature and just see the errata. Staff will provide.

MR. WEAVER noted page 8, 5.3 adjusted names of departments but should be department of Community Development and replacing Planning with Department of Community Development and Department of Public Works.

MR. RUDOLPH stated in that same section, 5.3, looked like missed changing Director of Traffic? CHAIR ERICKSON stated it would be Director of Traffic Engineering. MR. LYON stated he thought if it just said Traffic. CHAIR ERICKSON stated no objection but should match current organization. MR. WEAVER asked the intent is to hire a Traffic Engineer and is within the Division of Traffic so that should not be any other divisions, PM&E so divisions are there. PM&E title is different too. MR. LYON replied we can figure that out. Intent is to have 11 members.

ANNE BROOKS commented when worked on public involvement plan she got a lot of feedback as a citizen you can find an operating agreement but don't know it is also tied to policies and procedures is there a way to reference them in this agreement so they will know that existed. MR. LYON stated the P&P were created separately after this was signed, but not a bad idea to reference that as well. No time frame on this. We certainly can work on it.

MR. CARR asked in regard to some of references in 6.3, are the latest federal planning requirements really Oct 1993? MR. RUDOLPH replied no. MR. CARR noted he has seen that in several changes so check the references and make sure they are correct.

JOHN TOLLEY deferred to Jon Spring and trying to remember back to when he was on the TAC and he thought it was changed to 23 timeframe because it took 2 to 3 years to adopt a 20 year plan so we were in a conundrum of adopting the plan and it was really 18 year for 20 years.

MR. SPRING noted we would correct the problem when we go out 20 years and don't adopt for another 4 years. That's the reason why extended to 23 years and now it is a 4 year gap and if used same logic that would be a 24 year timeframe, although new one developing is going out 25 year and will be in essence a 24 year.

MS. WITT suggested if not time sensitive but is to DOT that we accurately reflect amendments and admin modifications, send back to staff for fine tuning on issue of # years. MR. TOLLEY noted it does say addressing at least 20 years so if you wanted it to be longer you have that flexibility. MR. RUDOLPH noted this is just minimum requirements. MS. WITT stated it needs to be scrubbed to get appropriate dates and references. CHAIR ERICKSON commented make an effort to distribute to TAC members in advance and even some feedback, but still discuss in open meeting and potential for additional changes.

No objection returning to staff.

**c. COMBINED LRTP UPDATE**

JON SPRING, project manager for AMATS on this project. Calling in is Ted Graznow with Trans Demand Model from CH2M Hill who works with AMATS on modeling issues. Mr. Graznow will be giving a presentation on the new H2H model developed for H2H project, we are asking the TAC to endorse model use and the development of the long-range plan.

MR. SPRING noted we are in the final stages of signing the contract for the consultants to begin work on the Long-Range Transportation Plan and the results is we are hammering out the details of the public involvement phase. It was a very tight budget, consolidates public review and utilizes this committee as a project advisory committee for the update and represents most of agencies we want to bring in as well as some public and doesn't cover everyone. Using TAC as project advisory committee and will add some additional members when we discuss the long-range transportation plan and suggest adding 7 ad hoc members when discussing the LRTP, the native tribe for SAFETEA-LU requirement, environmental representative, military, homeland security, freight advisory committee, transit advisory committee and CBERRSA board to have a member specifically from E.R. since combining the 2 plans. We have identified 3 specific meetings to devote to LRTP

- 1<sup>st</sup> mtg, Jan/Feb. to review goals and objective, developing measurable, smart objectives. SAFETEA-LU is asking for more work in this area to get more measurable objectives called Smart objectives and not easy to measure
- 2<sup>nd</sup> mtg, review the deficiency analysis. How well existing projects in the plan meet the 2035 deficiencies. This extends it to 2035 and how this meets the new planning horizon
- 3<sup>rd</sup> mtg involve final stage of planning process where we have list of road, transit, sidewalk, bicycle, whole gamut of recommendations of projects and have input before producing a final hearing draft. How we are laying out public involvement plan

We're asking for input from the TAC and if you don't like this idea we'll have to come up with a plan b, we could probably fit, one a month meeting, into existing meeting dates but if did that it would be devoted to that particular topic for entire meeting, and there would be 3, Jan, Feb. and probably April. There will be one final meeting where TAC gets comments from PZC and make your recommendation to Assembly, PC and would be separate from that.

MS. WITT noted this is an interesting approach, but did not understand this was the approach. Will we have a work session on this? Maybe feasible but didn't know we would be reviewing and need time to meet with staff and be briefed on this. Work session on this? Not prepared to discuss public involvement in this.

MR. SPRING explained we do have a kickoff, coordination meeting next week, Thurs, an objective to bring all players into one room and identify what task and responsibilities are. Large section of update to be done by AMATS staff, financial plan, modeling, outside of scope of consultant contract will cover. We want to come up with master work plan and master schedule and understand we they fit in and when their deliverables and timelines to be handed over. This is what came out of negotiations with the contractor and one way to work around money issue is try to combine, and know we will be coming to TAC regularly to keep TAC up-to-date and provides opportunity to combine the committee with the TAC by adding more parties and stakeholders required by SAFETEA-LU.

