

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

**January 29, 2009  
2:30 PM**

*This was a continuation of the January 22, 2009 TAC meeting.*

Those in attendance were:

<u>NAME</u>	<u>REPRESENTING</u>
** Jennifer Witt	ADOT, Central Region, Planning
** Kim Rice	ADOT, Central Region
Aneta Synan	ADOT
** Cindy Heil	Alaska Department of Environmental Conservation
** Steve Morris	MOA/Department of Health and Human Services
** Jerry Hansen	MOA/PM&E
Jim Lamson	MOA/PM&E
** Lance Wilber	MOA/Traffic Department
Craig Lyon	MOA/TD
** Todd Cowles	MOA/Port of Anchorage
** Lois Epstein	MOA/Citizens Air Quality Advisory Committee
** Jody Karcz	MOA/ Public Transportation Dept.
** Bruce Carr	ARRC
Alison Lohrke	DOWL HKM

\* AMATS Policy Committee members

\*\* AMATS Technical Advisory Committee members

**1. CALL TO ORDER**

CHAIR WILBER called the meeting to order at 2:38 PM. A quorum was present. Tom Nelson was absent and Jennifer Witt arrived at 3:05 PM.

**2. PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT ANNOUNCEMENT**

CHAIR WILBER explained this meeting was a continuation of the January 22, 2009 meeting specifically to deal with the 2006-2009 TIP Administrative

Modification #1, which includes discussion of the Economic Stimulus Package, and the 2010-2013 TIP criteria and nomination forms.

**3. APPROVAL OF AGENDA**

KIM RICE asked to address the First Quarter Obligation Report as an item of Other Business.

*There were no objections to the agenda as presented.*

**4. APPROVAL OF MINUTES – None**

**5. BUSINESS ITEMS**

**a. 2006-09 Transportation Improvement Program  
Administrative Modification #1**

CRAIG LYON explained that there is a need to address changes in the 2009 TIP through an Administrative Modification (Admin Mod) and to include funding in the Economic Stimulus Package (ESP). The TAC was given information last week on the guidelines and potential time frames for the ESP funds. Some TAC members asked if it would be wise to wait for the final ESP bill before adopting the TIP. In response to that question, FHWA has indicated that other MPOs are adopting an amendment now and it would be safer to adopt an Admin Mod and then, if the final version of the ESP is different than what was used as a basis for the Admin Mod, another Admin Mod could be done. He did not have a chance to talk with FTA regarding their thoughts. The action requires TAC approval and notification to Policy Committee, so long as there is no need for an Air Quality Conformity Analysis or a change to the environmental document. He suggested that the TAC approve this Admin Mod and send it to the Policy Committee.

<b>Table 3: Roadways</b>
--------------------------

MR. LYON explained the format of the TIP document before the TAC, which outlines both the “regular AMATS allocation,” the suggested expenditure of “economic stimulus funds,” potential “illustrative projects & funds” in the event that projects included for ESP funds cannot move forward, and the “2010 regular AMATS allocation (illustrative).”

**Project G-3**, Huffman Road Reconstruction includes \$15.6 million in ESP funds. The balance of the ESP is in **Project 1**, Pavement Replacement Program, specifically Minnesota (13<sup>th</sup> to C Street). A regular AMATS allocation figure of \$500,000 is coming out of Project G-4, Eagle River Road Rehabilitation. If Huffman Road is delayed and cannot be awarded in the short time-frame permitted for ESP, the idea would be to put the money into **Project G-6**, Old Glenn Highway Reconstruction Phase II, or all of it would be put into **Project 1**, Pavement Replacement Program. Projects need to be ready to start in order to qualify for ESP funds.

MS. RICE stated that in order to meet the 90-day or 120-day time frame for ESP projects, some NHS projects are included and the money for those would be returned to AMATS. She noted that only half of the ESP has to be completed within the prescribed time frame. MR. CARR indicated the Railroad wonders whether that 50% figure is of the total ESP amount or 50% on each project. MS. RICE stated ADOT has been assuming it is 50% of the total amount. MR. CARR asked if borrowing from one project to go to another is in the spirit of supplementing and not replacing. CHAIR WILBER understood the suggestion is to use an amount of ESP funds for NHS projects and then bring ESP funds back to the Non-NHS portion of the Program, which is the intended use for the ESP funds.

