

Roads and Highways Advisory Board Meeting
January 25, 2019 – 1:00 PM – 4:00PM
2720 Picket Place, McKinley Building, Room T2
Call in Number: 907-463-1208

Board Members: John Baker, Scott Eickholt, Donna Gardino, Daniel Hall, Anton Johansen, Howard Thies

1. Call to Order
2. Board Roll Call to Establish Quorum
 - a. Welcome and Introduction of other participants
3. Phone Roll Call and Introduction of Those Present
4. Approval of Agenda
5. Approval of Minutes
6. Public Comments (3 minutes per speaker)
7. Chair's Remarks
8. Department of Transportation and Public Facilities Update - Commissioner MacKinnon
9. New Metropolitan Planning Organizations – Judy Chapman, DOT&PF, Marie Heidemann, DOT&PF
 - a. Plans for funding planning efforts including amounts and timetable
 - b. Metropolitan Planning Organizations planning allocation distribution formula modifications and methodology
 - c. Surface Transportation Block Grant Program discussion for Metropolitan Planning Organizations
10. Bi-annual Budget Proposal
11. Board Vacancies
12. Solidify the Committee in Legislation
13. Board Comments
14. Next Meeting – TBD (telephone)
15. Adjourn



THE STATE
of **ALASKA**
GOVERNOR SEAN PARNELL

Department of Transportation and
Public Facilities

Program Development

3132 Channel, Suite 200
PO Box 112500
Juneau, Alaska 99811-2500
Main: 907.465.4070
Fax: 907.465.6984
TTY/TTD: 907.465.3657

August 26, 2014

Mr. John Lohrey, Statewide Programs Team Leader
Federal Highway Administration
Alaska Division
P.O. Box 21648
Juneau, AK 99802-1648

RE: 2014 Metropolitan Planning (PL) Funds Distribution Formula

Dear Mr. Lohrey,

We request your approval of the updated distribution formula described in the attachment for Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) Metropolitan Planning (PL) funds. The formula was developed in accordance with 23 CFR 420.109 and in consultation with the two metropolitan planning organizations (MPOs) in Anchorage and Fairbanks.

The new PL distribution formula incorporates changes to the Metropolitan Planning program by MAP-21.

In accordance with 23 CFR 420.109(b), the PL distribution formula was developed with consideration of:

1. Population
2. Status of planning
3. Attainment of air quality standards
4. Metropolitan area transportation needs
5. Other factors necessary to provide for an appropriate distribution of funds to carry out the requirements of 23 USC 134 and other applicable requirements of federal law.

The Department prepared a draft distribution formula in early 2014, then consulted with the two MPOs in the spring. The AMATS Coordinator gave verbal approval to the draft formula, but the FMATS Coordinator listed a number of concerns in a written letter. Based on the comments received we revised the formula. The revised formula was shared with both MPOs in August 2014. The AMATS Coordinator gave verbal approval to the revised formula at a meeting with DOT&PF and FHWA representatives, and the FMATS Policy Committee discussed the formula at its August 20th meeting and concurred with it. In addition, the FMATS committee expressed interest in continuing consultation with DOT&PF as it develops the Discretionary Urban Planning Program.

Mr. John Lohrey, FHWA

As a minimum allocation state, Alaska has the flexibility to use some of the PL funds for transportation planning outside of the urbanized areas. As it has done in the past, DOT&PF intends to use a portion of the annual PL apportionment along with unexpended/deobligated PL funds for a discretionary urban planning program and for other statewide planning purposes. The details of the program have yet to be fully fleshed out, but it would allow the two MPOs and smaller urban areas (5,000- 50,000 population) to apply to the program for specific planning projects. This flexibility written into the federal law enabled us to fund local transportation funding in the Fairbanks area for nearly three decades before it was designated 'urbanized' and a formal Metropolitan Planning Organization was formed. The urban area around Wasilla and Palmer are growing at a rapid rate and may reach the population threshold to become an urbanized area after the next census.

If you should have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact me at 465-6971, or Bob Laurie, Federal Planning Programs Manager, at 465-6989.

Sincerely,



Jeff Ottesen
Director

CC: Mike Vigue, FHWA Assistant Division Administrator
Mike Crabb, Program Development Division Operations Manager
Robert Laurie, Federal Planning Programs Manager
DOT&PF Regional Directors

ENCLOSURE

Metropolitan Planning (PL) Distribution Formula in Alaska – August 14, 2014

Alaska DOT&PF has the responsibility under 23 USC 104(d) to allocate Metropolitan Planning (PL) funds in Alaska according to a formula developed by the State in consultation with the MPOs and approved by the Secretary of Transportation. This formula must take into account the populations of the two MPAs according to the latest decennial census, the attainment of air quality standards, transportation planning needs, transportation planning status and other factors. The funds are to be used to carry out the requirements of 23 USC 134 and other applicable Federal law. While the primary intent of these funds is to support the transportation planning efforts of urbanized areas with populations over 50,000, as a state receiving the minimum apportionment, Alaska may, subject to Federal approval, use the funds for transportation planning outside of the urbanized areas.

This formula replaces the previous distribution formula that was approved by FHWA in September 2006 and the interim distribution formula approved by FHWA in December 2013. This will be effective with the FFY15 distribution.

Metropolitan Planning (PL) funds will be distributed to the MPOs as follows:

The PL distribution is subject to the estimated annual obligation authority limit.