MS. HEIL asked once we have our LRTP, every 4 years have to do refresh update of what is happening? MR. SPRING explained they don't distinguish between updates and LRTP. Have to adopt a new plan every 4 years. MS. HEIL asked one of our first jobs for TAC or PC, how big an effort do we want and what expectations every 4 years. Right now incorporating E.R., but every 4 years going through massive effort, don't think this is what we want to do. How are we doing next one so we are efficient when going through this again in 4 years. Hoping next week we'll talk about that, but sounds like we should have discussed earlier. How are you setting this up for expectations from public the next time?

MS. WITT noted the tight budget and level of effort would be hard. Using current data, ISER projections, population, land use, employment and to validate the financial constraints, air quality, but going back and it was very deliberate how the body established the budget which was a reduced effort. May need to be work session with TAC about how this would work and you are sharing different information from what was originally intended.

MR. SPRING commented he was not sure what you intended exactly from reading the RFP, which was very general, it didn't give any specifics on public involvement plan. Trying to make sure we make SAFETEA-LU requirements. Think it meets those requirements but not only public involvement we are doing, transportation fair in January as a kickoff for entire process. MS. HEIL asked what are kind of expectations are you asking from the public to put in new projects or expectation we are refreshing the LRTP and all we are is meeting requirements. MR. SPRING will make sure that it is very clear what the objective is upfront but we do need to inform people about the LRTP update.

MS. HEIL not a whole new plan and this is a lot narrower. MR. SPRING agreed with Ms. Heil and this transportation plan gives us that opportunity.

MS. WITT mentioned continuing the meeting and have work session before this body and understand what was before this body was a concept of using updated model. MR. SPRING noted the opportunity to let TAC know how we want to involve TAC. There is

time to discuss. CHAIR ERICKSON stated the committee is not prepared for what is being heard. Perhaps a work session, and work with staff.

MR. SPRING stated Ed Graznow who is the chief modeler for CH2M HILL under contract with AMATS to support the AMATS model will be giving a presentation by phone. Existing to H2H model he thinks will benefit us in development of LRTP plan. Step that is important is that any model we use is endorsed by AMATS TAC to talk about the model and what it can do and the suitability to LRTP; the capabilities and enhancements.

MR. GRAZNOW presented:

- AMATS vs. H2H model processes – enhanced capabilities of H2H platform
- Added Mat-Su borough model information
- Model area extended, count data refreshed, validation extended, transit representation, park-n-ride, basic travel costs extended, highway loading improved, future model uses “delta approach”, land use forecasts extended
- From travel time model to Cost base model-value of time
- Description of new capabilities
- Additional required review and conversion
- Major model components already completed; reports, sub-processors, external links require review and potential conversion
- Expected schedule & budget needs – at this point can only be approximated.
- Need for AMATS staff training

MR. RUDOLPH replied his understanding was Mat-Su is updating their model now to be done probably into January, was that taken into account or how easy or relevant to incorporate into this. MR. GRAZNOW replied if Mat-Su makes substantive changes, i.e., land use locations, and certain road plan elements it can be incorporated pretty easily. Models really based on 2 separate platforms and their model if a highway model only. Don't know if they are changing that, and in general in terms of looking at them, we should be able to accommodate pretty readily. We can certainly talk to them about that.

LORAN FRAZIER w/KABATA stated tying in population data and some models were easy to put that stuff in and good benchmark coming up is census data and how easy is the model or modification to input new census data on population forecasts. MR. GRAZNOW explained 2 levels, one level is model used to recalculate a model some of the census is toward that and a pretty good sized effort and what we did in 2005 when doing original LRTP. In terms of updating population information, reporting that come out of census comes as a traffic analysis but is later produced than census tract data. We should be pretty compatible in AMATS area. Other areas are harder to say. This model is GIS based on a platform tied to census jurisdiction boundary descriptions.

MR. SPRING noted at some point we would like a formal endorsement of this model use from TAC. Would recommend that we get direction from TAC relatively quickly our schedule is tight. Need to proceed with converting to H2H model for development of LRTP. Do you need more time, to make your recommendation?

MS. WITT noted the regional model had already been updated to include latest ISER info. What is the alternative? Go back to 2005 model and do whole other effort and is that reasonable? MR. SPRING suggested that could be used for this update, planning horizon would have to be updated, socio economic file to run to 2035. It's less effort than converting to H2H model. Disadvantages appears based on the certification review by feds they would like to see us go to regional model in any case and old model doesn't do that and incorporates AMATS boundaries. We know what they want and base new transportation plan on new model. Benefits with respect to transit model, Mat-Su modeling. It's a better model with some real positive attributes with regard to accuracy over older model. Takes existing traffic counts and forces model to adhere to that and have a base model calibrating to actual counts and take that forward to future and more confidence that your projections are accurate.

