

AMATS Community Advisory Committee (CAC) Meeting Minutes

Meeting Details

Date: February 10, 2026

Time: 5:00pm-7:04pm

Location: Virtual (Microsoft Teams)

Chair: Matt Cruickshank

Minutes Prepared by: Christine Schuette, (AMATS)

Roll Call

District 1: SJ Klein — Absent

District 2: Matt Cruickshank — Present

District 3: Allie Hartman — Present

District 4: Diana Evans — Present

District 5: Dave Weber — Present

District 6: Nancy Pease — Present

Anchorage Chamber of Commerce: Kathleen McArdle — Present

Eagle River Chamber of Commerce: Chuck Homan — Present

Federation of Community Councils: Bob French — Present

Planning & Zoning Commission: Jeff Raun — Present

JBER: John Scudder — Present

Staff: Christine Schuette (AMATS), Aaron (AMATS), Chris Hughs (HDR), Public Members: Edith McKee, Steve McKeever

Quorum: Yes



Agenda Items

Approval of the Agenda

Motion: Approve the agenda

Moved by: Member Hartman

Seconded by: Member Homan

Outcome: Approved (no objections)

Approval of Prior Meeting Minutes

Minutes considered: 1-27-26

Motion: Approve the minutes

Moved by: Member Homan

Seconded by: Member Hartman

Outcome: Approved (no objections)



Action Items & Discussions

A. Amendment #4 to the 2023–2026 TIP (Funding Program)

Background

The Funding Program (TIP) is a short-range planning document that programs federal, state, and local transportation funding for projects over a four-year period. It includes capital, maintenance, and operational projects for roads, public transit, bicycle and pedestrian facilities, and other transportation infrastructure. The TIP reflects the priorities identified in the Transportation Plan (MTP) and is developed in coordination with local agencies, stakeholders, and the public. Projects must be included in the TIP to receive federal funding and advance to implementation.

At the 2026 first quarter meeting on January 27th, AMATS staff requested the Community Advisory Committee review and provide comments on the 2023–2026 Funding Program Amendment #4. Since no draft comments were submitted before the agenda posting, the committee convened a special meeting on February 10th to address this item.

Committee Submitted Comments

Member Klein provided the following comment for consideration:

1. Fairview agrees with the AMATS Policy Committees objections to Department of Transportation & Public Facilities (DOT&PF) Commissioner Anderson's decision to defund

safety projects within the AMATS boundary. The following Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP) projects (Table 7) need to be reinstated asap into the funding program:

- HSP0009 Gambell St. Utility Pole Removal and Increased Lighting
- HSP0010 Gambell and Ingra streets Overhead Signal
- HSP0029 Ingra/Gambell Road Diet

Public Comment: None

Committee Questions

Member Weber asked a question as to whether the funding for the noted HSIP projects had already been reinstated or not.

AMATS Director Jongenelen provided context that funding for HSP0009 is part of an Administrative Modification that has not gone before the AM yet and that there is no reinstated funding for HSP0029 at this time.

Public Comment: None

Motion

To approve the submitted CAC comment

Moved by: Member Hartman

Seconded by: Member Hartman

Amendment 1

Add a missing apostrophe in the AMATS Policy Committee('s) objection in the first sentence.

Moved by: Member Hartman

Seconded by Member Scudder

➤ There were objections to this amendment.

Amendment 2

Remove project HSP0029 Ingra/Gambell Road Diet from the comment

Moved by: Member Homan

Seconded by Member Cruickshank

Discussion on Amendment 2

Member Homan stated that he believed project HSP0029 Ingra/Gambell Road Diet could be removed from the comment due to a perceived offset of pedestrian use with the planned pedestrian Blvd. project on Hyder Street.



Member Hartman expressed her disagreement with this motion stating that there is a lot of room for improvement on the Ingra/Gambell corridor even with the planned Pedestrian Blvd. on Hyder Street.