<b>Table 4: Transportation Enhancements</b>
---------------------------------------------

MR. LYON stated staff is suggesting splitting ESP funds between **Project G-2**, Chester Creek Trail Connection, and **Project 1**, Anchorage Areawide Trails Rehabilitation.

MR. MORRIS asked if more funding is needed for Chester Creek. MR. LYON explained that project would use \$2.11 million of regular AMATS allocation and \$1.26 million in ESP for a total of \$3.371 million. He noted that there are specific TE stimulus funds of \$2.532 million.

MS. WITT arrived at 3:05 PM.

MS. EPSTEIN asked if the *Pedestrian Plan* was reviewed to see whether there are any TE projects in it that are ready to go. MR. LYON stated he spoke with Ms. Schanche who suggested that the *Areawide Trails Plan* is the best place to find projects that are ready to go. CHAIR WILBER recalled

asking Ms. Schanche to talk with the original consultant regarding projects in the *Trails Plan* that are ready to go. MS. HEIL explained that there is no project in the TIP that speaks to the *Pedestrian Plan* and it is not possible to include that without triggering the need for a Major Amendment. MS. EPSTEIN asked why the *Pedestrian Plan* is not in the TIP. CHAIR WILBER explained that it was not done when the TIP was updated. MS. EPSTEIN asked if it would be possible to include the *Bicycle Plan* in the next TIP as a placeholder until it is finalized. CHAIR WILBER replied in the affirmative.

MR. CARR noted that this program goes to FHWA and FTA the language should probably not include comments related to 2005 and 2006, such as are found in Project 1. He remarked that guidance from FHWA is that the project must be in the TIP or STIP, but if it is not, perhaps it could be accelerated to include it if no air quality conformity is needed. This is inconsistent with the regulations, which require an air quality conformity for any new project added to the TIP or STIP.

MR. CARR asked if the \$2.532 million is a specific ESP dollar amount for TE or is it 10% of the 20%. MR. LYON replied that it is a specific dollar amount.

<b>Table 5: CMAQ</b>
----------------------

MR. LYON stated under Projects, <b>Project 4</b> shows \$4.3 million in “Illustrative Projects and Funds” as a potential option if Huffman Road and Pavement Replacement projects cannot be done.
---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

<b>Table 6: National Highway System</b>
-----------------------------------------

<b>Project 6</b> , Pavement Replacement Program would complement Project 1 in Table 3.
----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

CHAIR WILBER confirmed through Mr. Lyon that there is no money in the current 2009 TIP for Project 4.

CHAIR WILBER understood the total Non-NHS ESP amount is \$18 million. MR. LYON stated the total in ESP funds is \$22.79 million, including the TE. CHAIR WILBER asked how much of the ESP that is coming to the State is going to the NHS. MS. WITT distributed the State STIP Amendment, which is developed to allow the greatest amount of flexibility and latitude in

meeting the restrictions Congress will place on the ESP funds. The State is doing a Major Amendment, which will be released on February 2, 2009. Both a “slow” and a “fast” list have been developed. For Central Region, the Parks Highway, Glenn Highway, and two others outside of the MPO, are proposed.

CHAIR WILBER understood the current thinking is that \$25 million will be allocated to the NHS, so the ESP column in the TIP Table 6 should equal \$25 million. MS. WITT noted there is \$48 million in illustrative programs and, if some of those projects cannot be delivered, there are two other segments of the Glenn Highway, one of which is between Anchorage and Artillery Road estimated at \$28 million, and the other from Eklutna to the Parks Interchange that would be funded.

CHAIR WILBER asked if the \$25 million for **Project 6**, Pavement Replacement Program, is Hiland to Eklutna. MS. WITT replied in the affirmative.

MR. MORRIS asked if there is enough paving capacity in the area to accomplish this in one year. MR. HANSEN was uncertain. MS. WITT remarked that this is a question nationwide. MS. RICE noted that half of these projects are in the second year.

<b>Table 7: Transit Program Funding</b>
-----------------------------------------

MR. LYON stated this table incorporates suggestions for municipal FTA funds. The ARRC’s suggestions are also included.

MR. CARR asked that the format for this table be the same as Tables 3 through 6 for ease of understanding.