Eighty percent of the available obligation limited PL funds will be distributed to the two Metropolitan Planning Organizations (MPOs) in Alaska. This total will be divided in accordance to a formula that takes into account the relative populations of the two MPAs, the attainment of air quality standards, transportation planning needs, transportation planning status and other factors. In short, the formula allocates 77.42% to the Anchorage Metropolitan Area Transportation Solutions (AMATS) and 22.58% to the Fairbanks Metropolitan Area Transportation System (FMATS). The formula and the factors considered are discussed in more detail in the following pages.

The remaining twenty percent of available funds will be distributed to DOT&PF for a Discretionary Urban Planning Program and for tasks in the Annual Work Program that support metropolitan and non-metropolitan transportation planning by the state. The distribution to the AWP does NOT represent the funds allocated by the MPOs to DOT&PF regional offices for MPO-specific planning tasks. The table below shows a 46-54 division between the AWP and the DUPP, but the actual allocation may differ at the discretion of DOT&PF.

This table illustrates estimated funding availability for the MAP-21 authorizations (FFY 13 & 14). MAP-21 expires at the end of FFY 14. The apportionment for FFY 15 shown below assumes level funding (the same as FFY 14), but while Congress has extended provisions of MAP-21 for about 8 months of the next federal fiscal year (May 2015), there is no guarantee of funding beyond that date. New legislation may require a development of a new distribution formula. The actual funding that may become available in FFY 15 and beyond is subject to action by Congress and may be different from this illustration.

Metropolitan Planning (PL) Distribution Formula in Alaska –
 August 14, 2014

| | <u>FFY 13</u> | <u>FFY 14</u> | <u>FFY 15</u> |
|----------------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|
| Est'd Apportionment | \$2,166,435 | \$2,167,875 | \$2,167,875 |
| Est'd Obligation Limit | 94% | 94% | 94% |
| <u>Estimated Available</u> | <u>\$2,036,449</u> | <u>\$2,037,803</u> | <u>\$2,037,803</u> |
| AMATS* | \$1,261,260 | \$1,262,098 | \$1,262,098 |
| FMATS* | \$367,899 | \$368,144 | \$368,144 |
| AWP** | \$187,617 | \$187,742 | \$187,742 |
| DUPP** | \$219,673 | \$219,819 | \$219,819 |

*The figures for AMATS & FMATS include the sub-allocations to the DOT&PF Regional Planning Offices for work items assigned to them.

**The AWP line represents PL funding for non-MPO statewide or regional planning projects.

The Discretionary Urban Planning Program is intended to fund discrete transportation planning projects in the two MPOs as well as in Alaska's smaller urban areas (5,000 – 50,000 population). Program details will be developed and described in a separate guidance. In addition to the annual allocation, unexpended deobligated PL funds remaining at the end of each UPWP and AWP will be made available to the DUPP.

2014 Metropolitan Planning (PL) Distribution Formula Factors Discussion/Considerations

Overview –

The Metropolitan Planning (PL) program is a federal program intended to provide funding to Metropolitan Planning Organizations (MPOs) to assist them in carrying out transportation planning activities required by 23 USC 134 (Metropolitan Planning) and other applicable requirements of federal law. The MPOs, in cooperation with the State, are required to develop transportation plans and programs in the urbanized areas of the state. In States that received the minimum apportionment in FFY 2009 (Alaska is one) may, subject to FHWA approval, use PL funds for transportation planning outside of urbanized areas; and funds not used to carry out section 134 may be made available by a MPO to the State to fund activities under 23 USC 135 (Statewide Planning).

Relevant Statutes/Regulations –

23 USC 104 [Apportionment] (d) [Metropolitan Planning]

23 CFR 420.109 [Metropolitan Planning fund distribution requirements]

2014 PL Distribution Formula –

The PL Distribution Formula in Alaska allocates the annual Metropolitan Planning apportionment, as adjusted by the obligation limitation, as follows:

- Metropolitan Planning Organizations (MPO) 80%

Of the distribution to the State's two MPO's, the funds will be divided as shown below:

- AMATS* 77.42%
- FMATS* 22.58%

- Discretionary Urban Planning and Annual Work Programs 20%

The remaining PL funds not directly distributed to the MPOs will be combined with unexpended and deobligated funds remaining at the end of each UPWP and AWP and made available to smaller urban communities (5,000 – 50,000 population) and the MPO's for specific transportation planning projects. At DOT&PF's discretion some of the funds may be allocated in the department's Annual Work Program for metropolitan and non-metropolitan planning purposes.

With an obligation limit of 94%, this distribution would result in the following amounts in FFY 15 (assuming level funding from FFY 14), with the previous distribution in FFY 12 for comparison:

| | <u>FFY 15</u> | <u>FFY 12</u> |
|---------------------------------|---------------|---------------|
| Apportionment (after setasides) | \$2,167,875 | \$1,519,833 |
| Ob Limit | 94% | 85% |
| Estimated Available | \$2,037,803 | \$1,291,858 |
| AMATS* | \$1,262,098 | \$930,138 |
| FMATS* | \$368,144 | \$232,534 |
| Discretionary Urban Planning | \$219,819 | \$0 |
| AWP** | \$187,742 | \$129,186 |

2014 Metropolitan Planning (PL) Distribution Formula Factors Discussion/Considerations

* The figures for AMATS & FMATS include the sub-allocations to the DOT&PF Regional Planning Offices for work items assigned to them.

**The AWP line represents PL funding for non-MPO statewide or regional planning projects.

Unused funds remaining at the end of each UPWP and AWP program (within obligation limits) would be re-obligated to the Discretionary Urban Planning Program.