Member Scudder asked for more information on HSP0029

Member Hartman explained that these projects are currently removed from the DOT&PF Highway Safety Improvement program. And so, the comment is supporting adding these projects back in. The Ingra/Gambell corridor connects the Seward Hwy to the Glenn Hwy. It is my opinion that it is important to keep this project in the program so we can continue to explore ways to improve this important corridor for all users of the system

Member Scudder stated that he sees a lot of pedestrians in that area, and comment as written.

Roll Call Vote on Amendment 2

Y = Yes, N = No

- | | |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Y - Member Cruickshank • N - Member Hartman • N - Member Evans • N - Member Weber • N - Member Pease • N - Member McArdle | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Y - Member Horn • N - Member Fren • N - Member Rau • N - Member Scudder • / - Member Klein – not present |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|



➤ The amendment fails

Roll Call Vote on the Main Motion as Amended

Y = Yes, N = No

- | | |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Y - Member Cruickshank • Y - Member Hartman • Y - Member Evans • Y - Member Weber • Y - Member Pease • Y - Member McArdle | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Y - Member Homan • Y - Member French • Y - Member Raun • Y - Member Scudder • / - Member Klein – not present |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|

➤ The motion passed as amended

B. Draft Funding Program (TIP) for 2027–2030

Background

At the 2026 first quarter meeting on January 27th, AMATS staff requested the Community Advisory Committee review and provide comments on the draft 2027–2030 Funding Program. Since no draft comments were submitted before the agenda posting, the committee convened a special meeting on February 10th to address this item.

Committee Submitted Comments

Member Pease

1. Project RDY000008 Rabbit Creek Road Rehabilitation, which has b
Illustrative list

Recommend that the Rabbit Creek Road rehabilitation project be express intersection improvements at two of the most hazardous Highway and Elmore Road. Safety improvements such as left-turn light, or similar small-scale upgrades, could be advanced in this TI out years. Student crossing at Golden View Drive is also desirable.

2. Acknowledge the need for interim safety upgrades safety owing t exceed 8,000 vehicles ADT on this two-lane road, which has poor sight lines, steep grades, numerous driveways, and no amenities for active transportation.



Member Evans

3. The CAC District 4 representative asks the CAC to vote on the following resolution: AMATS CAC requests a concerted effort from AMATS, Alaska DOT&PF, and the MOA to prioritize the Fireweed Lane project in the 2027-2030 TIP. The attached [RPCC and NSCC resolution](#) (to be voted on at their February 9 and 11 meetings), show community support for this request.

Member Weber

4. NHS0011- Muldoon Road Pavement Preservation
For over a decade, the decorative block wall on both sides of Muldoon Road — from the Glenn Highway to DeBarr Road — has steadily deteriorated. The wall was one of the final phases of a decade-long Muldoon improvement project constructed by the State of Alaska and completed in 2012. It included landscaping with trees and perennials, the addition of well-defined bus stops and other touches. The aesthetic improvements enhanced the business district and unified various developments into appearing as one unified corridor. The wall itself is made of commercially available concrete block.

However broken blocks litter the sidewalks, and gaps mark places where blocks are entirely missing. Years of abuse from wayward vehicles, snowplowing, freeze/thaw cycles and other factors have left it unrecognizable and a posterchild of urban decay. In September 2018 the Northeast Community Council passed a resolution asking for repairs to the wall, landscaping, and continued maintenance. That resolution has gone unheard. Other than being a decorative wall it is also an important barrier for drivers and prevents them from exiting or entering from areas other than designated driveways.

As such, the AMATS Community Advisory Committee recommends the NHS0011 Muldoon Road Pavement Preservation: DeBarr Road to JBER Gate provide for rehabilitation of the decorative Muldoon wall and landscap

5. PLN00026 AMATS Muldoon Road Corridor Plan [Tudor Road to JBER Gate] project also provide for a comprehensive analysis of the rehabilitation of the decorative Muldoon wall and landscaping. However broken blocks litter the sidewalks, and gaps mark places where blocks are entirely missing. Years of abuse from wayward vehicles, snowplowing, freeze/thaw cycles and other factors have left it unrecognizable and a posterchild of urban decay. In September 2018 the Northeast Community Council passed a resolution asking for repairs to the wall, landscaping, and continued maintenance. That resolution has gone unheard. Other than being a decorative wall it is also an important barrier for drivers and prevents them from exiting or entering from areas other than designated driveways.