MR. MORRIS asked if vanpooling is an expansion. MS. KARCZ noted that **Project w** handles part of that, and the purchase of vehicles is in **Project v**. She asked if no CMAQ dollars would come in the ESP. MS. WITT replied that she has heard it is all STP and TE only. MR. LYON noted that normally the STP is split to allocate 10% to TE and 10% CMAQ. At this point, all of the ESP is in the Roadway and TE portions of the program and none is in CMAQ. There is an illustrative project in Table 5, \$4.3 million for **Project 4**, Transit Centers/Facilities.

MR. CARR understood there are the same options with the ESP funds, as there are with the normal annual apportionments. The current guidance is 70%-80% Roadways, 10%-20% TE, and 10% in CMAQ. The 10% for CMAQ has to come out of the STP funds. MR. LYON noted that the policy is 10% over 4 years. MR. CARR asked whether AMATS could follow its policy in the use of ESP funds. MS. KARCZ felt this was appropriate. She noted that projects in U-Med under Table 5, Projects, **Project 4**, are ready to go. She noted that the \$4.3 million amount should be \$3.7 million. She wanted funding for more operating assistance. MS. WITT thought the regular STIP allocation could be used for that and the ESP used elsewhere. MS. KARCZ noted that Table 5, Projects, **Project 3**, Transit Fleet Expansion/Replacement could use funding as well. She anticipated the ESP would include money for bus purchase. MS. WITT asked if the \$4.4 million in Table 7, **Project d**, Bus Stop Improvements, is the U-Med project. MS. KARCZ replied in the affirmative.

MS. HEIL noted that while STP funding might be put into the CMAQ table, it is not subject to the same rules as are CMAQ funds.

CHAIR WILBER asked how much of the \$4.4 million in Table 7, **Project d** is illustrative. MS. KARCZ replied that the previous figure was \$707,000.

MS. WITT asked if the FTA ESP funds are under the same time frame constraints for delivery as the FHWA ESP funds. MR. CARR understood that all of the transportation funding went to a 90-day time frame.

MS. HEIL suggested changes to the format Table 7, as she found it confusing. She suggested identifying projects throughout the TIP tables as “ESP Option 1,” “ESP Option 2,” “Illustrative Projects and Funds Option 1,” etc.

MR. CARR noted that there are many variables to consider, including funding categories and what will be the final outcome of the Congressional work on the ESP. When the bill is signed, it will be clear what amount is available and what will be apportioned to particular projects to meet the time frame guidelines. CHAIR WILBER asked if the suggestion is to not make a recommendation to the Policy Committee until these things are known. MR. CARR believed there is an obligation to forward the current planning to the Policy Committee, but he was reluctant to send this document to FHWA as

Admin Mod #1 and then submit another Admin Mod #2 when the ESP funds are known. He was concerned with inundating the funding agencies with paperwork that will change.

MS. HEIL asked if it is possible that the ARRC and Public Transportation Department will receive additional funds over what AMATS is considering today. MS. KARCZ replied that the Commissioner said last week there is \$30 million coming to transit statewide, so there are other funds. MS. WITT stated FTA and FHWA do not have to approve an Admin Mod; she suggested the Admin Mod be the as optimistic and broad as possible with options identified under the different total dollar amounts. MR. CARR commented on computerized tracking requirements associated with reporting that would likely be associated with ESP funds.

CHAIR WILBER stated that if the TAC wished to allocate 80% to Roadways, the ESP funding split would be \$16 million to Roads, \$4 million to CMAQ and \$2.5 million to TE. If the TAC wished to allocate 70% to Roadways, the ESP funding split would be \$14 million to roads.

MS. WITT suggested that the Roadway program be examined to see what flexibility may exist for funds that could be used for Public Transportation Department projects. MS. KARCZ clarified that she only had concern that AMATS be consistent with its policy to allocate a portion of funds to CMAQ.

MR. MORRIS thought that if Congress is going to put additional funds to mass transit, perhaps that is the source for this type of project, rather than using this allocation of ESP.

MS. WITT asked what is the total amount of 5307 Funds that might be coming. MR. CARR replied that the figure being considered is \$33 million in the Senate and in House version it is \$24 million. MS. WITT asked how much funding might come to the MOA under 5307 Funds. MS. KARCZ stated she has heard a range of \$4 to \$5 million and has also heard \$30 million spread between FMATS and AMATS. MS. WITT asked what is the preference for spending that money. MS. KARCZ indicated she would prefer to spend it on buses or projects in the U-Med District. MS. WITT understood that Ms. Karcz is looking at an additional \$4 to \$5 million in STP funds, which could be seen as double dipping. MS. KARCZ clarified that in the past, STP has

been allocated between Roadways, TE and CMAQ. MS. WITT thought that the flexibility exists as the tables are written now. MR. CARR stated that is why this proposal must go to the Policy Committee for policy direction.