Previous PL Distribution Formula –

The 2006 PL distribution formula (attached) distributed funds in a similar manner as is described for this formula, except that it attempted to carve out funding for a Discretionary Statewide program from the unobligated funds remaining at the completion of each MPO's program. In practice, however, the unused funds at the end of the each MPO's UPWP were not sufficient to fund a meaningful planning program.

Since the expiration of SAFETEA-LU in 2009, PL funds available to Alaska were locked at the 2009 level until the enactment of MAP-21. Since 2009, the formula distributed \$930,138 each year to AMATS, of which \$90,000 was assigned to DOT&PF Central Region for specific AMATS planning tasks. FMATS received \$232,534 annually, of which \$48,950 was assigned to DOT&PF Northern Region for specific FMATS planning tasks.

Flexibility –

States that received the minimum apportionment in 2009 may, in addition to funding MPOs to carry out the provisions of 23 USC 134, and subject to the approval of FHWA, use the funds to finance transportation planning outside of urbanized areas.¹ Alaska was a "minimum apportionment" state in 2009 and thus has that flexibility.

Alaska DOT&PF used its flexibility in the past to make transportation planning funding available to small urban communities. Fairbanks (before it was designated urbanized), Juneau, Ketchikan, Kodiak and Sitka have taken advantage of this to conduct transportation planning projects.

There is interest in funding assistance for transportation planning projects in small urban communities, with populations between 5,000 and 50,000. DOT&PF Regional Planning staffs have expressed interest in the availability of PL funds for planning projects in small urban areas. In addition, the MPOs have expressed interest in additional transportation planning funds for various one-time planning projects.

To respond to this demand, DOT&PF proposes as part of this distribution formula to make PL funds available to small urban areas and the MPOs through an annual discretionary program.

¹ 23 USC 104(d)(1)(A)(ii). States receiving minimum apportionment. - A State that received the minimum apportionment for use in carrying out section 134 for fiscal year 2009 may, subject to the approval of the Secretary, use the funds apportioned under subsection (b)(5) to fund transportation planning outside of urbanized areas.

2014 Metropolitan Planning (PL) Distribution Formula Factors Discussion/Considerations

Process –

DOT&PF began the process to update the Metropolitan Planning (PL) distribution formula for Alaska in spring 2013. The process was delayed awaiting new Metropolitan Planning Area (MPA) adjustments resulting from the 2010 Census and the resulting population determinations for the MPA's. DOT&PF has been working with the MPOs to develop a formula that adequately funds essential transportation planning in the state's two largest communities and makes funds available for special non-continuing transportation planning projects in the MPO's and the state's smaller urban communities. The process to develop a new PL distribution formula is outlined below; this paper represents the work of the seventh step.

1. Review applicable federal statutes and regulations
2. Review existing & previous Alaska PL distribution formulas
3. Develop Discussion Draft of issues, factors, preliminary distribution formula
4. Circulate draft for review and comment from DOT&PF planning staff.
5. Consider comments and revise as appropriate
6. Circulate for review and comment from DOT&PF and MPO committees
7. Consider comments and revise as appropriate
8. Get formal DOT&PF approval, submit to FHWA for approval

DOT&PF distributed a draft distribution formula to department staff and MPOs in March 2014. Based on comments received, the department has made some adjustments to the formula proposed in March, the net result being a small increase in the distribution to FMATS and a small decrease to AMATS. Nevertheless, the final formula results in an overall increase to both MPOs well in excess of the rate of inflation since the last formula in 2006.

Developing a new formula –

Distribution of PL funds within the state must be in accordance with a formula developed by each state in consultation with the MPOs and approved by FHWA. In developing the new PL distribution formula we looked first at the overall PL funding that will be available to the state and any limitations that might be put on those funds. Once we got reasonable estimates of how much would be available to distribute, we considered a number of factors as required by federal regulations. A summary of our review follows:

Funding Apportionment –

According to FHWA calculations under MAP-21 guidelines, the following amounts of PL funding are apportioned for Alaska:

| <u>FFY</u> | <u>Apportionment</u> | <u>Source</u> |
|------------|----------------------|---------------------------|
| 2013 | \$2,166,435 | 9/10/13 W10A Report |
| 2014 | \$2,167,875* | 1/31/14 N 4510.772 Notice |

*Note this differs from our March discussion draft by about \$28,000 less. This estimate is reduced by Federal set-asides taken from the PL program – we did not have that information at that time.

2014 Metropolitan Planning (PL) Distribution Formula Factors Discussion/Considerations

Obligation Limitation –

Like most other federal transportation funding programs, the Metropolitan Planning program is subject to the annual limitation to obligation authority.

MAP-21 increased the percentage of funds apportioned to Metropolitan Planning (from 1.25% to 1.5%), and made changes to the base upon which that is calculated. Alaska's PL apportionment grew from \$1,418,867 in FFY09, the last official year of SAFETEA-LU, to \$2,166,435 in FFY13.

The distribution formula uses an obligation authority of 94% in FFY 2014 of the MAP-21 apportionment, which results in the following amounts available for statewide distribution.

| <u>FFY</u> | <u>Apportionment</u> | <u>94% Obligation</u> |
|------------|----------------------|-----------------------|
| 2014 | \$2,167,875 | \$2,037,803 |

| <u>FFY</u> | <u>Apportionment</u> | <u>94.0% Obligation</u> |
|------------|----------------------|-------------------------|
| 2013 | \$2,166,435 | \$2,036,449 |

Factors –

According to 23 CFR 420.109(b) the state's PL distribution formula must consider (but not necessarily be limited to):

1. Population
2. Status of planning
3. Attainment of air quality standards
4. Metropolitan area transportation needs
5. Other factors necessary to provide for an appropriate distribution of funds to carry out the requirements of 23 USC 134 and other applicable requirements of Federal law.