As such the AMATS Community Advisory Committee recommends the PLN00026 AMATS Muldoon Road Corridor Plan [Tudor Road to JBER Gate] project also provide for a comprehensive analysis of the rehabilitation of the decorative Muldoon wall and landscaping.

6. CMQ00009 - Anchorage Ridesharing/Transit Marketing

This project funds the Municipal RideShare program which promotes, subsidizes, and contract manages an area-wide vanpool commuter service; and a comprehensive public transportation marketing effort. CMQ00010 - Air Quality Public & Business Awareness

Education Campaign. The goal of this program is to further inform the public about air quality issues and what steps people may take to reduce pollution.

The Community Advisory Committee recommends these programs produce Annual Performance Reports that evaluate effectiveness and progress toward strategic goals using key performance indicators (KPIs). KPIs should be included but not limited to the estimated number of unique individuals who see advertisements of the programs, number of carbon tons reduced, economic impact of the programs, and increase in first time and frequency of rideshare and mass transit customers.

Member Klein

7. Active Transportation (Table 3): Fairview supports the addition of t Hyder Street Pedestrian Boulevard. This new project addresses ou priority and is also identified in the DOT&PF Seward to Glenn Hig Planning & Environmental Linkage Study. The project will serve th network in the entire urban core.
8. Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP) (Table 7): Fairview is return of the road diet projects, including HSP0029 Ingra/Gambel projects need to be added:
 - a. HSP0009 Gambell St. Utility Pole Removal and Increased Lighting
 - b. HSP0010 Gambell and Ingra streets Overhead Signal



Additional Fairview projects to support

9. Complete Streets (Table 2): 3rd Avenue Reconstruction & AMATS 15th Ave Rehabilitation.
10. Plans and Studies (Table 4): AMATS A/C Street Corridor Plan
11. Pavement Replacement (Table 6): Gambell/Ingra (6 to 4th Ave), Sitka St Park Pathway (Orca to Lake Otis), Ship Creek Trail (C St to Tyson Elementary)
12. Highway Safety Improvement Program (Table 7): A Street Road Diet (Fireweed to 9th Ave)

Committee Questions

Member Weber asked about number one and if changing the project scope would require moving it from the complete streets list.

AMATS Director Jongenelen stated that no, the two lists are complete streets or active transportation now and this is not an active transportation project so it would just require an adjustment of the description.

Member Evans asked if member Pease was proposing to reduce the project scope and if we needed to adjust the budget then too.

Member Pease stated that the Rabbit Creek Community Council was hoping the project could proceed in the 2027-2030 program with the reduced scope.

AMATS Director Jongenelen stated that the project could remain in the 2027-2030 Funding Program as illustrative and if there was project slip with other projects in the program it would be easier to slide into place with the reduced scope.

Member Evans wanted the committee to know that the Rogers Park Community Council approved that resolution for the Fireweed Lane project.

Public Comment

Edith McKee stated that she supported item number three, supporting funding action for the reconstruction of Fireweed Lane. Requested that the design pedestrian and cyclist conflict better than a two-way left turn lane. Suggest as reduced lane width to allow for a cycle track, continued elevation of sidewalk across access points for visibility and traffic calming, and improved bike lane measures.



Motion

To approve the submitted CAC comments

Moved by: Member Pease

Seconded by: Member Hartman

➤ Outcome: The motion passed

C. Safer Seward Highway Project (Draft Environmental Assessment (EA))

Background

The Alaska Department of Transportation and Public Facilities (DOT&PF) wants to make long-term highway improvements on the Seward Highway to improve safety and eliminate the need for a special Safety Corridor designation. The Draft EA for this project was available for comment December 29, 2025, to February 27, 2026.