CHAIR WILBER asked if there is objection to allocating ESP funds as AMATS has historically allocated its regular funds. MR. LYON stated that the AMATS policy is 70%-80% Roadways, 10%-20% TE and 10% CMAQ for Non-NHS regular formula funds. MS. HEIL noted that the ESP is both STP and TE and asked if those should be combined or should STP be considered separately. MR. MORRIS asked if that is in accordance with the bill. CHAIR WILBER stated the bill does not give direction. MS. WITT objected to dividing the money as is done with the AMATS allocation because it is clearly for capital improvements that put people to work. CHAIR WILBER suggested the approach should be to begin with the allocation divided as AMATS policy suggests, and if there are not enough shovel-ready projects in CMAQ, for instance, those funds would be allocated elsewhere. He further suggested that the percentages be applied to STP only, not the combination of STP and TE. MS. RICE emphasized that any projects shown using ESP funds must be shovel-ready. MS. WITT felt the ESP funds for STP and TE should be combined and then the percentages calculated because the TE allocation is at the 10% policy figure. MR. CARR stated that it is not necessary to define shovel-ready projects because Title 1 through Title 12 specifically calls for the ability to purchase. Ordering buses or rail cars put people to work in factories that build those. The objective is to keep people employed, not necessarily only in construction-related fields. He further noted that the 90-day time frame applies only to 50% of the ESP funds.

In discussion, MS. WITT noted that the State is including the second year TE monies, which could go to the Glenn Highway Trail.

***There was no objection to combining STP and TE funds allocated through the ESP and dividing it between Roadways, TE and CMAQ as is historically done with the Non-NHS regular allocation funds.***

CHAIR WILBER understood the intent is to develop options for spending ESP funds, identified throughout the TIP tables, so that when Congress passes the bill, adjustments can be made and the Admin Mod approved.

MS. KARCZ asked whether this meeting should be continued to next week, given that changes are occurring rapidly and often. MS. WITT agreed that the TAC should review the tables again. Everyone needs to understand the amount coming to Anchorage and what can be accomplished above what was envisioned in the current TIP.

MS. HEIL added that there is a need to update the 2009 TIP tables, regardless of the ESP.

CHAIR WILBR suggested that the Policy Committee could approve the Admin Mod at its February 12, 2009 meeting and the ESP allocations at a later date, if necessary. MR. LYON clarified that the Admin Mod requires only TAC approval.

MS. WITT asked whether, if there is an additional \$14 million to transit, money could be moved from CMAQ to TE in the TIP. MS. KARCZ remarked that this was done last year, so there is precedent for such action.

CINDY HEIL moved for approval of the Admin Mod #1 for the 2009 TIP.  
BRUCE CARR seconded.

MR. CARR asked that Tables 6 and 7 be changed to show the original 2009 figures. *This was accepted as a friendly amendment.*

MS. WITT stated regarding Table 3, **Project 1**, Pavement Replacement Program, that many roads in Anchorage that are rutted cannot be done under the ESP because they involve curb and gutter, utilities, etc. There is a need to move forward quickly on the projects shown in a list Ms. Synan gave to the TAC, which was provided by ADOT; the environmental process could begin for those projects. That will impact the 2010-2013 TIP. To accomplish this, Table 3, **Project G-4, Eagle River Road Rehab** would be reduced by \$500,000 and DeBarr design would be funded under Pavement Replacement Program. *This was accepted as a friendly amendment.*

MS. KARCZ noted that Table 5, SIP-Mandated, **Project 1, Rideshare Marketing,** should show an amount of \$670,000. *This was accepted as a friendly amendment.*

MR. CARR stated that he has always looked at Table 8 as a way to show what the Railroad is doing, but if he has to move money into an approved project, he moves it into Table 7. He asked whether the Port has had any trouble with its funding agencies about whether its projects are in an approved funding document. MR. COWLES indicated that he has not because the funding is MURAD and MURAD is going to get a share of the ESP funds going to ADOT. MS. WITT suggested that Mr. Cowles inquire whether any further action is required in order for the Port to receive ESP funds.