Population

Urbanized areas have populations of more than 50,000 and are designated by the Census Bureau². For transportation planning purposes, the boundaries of the urbanized Metropolitan Planning Areas (MPA) must contain at least the Census-designated urbanized boundaries, but may be expanded to take into account transportation patterns and predicted population growth and development. For the purposes of determining population for the PL Distribution Formula, we are required to use the most recent estimate published by the Secretary of Commerce (i.e. the decennial Census) for the adjusted boundaries. (*per FHWA Q&A on Metropolitan Planning website*).

There are two urbanized areas in Alaska: Anchorage and Fairbanks.

The MPA boundaries of Anchorage include the urbanized areas of the Anchorage bowl plus the urban area of Eagle River and Chugiak; and encompass a 2010 population of 285,159. Because it has a population greater than 200,000, Anchorage is considered a Transportation Management Area (TMA), which carries additional planning responsibilities than those of an urbanized area. The 2010 population of the entire

² **Urbanized areas** with populations greater than 50,000 may be differentiated from **urban areas**, which, are defined by 23 USC 101(33) for transportation planning purposes, as having populations of 5,000 to 50,000.

2014 Metropolitan Planning (PL) Distribution Formula Factors Discussion/Considerations

Municipality of Anchorage, including Girdwood, Indian, Bird and other areas outside the defined MPA boundaries, is 291,826.

The Census-designated Fairbanks urbanized areas include the cities of Fairbanks and North Pole, and portions of College, Ester, Fort Wainwright, and the Beaver Loop Road areas. According to the Fairbanks North Star Borough, the 2010 population of FMATS MPA with adjusted boundaries is 71,824. The 2010 Census population of the Fairbanks North Star Borough is 97,581.

The population within the AMATS MPA represents just under 80% (79.88%) of the total urbanized population in the state, while the FMATS MPA population makes up just over 20% (20.12%) of the total urbanized population. The combined population of the two urbanized area represents just over half of the entire population of the state; 50.26%.

Historic and projected rates of population growth are discussed later in transportation needs.

Other Urban Areas Population

23 USC 104(d) allows minimum apportionment states to use PL funds for transportation planning outside metropolitan planning areas. DOT&PF plans to make some of the annual apportionment available to small urban areas and the MPOs for discrete transportation planning projects. FHWA recognizes areas with populations of 5,000 or greater as Urban Areas. Under the DOT&PF Discretionary Urban Planning Program, urban areas with organized local governments that would be eligible for PL funds include:

| Urban Area | 2010 UA Population ³ | Local Government |
|----------------------|------------------------------------|---------------------------|
| Juneau | 24,537 | City & Borough of Juneau |
| Wasilla ⁴ | 44,236 | Matanuska Susitna Borough |
| Kodiak | 9,335 | Kodiak Island Borough |
| Ketchikan | 10,352 | Ketchikan Gateway Borough |
| Sitka | 7,027 | City & Borough of Sitka |
| Soldotna | 6,526 | Kenai Peninsula Borough |

The 2014 Alaska PL Distribution Formula begins with the relative populations of the two MPOs: 79.88% and 20.12%. Consideration of subsequent factors adjust that base allocation.

Status of planning

SAFETEA-LU and MAP-21 established additional planning requirements for both MPO's. Both MPO's meet the requirements to develop:

- Long-Range Plans, to be updated at least every 4 years, incorporating new planning requirements. MAP-21 renamed the long-range plans "Metropolitan Transportation Plans."

³ The figures in this table represent the Census-designated Urban Cluster (UC) totals; they do not represent totals within urban areas whose boundaries have been adjusted for FHWA transportation planning purposes. The process of adjusting the urban/rural boundaries as part of the Functional Classification process was completed in late 2013 for all urban areas except Anchorage.

⁴ The census-designated "Lakes, Knik-Fairview, Wasilla" urban cluster includes Palmer.

2014 Metropolitan Planning (PL) Distribution Formula Factors Discussion/Considerations

- 4-year Transportation Improvement Programs (TIPs) based on the updated Metropolitan Transportation Plans.
- New or revised public participation plans.

As a Transportation Management Area, AMATs is also required to develop a Congestion Management Plan. FMATS does not have this requirement.

MAP-21 added the development and implementation of performance measures, coordinated and consistent with State performance measures. The performance-based approach is to be integrated into the MPO's transportation decision making processes and development of transportation plans.

Small urban areas in Alaska face their own transportation planning challenges:

- Because PL funds were not available in recent years to small urban areas, many transportation planning products are in need of update.
- The Wasilla area attained sufficient population to be considered an urban area in the 2000 Census, and is one of the most rapidly growing areas in the state, as shown later in this paper.
- Soldotna reached small urban status with the 2010 Census. Neighboring Kenai, with a 2010 population of 4,921, fell just short of the 5,000 cutoff.