Committee Submitted Comments

Member Pease summarized her submitted comments for committee consideration. The more she read the EA, the more dismayed she was with the quality of the data and analysis. We should urge the Policy Committee and DOT to start over with accurate data and modeling.

The crash modeling has serious flaws that discredit the results. The current support for the four-lane divided design based on safety is flawed, and it's unclear what safety benefits this design would actually deliver.

Since submitting the following comments, she identified additional issues that should be included as amendments:

- **Crash Modeling Flaws:** The model uses unrealistic speeds—the speed used for modeling the four-lane design was 58–59 mph—while DOT acknowledges actual speeds are 65–73 mph in passing zones, but in the document it says up to 80 mph in passing zones.
- **Heavy Truck Traffic:** The design requires over 12 million cubic yards generating 1.6–2 million tandem dump truck loads (trips), even if this represents a significant increase in heavy truck traffic.
- **Unverified Safety Model:** There is no standard model showing safety when converting from two lanes to multi-lane. HDR created a model using peer review.



Committee Questions

Member Weber asked what the business community's thoughts were on the draft EA.

Member Raun asked member Pease to elaborate on why she chose the specific language of not approving the draft EA.

Member Pease stated that it was her understanding that DOT&PF gets to decide when the draft EA is ready to go and she is asking them not to submit it to Federal Highways due to its many flaws.

Member Scudder stated that while he is in complete agreement with the context of the comments provided, he wasn't sure if the words "do over" were the correct words to use. The contractor needs to go back and check their work, but a complete do over sounds expensive.

Member McArdle stated that the Anchorage Chamber of Commerce does not have an official position on this project, but one of the Chamber's advocacy priorities is investments and infrastructure and improvements to the stability and long-term maintenance of ports, bridges, roads, railroads, etc. They would welcome projects that increase the transportation flow through Southcentral Alaska, however if this committee feels that this draft EA is based on flawed data, she would be interested in a reassessment before significant expense was undertaken.

Member French suggested the following wording: be rejected in its current form and that it be revised to respond to the following comments.

Public Comments

AMATS Staff Schuette read a submitted public comment into the record.

William Ashton: I am submitting this email and the attached comment letter for my public comment during the February 10, 2026 AMATS Community Advisory Committee (CAC) virtual meeting. I will not be attending the meeting either virtually or by phone.

I strongly oppose the Project as proposed and recommend significant changes to the design and the draft EA. My comment letter details my critical review of the Proposed Action. In the summary section of my comment letter I propose an Alternative to the Proposed Action (see Table 1). I ask that you seriously consider reviewing the Alternative to rep Action.

I support the detailed CAC proposed comments on the draft EA. I congratulate the persons who assembled the comments, they are a thorough review of the Purpose and Need section of an EA is in many ways the most important chapter in the EA document. I propose the CAC add the following to the list of seven reasons for the Project to be approved:

8.

The Purpose and Need statement is insufficient. The Project has two major designations that need to be addressed in the Purpose and Need. The designations are: Safety Corridor and Scenic Byway. The Purpose in the draft EA is insufficient and inadequate in addressing both these designations. A revised Purpose is proposed as follows, with added language shown in italics:

The purpose of the Project is to improve safety and maintain the Scenic Byway intrinsic qualities by reducing crash rates and severity, improve mobility and reliability, safely accommodate mixed uses within the corridor, and provide a context sensitive design.

I believe smaller, targeted safety improvements such as alternating passing lanes, barriers, turn lanes and enhanced signage can reduce crash rates and severity, be less costly, and have less of a scenic and environmental impact.

Thank you for the work you have done reviewing the draft EA. Thank you for considering my comments.

Motion

To approve the submitted CAC comments

Moved by: Member French

Seconded by: Member Pease



Amendment 1

Add William Ashton's statement, that the purpose of the project is to improve safety and maintain the Scenic Byway intrinsic qualities by reducing crash rates and severity, improve mobility and reliability, safely accommodate mixed uses within the corridor, and provide a context sensitive design.