***There being no objection, the motion passed unanimously.***

MS. EPSTEIN asked whether the STIP amendment is available online. MS. WITT replied that the STIP amendment will be released on February 2, 2009. MS. EPSTEIN asked if the amendment is all repairs and maintenance and not capacity enhancement. MS. WITT replied that much of it is repairs and maintenance. Capacity is being added on one segment of the Parks Highway. There was a challenge identifying projects that could be deliverable within the identified time frames. There are some in the Mat-Su, such as Seward Meridian Road.

MR. CARR asked if the review period for the STIP amendment is 30 or 45 days. MS. WITT replied that it is 45 days.

**c. Other Business Items**

***1<sup>st</sup> Quarter Obligation Report***

ANETA SYNAN explained that the engineer for **Project G-6**, Old Glenn Highway Rehab, Eagle River-Fire Lake to Peters Creek, has asked for an additional \$400,000 to complete design. The engineer indicated that he had talked to the consultants and issues have arisen, including the need for additional SHPO reviews and the existence of private septic systems in the right-of-way. This amendment requires TAC approval.

MS. WITT noted that this project is an illustrative project in the ESP plan, so it is important to keep it moving forward.

CHAIR WILBER asked what was the original amount of design money for this project. MS. RICE recalled it was approximately \$4 million.

BRUCE CARR moved to adopt the 1<sup>st</sup> Quarter Obligation Report as presented, particularly to add \$400,000 to Project G-6, Old Glenn Highway Rehab, Eagle River – Fire Lake to Peters Creek. CINDY HEIL seconded.

MR. CARR supported his motion as he felt it was important to allow ADOT to move forward with this project, if it is 10% less than the amount of the total design.

CHAIR WILBER asked if this additional funding brings the total TIP obligation over the 15% variance limit. MS. SYNAN replied that it does not. CHAIR WILBER stated that coming in at this late stage for this large an amendment is ill advised. Project managers should not request this type of funding so late in a project.

*There being no objection, the motion passed unanimously.*

**b. 2010-2013 TIP criteria and nomination forms: Release for Public Review and Comment**

MR. LYON began with a review of Roadway projects criteria. He explained that new language shown in red is, while deleted language is shown in red and underlined. Criterion 16 in Roadways is entirely new. Criterion 7 in TE was changed to reflect the same criteria in the Roadways category..

MS. EPSTEIN stated she discussed with Ms. Karcz whether transit could be scored under Roadway, but she did not want to fund something without associated operating funds. MS. EPSTEIN stated she had raised an issue about scoring consistency between Roadway and TE. She has also been reviewing the STIP criteria and felt an important omission in scoring criteria is whether a project would have greenhouse gas reductions; that is also not included in the TIP criteria. Vehicle miles traveled (VMT) could be used as a surrogate for that. In terms of integrating *Anchorage 2020* into these criteria, extra points should be given if something serves people in a particular area. For instance, the points could be changed under Roadway criterion 1. Lastly, there should be a criterion to determine whether a project protects fish and wildlife habitat.

CHAIR WILBER asked that the TAC either continue this meeting or close this meeting, hold a work session on the criteria, and schedule a special meeting.

MS. WITT asked if it is necessary to continue this meeting in order to include Tables 6 and 7 in the Admin Mod. She suggested that meeting could be followed by a work session on the criteria.

MR. CARR agreed that the meeting should be continued and suggested that the TAC closely review the criteria and have questions ready for Mr. Lyon. MS. HEIL stated that if Ms. Epstein's suggestions are shown in a document for review and that document is provided prior to the meeting, it may be possible to take action on the criteria. However, if that document is not available prior to the meeting, more time will be required to review it.

CINDY HEIL moved to continue this TAC meeting to February 5, 2009 in order to consider the 2006-2009 Transportation Improvement Program Administrative Modification #1 and the 2010-2013 TIP criteria and nomination forms as Business Items, and to potentially conduct a work session following that meeting. BRUCE CARR seconded.

*There being no objection, the motion passed unanimously.*

**6. INFORMATIONAL REPORTS – None**

**7. Scheduled AMATS Meetings**

Policy Committee, February 12, 2009

Technical Advisory Committee, February 22, 2009

**8. ADJOURNMENT**

The meeting was adjourned at 4:35 PM