DOT&PF judged that the planning status of the two MPOs to be largely equal as they have met and appear to continue to meet the planning requirements outlined in 23 USC 134. We gave additional credit to AMATS for their additional requirement as a TMA to develop and maintain a congestion management system. Given that the PL program is primarily intended to fund transportation planning in the MPOs, we gave first priority to the MPOs by allocating the lion's share of the available funding directly to them and by making them eligible to participate in Discretionary Urban Planning Program. Secondly, we chose to make available a portion of the annual PL apportionment to the small urban communities, as had been done in past years. This flexibility allowed in federal law enabled DOT&PF to fund local transportation planning in the Fairbanks area prior to it being formally designated a Metropolitan Planning Area in 2003. The Wasilla-Palmer area in the Matanuska-Susitna Borough is among the fastest growing in the state, at over 2 ½% per year. It's anticipated that it could reach the threshold to become an MPO with the next census in 2020.

Attainment of air quality standards

Both MPOs have improved from non-attainment status to maintenance for carbon monoxide. This does not necessarily reduce the needed planning effort; additional work needs to be done to ensure the communities do not slip back into non-attainment.

A portion of the Fairbanks North Star Borough, including the entire MPA, was designated in 2009 as a non-attainment area for the 24 hour PM_{2.5} NAAQS. The fine particulate matter typically is created by burning fuels. Sources include power plants, vehicles, wood-burning stoves, and wild land fires. Most of the PM_{2.5} in the borough is non-vehicle related, yet Fairbanks area agencies, including FMATS, must do additional work to address air pollution monitoring and control as a result.

2014 Metropolitan Planning (PL) Distribution Formula
Factors Discussion/Considerations

Although the Anchorage bowl is considered in attainment with EPA standards for fine (PM_{2.5}) and coarse (PM₁₀) particulate matter, a portion of Eagle River community is still technically designated a PM₁₀ non-attainment area as a consequence of violations recorded in the late-1980's. These violations were the result of dust from unpaved roads. In 1991, the Anchorage Assembly adopted a PM₁₀ Control Plan that was submitted to and approved by the EPA. As a consequence of the plan, nearly all the roads in the Eagle River area were paved or surfaced with recycled asphalt. The last violations of the PM₁₀ standard were recorded twenty years ago.

In 2010, a PM₁₀ maintenance plan was prepared and submitted to EPA for approval. EPA approved the plan in early 2013. The plan commits the Municipality and DOT&PF to a number of activities in the Eagle River area that will address dust.

The revised formula gives extra allowance to AMATS its maintenance status for carbon monoxide and PM₁₀ particulates; and to FMATS for carbon monoxide maintenance status and its non-attainment status for the PM_{2.5}. We also allow for the PM₁₀ status for the Mendenhall Valley in Juneau. We note that DOT&PF directly funds the additional studies and analyses required as a result of the non-attainment area in Fairbanks, sparing FMATS those additional costs.

Metropolitan/urban area transportation needs

This can be measured in part by recent and projected population growth rates of each borough. Because of fluctuating boundaries, urbanized or urban area population figures are not good measures to compare area growth rates.

- The Municipality of Anchorage's population has been growing at average annual rate (2000-2010) of 1.21%, slower than the statewide rate (1.33%).
- The Fairbanks North Star Borough's population has been growing at average annual rate (2000-2010) of 1.78%, faster than the statewide rate (1.33%).

Historic (2000-2010) population growth rates in the smaller urban areas range from a negative 0.42% in Ketchikan to plus 5.00% in the Matanuska-Susitna Borough. Even negative or stagnant growth rates present their own transportation planning challenges as communities cope.

| <u>Borough</u> | <u>2000 Population</u> | <u>2010 Population</u> | <u>10-Year (2000-2010) Average Annual Growth (Decrease) Rate</u> |
|----------------|----------------------------|----------------------------|--|
| Statewide | 626,932 | 710,231 | 1.33% |
| Anchorage | 260,283 | 291,826 | 1.21% |
| Fairbanks | 82,840 | 97,581 | 1.78% |
| Juneau | 30,711 | 31,275 | 0.18% |
| Ketchikan | 14,070 | 13,477 | (-0.42%) |
| Sitka | 8,835 | 8,881 | 0.05% |
| Kenai | 49,691 | 55,400 | 1.15% |
| Kodiak | 13,913 | 13,592 | (-0.23%) |
| Mat-Su | 59,322 | 88,995 | 5.00% |

2014 Metropolitan Planning (PL) Distribution Formula
 Factors Discussion/Considerations

In developing the PL Distribution Formula, these historic growth rates have been accounted for by building the formula on the base 2010 US Census population estimates. They are mentioned here to give some context to the latest available projected growth rates for the various areas, which we used to give credit in the formula for anticipated transportation planning needs.

Projected (2012-2022) population growth rates, using the most current Alaska Department of Labor figures, suggest that the rates of change will remain similar as recent history. They project that Ketchikan will continue to decline in population at about negative 0.07% annual rate while the Matanuska-Susitna Borough will continue to grow at about 2.56% annually.

| <u>Borough</u> | 2012 Population | 2022 Population | Projected 10-Year (2012-2022) Average Annual Growth (Decrease) Rate |
|----------------|--------------------|--------------------|--|
| Statewide | 732,298 | 806,479 | 1.01% |
| Anchorage | 298,842 | 326,612 | 0.93% |
| Fairbanks | 100,343 | 112,843 | 1.25% |
| Juneau | 32,832 | 33,839 | 0.31% |
| Ketchikan | 13,938 | 13,843 | (-0.07%) |
| Sitka | 9,084 | 9,020 | (-0.07%) |
| Kenai | 56,756 | 61,391 | 0.82% |
| Kodiak | 14,041 | 14,402 | 0.26% |
| Mat-Su | 93,801 | 117,845 | 2.56% |

In assessing the impact of this projected growth on transportation planning needs, we assigned a default factor of 1 for annualized growth rates of 1% or less, while assigning the full annualized growth rate for those areas over 1%. AMATS was held harmless at 1, while FMATS was factored at 1.25.