Friendly Amendment 1.1

Member Evans proposed a friendly amendment on placement for this language. The statement on purpose and need could be added as item 8 under the first section of comments with the following title: Insufficient Purpose and Need Statement.

Agreed to by the first and second motioners.

Amendment 2

Amend the language to what member French proposed, that the draft EA in its current form and that it be revised to respond to the following comment:



Amendment 3

Add the following as bullet f under 2. Safety: The crash modeling has three items that discredit the safety results. 1. The model uses an unrealistic speed. Speed used for modeling the four-lane design is 58 to 59 miles an hour miles per hour. Whereas DOT acknowledges in the reconnaissance study that drivers actually drive 65 to 73 miles per hour in existing passing zones on the Seward Highway. 2. The volumes of heavy truck traffic required for the four-lane divided design are not included in the crash modeling. 12 million cubic yards of material to haul off site could generate 1.6 to 2 million tandem dump truck loads. 3. There is no standard model to show safety gains on curves from converting a two-lane to a multi-lane design. HDR used its own model that has not been vetted or peer reviewed.

Amendments 1-3 Moved by: Member Pease

Seconded by: Member Hartman

➤ There were no objections to these amendments.

Member Raun asked for project staff to explain more on the process and how EA's work verses EIS's

HDR Hughes from the consultant team explained where they are in the process and what they expected to do moving forward.

Member Raun asked for more clarification on the project process regarding NEPA, mentioning that he did not hear the speaker say that the EA would go out for another round of public review once revised even though that is what the committee is asking for here today.

HDR Hughes clarified that the purpose of an Environmental Assessment (EA) under NEPA is to determine whether a project has significant impacts. One possible finding is a FONSI – Finding of No Significant Impact. Or if significant impacts are identified then another possible finding is to transition to a more detailed Environmental Impact Statement (EIS). This would be saying that there are significant impacts, and they may not be mitigable. He further explained that putting out another document for public review after responding to public comments on this EA is not part of the NEPA process or a requirement.

Member Evans asked the project team to clarify how just responding to comments to mitigate the significant errors that this committee was pointing out in the EA.

HDR Hughes stated that all comments regarding the analysis will be reviewed by the project team to strengthen the argument, justify conclusions, and improve the document in line with the NEPA process. He pointed out that the traffic and safety report, as well as the analysis in the appendix, was prepared by licensed professional traffic engineers following industry practices and standards, but if the committee is pointing out this need to be reconsidered, those comments will be reevaluated against industry guidelines and research to determine if additional analysis is needed.



AMATS Director Jongenelen offered a few technical changes for consideration.

- a. The CAC cannot submit comments as a body to the mayor or legislative members so the CC should be removed from the top of these comments
- b. The CAC does not have to submit project comments through the Policy Committee anymore so the THRU at the top of these comments should be removed.
- c. The “Standing to Comment” section at the top should be removed because the CAC does not need to justify why they should be allowed to comment on projects.
- d. Italicized formatting for roman numerals ii and iii under the first number 3 section, may have been a formatting error on our part because they do not appear to be actual quotes from regulations.
- e. The last statement under 1 e: the statement saying that, building a lightly used highway is as wasteful as building a lightly occupied school, I would recommend that you remove it or remain it to focus on the highway component and not the comparison.
- f. 1f - doesn't seem to be a complete sentence “DOT&PF”, maybe add (has a) “history of overbuilding”
- g. 2a ii italicized section – are you restating this from somewhere

- h. 6a – doesn't seem to be a complete sentence "no acceleration or deceleration lanes. these are likely needed for effect the visual appearance and safety."
- i. 10a: AMATS funding is not anticipated to fund this project so the statement might need to be worded differently. So maybe something like 'it is very likely this project would delay and prevent the funding of numerous projects within the AMATS area'

Member Pease clarified that she was restated item g from Section 3.2.2, table 3-12.

Member Pease clarified that item h is missing words; no acceleration or deceleration "are" depicted on Potter Marsh; these are likely needed. (A period is needed there) and "they will" (delete for) affect the visual appearance and safety.