MR. GRAZNOW stated the disadvantages are take time to convert and get it ready for use. Concern that model conversions don't happen in the time you want them to and that is a risk. He laid out a schedule that can be done from 30 to 60 days and fits in schedule for LRTP, and fits our schedule for this conversion. MS. WITT asked what percentage of budget required doing that. MR. SPRING replied outside the budget and would have to be funded thru existing support contract with CH2M Hill or separate contract. Est. \$30,000 based on Mr. Graznow's rate.

MR. CARR noted the regional model has been talked about for some time, but at the same time heard was Mat-Su updating their model and majority of their traffic is in the same area in our regional model. Any way to get them to work with us and have them help pay for regional model. MS. WITT noted the effort to update their model is paid for out of another project; how being models being linked? Don't know. MR. CARR commented still have distinctions about what is universally being accepted as a region and we are talking about another regional transit study maybe even developing another Regional Transit Authority and development of another MPO. Integrate work efforts instead of separate. MR. SPRING replied we'll have some discussions with Mat-Su to see what their thinking is on that. Driving force behind any model and trip generation is land use. It would be good to have updated land use information. Anything Mat-Su does to update their land use will help our model.

MR. MORRIS asked if there are time constraints with endorsement from TAC. MR. SPRING responded staff feels we need to convert to H2H, we want to go ahead and issue contract to start conversion process. Question do we want to do as part of LRTP? Recommend AMATS initiate conversion endorsement and for your approval.

MR. MORRIS moved to endorse we use H2H model for next LRTP. MS. WITT seconded. *Hearing no objections, the motion was approved unanimously.*

Work session to be scheduled.

## 6. INFORMATIONAL ITEMS

### a. REGIONAL TRANSIT AUTHORITY STUDY

ANNE BROOKS with Brooks and Associates supporting the RLS team on public involvement.

- Sponsors and funding – MOA and Mat-Su Borough
- Team – RLS & Associates and Brooks and Associates; team experience
- Scope consists of four tasks – 1) regional transit management & governance; underway; 2) regional transit services & operations; looking at cost estimates and funding; 3) Regional Transit Cost Estimation and Funding; 4) Regional Transit Authority Plan and Recommendations
- Goals; team activities; look at advantages and disadvantages of the RTA to the proponents, developing a framework, staffing and partnering plans and operations
- Next steps, reviewing other states legislation to see how they setup and empowered them, for reviewing power and duties
- Outreach included meetings with the AMATS TAC, Mat-Su Community Transit, People Mover, the Alaska Mobility Coalition Board, and the Joint MSB/Anchorage Assembly, MSB Community Transportation Coalition, Legislative staff, Statewide Planning, MOA Transit Advisory Board and others

MS. BROOKS indicated that the team wanted to understand from the AMATS TAC which questions they would like to see answered in task 1 which relates to regional transit authority governance.

MS. EPSTEIN noted the cities referenced in the case studies are bigger than Anchorage. For the final study consider including some smaller comparable studies. MR. CARR stated the there are number of emerging regional transportation authorities developed in the last 5 years that much are smaller. Not sure value in comparing how LA, Chicago, Seattle that are more mature and have more than one transit authority. MS. EPSTEIN replied that the study should look at Portland and maybe Duluth. MS. BROOKS replied the team looked at the larger RTAs as examples of an ultimate structure. Most all the case study cities began their RTAs at a much smaller scale.

MS. KARCZ commented that was one of reasons Mat-Su and MOA went out for a proposal or contractor to look at this was because her department was not comfortable looking at RTA without having more information, background and understanding of

potential governance structures, etc. Las Vegas – their RTC has 300 employees, contract out for buses, Paratransit service and also maintain traffic signals. She felt it was important to understand what these various governing structures look like and how would it fit in the Anchorage/Mat-Su region. This is about a \$100,000 contract split between the MOA and Mat-Su. At any time work can stop if after the task is completed, both parties agree this isn't appropriate for the area.

MR. SPRING asked what the timeline for final report was. MS. BROOKS replied not sure. MS. KARCZ stated 4 to 6 months.

MS. WITT noted it was good to look at a Regional Transit Authority more comprehensively and see what recommendations come forth. She suggested that RLS develop case studies looking at smaller communities and take a good look at enabling legislation for the RTAs to see how they achieve what they do.

MS. EPSTEIN commented it seems that if there is any kind of taxing issue, local tax vs. statewide funding, it would be helpful to flush out those different options too.

**b. COMMITTEE COMMENTS – NONE**

**7. AMATS MEETING SCHEDULE**

Policy Committee, December 16, 2010

Technical Advisory Committee, January 13, 2010

**8. ADJOURNMENT**

**Meeting adjourned at 4:12 p.m.**