Other factors

In addition to the above information, the following factors were considered. While it is not possible to quantify some of the elements, these issues were considered in developing the PL distribution formula.

- Military realignments may affect the number of troops stationed at Fort Wainwright and Eielson Air Force Base, as well as Joint Base Elmendorf – Fort Richardson. In recent weeks, it was announced that Eielson is the preferred alternative for the location of F-35 fighters and the additional personnel needed to operate them.
- The proposed Knik Arm Bridge project appears to be moving ahead; it is a stated priority of the legislature. It will have a significant impact on traffic between Anchorage and the Matanuska-Susitna Borough, and within Anchorage itself.
- The proposed Alaska Natural Gas Pipeline project, should one move ahead, will have significant impacts on both Fairbanks and Anchorage and other areas of the state. Progress at this point is speculative.
- A significant portion of the commuter traffic in Anchorage, over 8%, is generated in the Matanuska-Susitna Borough.
- Both Anchorage and Fairbanks see significant traffic increases due to summer tourism.

2014 Metropolitan Planning (PL) Distribution Formula Factors Discussion/Considerations

- Both communities can be considered regional centers of commerce; with Anchorage having the additional role as a statewide center with the its port.
- Anchorage has more than twice the geographical area of Fairbanks and more than twice the urban miles of road.

Inflation – In developing the formula we sought to protect the funding allocations to the MPOs against inflation since the formula was last revised in 2006. We used actual and projected inflation figures based on the changes in the Consumer Price Index provided by the Department of Labor and Workforce Development, Research and Analysis Section.

Applying the inflation rate calculation would result in an increase of the allocation to AMATS from \$930,138 in FFY09 (the last year of SAFETEA-LU and the last year funding increased) to nearly \$1,011,000 in FFY14. The formula proposed would allocate over \$1,262,000 to AMATS in FFY14.

Applying the inflation rate calculation to FMATS would result in an increase of the allocation from \$232,534 in FFY09 to less than \$253,000 in FFY14. The proposed formula would allocate about \$368,100 to FMATS in FFY14.

Meeting planning needs –

One objective in the development of a new formula is to ensure that the MPO's receive adequate funds to meet their ongoing transportation planning needs. That is measured in part by holding them "harmless" from the effects of inflation, discussed above.

2014 Metropolitan Planning (PL) Distribution Formula
Factors Discussion/Considerations

Qualifying Urban Areas for the 2010 Census
Census Bureau Notice: 3/27/2012
Published in Federal Register; 77 FR 18651

Urbanized Areas

| | |
|---------------|---------|
| Anchorage, AK | 251,243 |
| Fairbanks, AK | 64,513 |

Urban Clusters⁵

| | |
|------------------------------------|---------------------|
| Anchorage Northeast, AK | 28,568 ⁶ |
| Barrow, AK | 3,835 |
| Bethel, AK | 4,434 |
| Eielson AFB, AK | 2,944 |
| *Juneau, AK | 24,537 |
| Kenai, AK | 4,921 |
| *Ketchikan, AK | 10,352 |
| *Kodiak, AK | 9,335 |
| Kotzebue, AK | 3,200 |
| *Lakes, Knik-Fairview, Wasilla, AK | 44,236 |
| Nome, AK | 3,222 |
| *Sitka, AK | 7,027 |
| *Soldotna, AK | 6,526 |

⁵ An urban cluster consists of densely settled territory that contains at least 2,500 people, but fewer than 50,000 people.

⁶ Included within AMATS Urbanized Area

FMATS 2017 - 2020 TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM
Administrative Modification #6
Draft 10.23.18