Amendment 4

Incorporate AMATS Director Jongenelen's technical changes a through i.

Moved by: Member Hartman

Seconded by: Member Pease

Friendly Amendment 4.1

For technical change suggestion - e - change the sentence to read; buildi highway "is cost inefficient and would deprive other safety projects of funding"

Moved by: Member Pease

Seconded: Member Hartman, the second to this motion, objected to friendly amendment 4.1.



Roll Call Vote on Friendly Amendment 4.1

- N - Member Cruickshank
- N - Member Hartman
- N - Member Evans
- N - Member Weber
- Y - Member Pease
- N - Member McArdle
- N - Member Homan
- N - Member French
- N - Member Raun
- N - Member Scudder
- / - Member Klein – not present

➤ The friendly amendment 4.1 fails

Friendly Amendment 4.2

For technical change suggestion - g - add the table citation (Section 3.2.2 to the end of that statement.

Moved by: Hartman

Seconded: Member Pease agreed

- There were no objections to friendly amendment 4.2.
- There were no objections to the amended amendment

No further amendments were added.

- Outcome: the motion passes as amended.

Member Raun noted that earlier it was indicated by Safer Seward project staff that a revised draft EA would not be made available to the public. Per DOT's Environmental Procedures Manual (EPM), Section 4.9, there is a provision for issuing a supplemental EA at both the draft and final stages. While the committee has already acted on this item, I just wanted to say on the record that there is a process for requesting a revised draft EA if needed.

HDR Hughes stated that he appreciates the comment in regard to the EPM and embraces the correction.

Member Pease stated her frustration with the committee acting after being given false information.

AMATS Director Jongenelen stated that the committee could move to reconsider a motion if they wanted.



Member French stated that maybe his amended comment in the beginning about the draft EA being rejected in its current form and revised to respond to the following comments might also be asking for a revised EA.

Motion To Extend

Extend the meeting by 15 minutes

Moved by: Member Pease

Seconded by: Member French

- There were no objections to the motion to extend

Motion To Reconsider

Reconsider CAC approved comments on action item 5C of this meeting's

Moved: Member Hartman

Seconded by: Member Pease



Committee Questions

Member Pease stated that she felt that the committee acted after being given information and while Member French's wording kind of gets to the point, she would like to see the committee ask for a revised draft EA specifically.

- There were no objections to the motion to reconsider

Amendment 5

Add the following sentence to the opening comment. We request that DOT&PF release the amended draft EA for public review.

Moved by: Member Pease

Seconded by: Member Hartman

Member Pease stated that it could go right after Member French's already approved rewrite of the opening sentence that reads: the draft EA should be rejected in its current form and that it be revised to respond to the following comments.

AMATS Director Jongenelen asked for clarification as to whether the committee wanted to ask for a specific time period for that public review period.

Member Pease stated that the original review period was 60 days, and they should ask for the same time for this one.

Friendly Amendment 5.1

Add (a 60-day) review period to the sentence

Moved by: Member Pease

Second: Agreed

- There were no objections to the friendly amendment
- There were no objections to the amendment

- Outcome: There were no objections to the main motion as reconsidered and amended

Committee Comments

Member McArdle thanked the committee for hanging in there and though reconsider at the end added a lot of value to the comments.

Member Hartman thanked the committee as well.

Public Comments

Steve McKeever thanked the committee for their work on the project. He fully reviewed the current draft EA but finds it unconvincing to justify building the project and he expressed his opposition to it. He appreciated the committee identifying discrepancies in the process. He was disappointed that the EA does not address certain safety measures for the Seward Highway, such as speed cameras, license plate tracking for speeders, and even pace cars to control traffic flow. He suggested there are other alternatives that have not been considered and stated the project appears to primarily benefit engineering and construction interests.



Adjournment

Motion: Adjourn

Moved by: Member French

Seconded by: Member Evans

Outcome: Approved

Adjourned at: 7:04pm