| NID | IRIS | Project Description | Fund Code | Phase | FFY17 | FFY18 | FFY19 | FFY20 | Beyond |
|--------------------------------------|------|---|------------------|-------------------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|--------|
| Funding (Revenue) Summary | | | | | | | | | |
| | | FMATS STP ALLOCATION (Federal) | STP | | | 7,344.4 | 7,528.1 | 7,716.3 | |
| | | (Federal) | CMAQ | | | 727.8 | 727.8 | 727.8 | |
| | | Planning funds | PL | | | 274.6 | 274.6 | 274.6 | |
| | | | BANK | | | 1,066.3 | 555.5 | | |
| | | | | | | 9,413.1 | 9,086.0 | 8,718.7 | |
| | | <i>This shows the overall match required for the federal funds above.</i> | | | | | | | |
| | | FMATS STP ALLOCATION (state & 3PF match) | Match | | | 729.0 | 747.3 | 765.9 | |
| | | Match needed for all CMAQ funds | CMAQ-M | | | 72.2 | 72.2 | 72.2 | |
| | | Match needed for all Planning funds | PL-M | | | 28.0 | 25.1 | 25.1 | |
| | | Match needed for all Banking funds | BANK-M | | | 105.8 | | | |
| | | | | | | 935.0 | 844.6 | 863.2 | |
| | | | | | | 10,348.1 | 9,930.5 | 9,581.9 | |
| Funding (Revenue) Total | | | | | | | | | |
| Projected Obligations Summary | | | | | | | | | |
| | | Fund Code Description | Fund Code | | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 | 2020 | |
| Federal Summary | | | | | | | | | |
| | | FMATS STP Allocation (federal) | STP | | | 7,044.2 | 7,528.1 | 6,350.3 | |
| | | Congestion Mitigation/Air Quality | CMAQ | | | 472.5 | 727.8 | 409.4 | |
| | | Planning Funds | PL | | | 274.6 | 274.6 | 274.6 | |
| | | (federal) | BANK | | | 1,066.3 | 555.5 | 0.0 | |
| | | | | <i>Federal Subtotal</i> | | 8,857.6 | 9,085.9 | 7,034.3 | |
| | | Advanced Construction | AC | | | 136.4 | 3,005.4 | 19,732.3 | |
| | | Advance Construction Conversion(Payback) | ACC | | | 0.0 | -136.4 | -3,005.4 | |
| | | | | <i>AC/ACC Subtotal</i> | | 136.4 | 2,869.0 | 16,726.9 | |
| Federal Match Summary | | | | | | | | | |
| | | State Match | SM | | | 373.6 | 430.7 | 1,661.4 | |
| | | Match contributions from local governments | 3PF | | | 774.3 | 697.4 | 279.1 | |
| | | FMATS Appropriation Match | FAM | | | 71.5 | 94.3 | 418.4 | |
| | | | | <i>Match Subtotal</i> | | 1,219.4 | 1,222.3 | 2,358.8 | |
| | | | | | | 10,077.1 | 10,308.2 | 9,393.1 | |
| Other Summary | | | | | | | | | |
| | | Transportation Alternative Program | TAP | | | 654.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 | |
| | | | | | | 654.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 | |
| Illustrative Summary | | | | | | | | | |
| | | Illustrative - Fund Place Holder | ILLU | | | 0.0 | 0.0 | 800.0 | |
| | | | | | | 0.0 | 0.0 | 800.0 | |
| General Fund Summary | | | | | | | | | |
| | | FMATS Appropriation Funds | FAF | | | 1,589.9 | 456.2 | 97.0 | |
| | | City of North Pole Contribution | CONP | | | 7.5 | 7.5 | 7.5 | |
| | | | | <i>TOTAL</i> | | 1,597.4 | 463.7 | 104.5 | |
| | | | | GRAND TOTAL | | 12,328.7 | 10,771.9 | 9,497.6 | |

STP: Surface Transp. Prog., SM: State Match, 3PF: 3rd Party Funding, CMAQ: Congestion Mitigation Air Quality, ILLU: Illustrative, AC: Advance Construction, ACC: Adv. Constr. Conversion, FAM: FMATS Appropriation Match, FAF: Appropriation Funds

| PROJECT LOCATION | FEDERAL FISCAL PROGRAMMING YEAR (\$ in Thousands) | | | | 4-year total | % of 4-year Non-NHS \$ |
|--|---|------------------|------------------|------------------|--------------------|------------------------|
| | October 1 - September 30 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 2020 | 2021 | 2022 | | |
| Non-National Highway System (Table 2) | | | | | | |
| Roadway Improvements without Pavement Replacement Projects | \$7,515 | \$20,764 | \$14,205 | \$20,133 | \$62,617 | 51.4% |
| Pavement Replacement Projects (Table 7) | \$5,600 | \$3,200 | \$7,111 | \$2,500 | \$18,411 | 15.1% |
| | \$13,115 | \$23,964 | \$21,316 | \$22,633 | \$81,028 | |
| Non-motorized (Table 3) | \$2,400 | \$2,000 | \$6,450 | \$6,000 | \$16,850 | 13.8% |
| Plans and Studies (Table 4) | \$8,050 | \$1,300 | \$250 | \$0 | \$9,600 | 7.9% |
| Congestion Mitigation & Air Quality (Table 5) | \$5,795 | \$2,830 | \$2,830 | \$2,830 | \$14,285 | 11.7% |
| Non-National Highway System Subtotal for Non-NHS roads, non-motorized & CMAQ projects | \$29,360 | \$30,094 | \$30,846 | \$31,463 | \$121,763 | 100.0% |
| STIP Non-National Highway System Allocation from ADOT&PF's CTP programs [as of 3/14] | \$29,360 | \$30,094 | \$30,846 | \$31,463 | \$121,763 | |
| AMATS CMAQ program set aside [as of 3/14] | \$2,255 | \$2,311 | \$2,369 | \$2,428 | \$9,363 | |
| Previously Programmed Projects Utilizing Funding/Deobligations | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | 0.0% |
| STIP Non-NHS Allocation for all projects (including CTP and CMAQ allocation) | \$31,615 | \$32,405 | \$33,215 | \$33,891 | \$131,126 | |
| Amount over or (-under) funding allocation level for all Non-National Highway System Projects for roads, non-motorized, CMAQ projects. | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | |
| | | | | | | |
| Other Funded Projects within the Municipality of Anchorage | | | | | | |
| Highway Safety Improvement Program (Table 8) | \$500 | \$0 | \$14,175 | \$0 | \$14,675 | |
| National Highway System (Table 9) | \$26,000 | \$45,000 | \$25,000 | \$25,000 | \$115,500 | |
| Transit Capital FTA Section 5307 to MOA (Table 10) | \$8,166 | \$9,821 | \$8,121 | \$8,121 | \$34,229 | |
| Transit Capital FTA Section 5307 to ARRC (Table 10) | \$3,890 | \$3,940 | \$4,180 | \$4,330 | \$16,340 | |
| Transit Capital FTA Section 5337 [State of Good Repair] to ARCC (Table 10) | \$600 | \$1,700 | \$4,300 | \$4,300 | \$10,900 | |
| | | | | | | |
| TOTAL PROGRAM ALLOCATION = (Non-NHS + NHS + HSIP Set Aside +AMATS Pave./Bridge Refurbish.+ all FTA 5307, 5337, and 5309) | \$68,516 | \$90,555 | \$86,622 | \$73,214 | \$318,907 | |
| Other Federal Funded Projects within AMATS (Table 11) | \$71,504 | \$57,030 | \$77,238 | \$863,000 | \$1,068,772 | |
| National Highway System Improvements Outside AMATS boundaries, but within the MOA (Table 12) | \$142,712 | \$14,732 | \$4,150 | \$9,150 | \$170,744 | |
| TOTAL FEDERAL FUNDING For Transportation Improvements within AMATS & the MOA | \$282,732 | \$162,317 | \$168,010 | \$945,364 | \$1,558,423 | |

Notice to MOA Project Managers / Project Sponsors! If your project includes ITS elements and uses funds from the federal highway trust fund, prior to acquisition, construction, or implementation, you must demonstrate compliance with federal Systems Engineering Analysis requirements. Complete the ADOT&PF Systems Engineering Analysis Checklist, link below, and submit to FHWA through ADOT&PF Central Region Planning.

| MPO Funding & Allocations | | |
|--|---------------------|--|
| FMATS STIP Projects | AMATS STIP Projects | |
| 2,079,809 * | | Urban Planning Program (6448) |
| 8,482,198 | | FMATS CTP Program Allocation (17662) |
| 800,000 | | FMATS CMAQ Allocation (17663) |
| 1,900,000 | | Committed Measures for the Fairbanks SIP (29232) |
| 1,040,000 | | Fairbanks North Pole Serious Statewide Implementation Plan (31878) |
| | 30,093,796 | AMATS CTP Program Allocation (6460) |
| | 2,311,375 | AMATS CMAQ Allocation for Qualifying Air Quality (9299) |
| 3,530,000 | | Statewide Congestion and Mitigation Air Quality (18791) |
| 500,000 | | Statewide Air Quality Mobile Source Modeling (26168) |
| <p>* Distributed planning funds are a combination of multiple fund sources and are determined by population, air quality, and various other factors.</p> <p><i>All funding amounts are from FFY20 and include match.</i></p> | | |



You are here: [Home](#) / [Services](#) / [Boards and Commissions](#) / [Apply for a Board Appointment](#)

Apply for a Board Appointment

The Boards and Commissions office actively recruits, interviews, and vets board candidates throughout the year. We often reach out to civic and community organizations, businesses, industry associations, legislators, and others and we welcome ALL Alaskans to apply for service on a board or commission. Applications can be submitted at anytime, even if the desired vacancy occurs in the future.

At any given time, approximately 1200 Alaskans are serving on over 135 boards and commissions. Alaska's boards and commissions relate to nearly every industry and interest, and have varying levels of demands, functions, authority, and involvement. In an average year, Governor Walker makes approximately 200 to 300 appointments. The majority of these appointments are volunteer positions and are usually eligible for standard travel expenses and per diem for official business.

[Apply Online](#)

[Email a Cover Letter or CV](#)

[Mail or Fax an Application](#)

Office of Governor
MICHAEL J. DUNLEAVY

You are here: [Home](#) / [Services](#) / [Boards and Commissions](#) / Appointment Process

Appointment Process

Applying for an Appointment to a Board or Commission

The Office of the Governor encourages all Alaskans to participate in their government and seeks qualified and committed candidates to [apply](#) for open positions. A current application is required to be considered for an appointment.

You may apply to as many boards or commissions as you wish. Please be specific when describing your interests and experience. Your application will remain active for up to two years, even if you do not receive an appointment after your initial application. Please note that your application materials are subject to the Alaska Public Records Act.

Letters of Recommendation

Endorsements are not required; however, if there are people who would like to express their support for you, they may submit letters of recommendation to the Office of Boards and Commissions by mail or [email](#)

Review of Application

The Office of Boards and Commissions reviews each application prior to the expiration of a seat or term on the specific board. Statutory requirements, current board composition, and professional and personal experience are all taken into consideration. Applicants may be asked for an in-person or telephonic interview.

Commitment Required

Although provisions differ among boards and commissions, most appointments are a three or four year term. Most boards meet three to four times per year.

Legislative Confirmation

Alaska's Constitution requires that appointments to certain boards be subject to confirmation by a majority of the members of the Legislature in joint session. These boards include those at the head of a principal department, regulatory/licensing boards, and quasi-judicial boards. This process involves legislative review of a candidate's experience and interest, and an affirmative vote.

Financial Disclosure

Appointment to certain State boards and commissions may designate you as a public official. By law, the Legislature requires public officials to disclose personal financial information in order to inform the public of any potential conflicts of interest that may arise due to actions of the board or commission to which they are appointed.

The Public Official Financial Disclosure (POFD) is due within 30 days after taking office as a public official. Annual POFDs are due by March 15, and cover any financial activity from the prior calendar year. Final POFDs are due within 90 days after leaving office as a public official.

You can download a list of those boards and commissions whose members are required to file these disclosures and for a description of the financial disclosure requirements.

Other Requirements

- Executive Branch Ethics Act Procedures
- Information for Board and Commission Members