

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

**October 28, 2025
5:00 PM**



This meeting was conducted virtually

COMMUNITY ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEMBERS		
NAME	REPRESENTING	IN ATTENDANCE
S.J. Klein	District 1	No
Matt Cruickshank	District 2	Yes
Allie Hartman	District 3	Yes
Diana Evans	District 4	No
Vacant	District 5	No
Nancy Pease	District 6	Yes
Kathleen McArdle	Anchorage Chamber of Commerce	No
Chuck Homan	Chugiak/Eagle River Chamber of Commerce	Yes
Bob French	Federation of Community Councils	Yes
Vacant	Planning & Zoning Commission	No
Tor Anderzen	Joint Base Elmendorf-Richardson	No

Also, in attendance from AMATS and As Presenters

Name	Representing
Aaron Jongenelen	AMATS
Christine Schuette	AMATS
Emily Weiser	AMATS

1. CALL TO ORDER/ROLL CALL

CHAIR CRUICKSHANK called the meeting to order at 5:04 pm. A quorum was not reached.

3. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

The agenda could not be approved.

4. APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES

The meeting minutes could not be approved.

5. ACTION ITEMS

Despite not having a quorum, the committee discussed each of the action items for potential future action.

- a. Letter to the AMATS Policy Committee in Support of the BPAC Letter on the Vision Zero Task Force**

PROJECT BACKGROUND

At their 3rd quarter meeting, the Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee (BPAC) drafted a letter to the DOT&PF Central Region and the MOA Traffic Department outlining some concerns they had with the progress made on the Vision Zero Task Force action items. The Policy Committee (PC) heard these concerns at this October monthly meeting and requested that BPAC revisit their letter and outline suggestions for how the agencies should proceed and reprioritize the available resources. The Community Advisory Committee drafted a letter in response to the PC action taken.

MEMBER KLEIN was not present to speak to his drafted letter, but the committee discussed their thoughts on it.

MR. HOMAN expressed that while he agreed with some of the requests in the letter, like the need for more enforcement, he had concerns with some of the items that seemed to go against AMATS's charging orders of reducing congestion and improving air quality.

MR. FRENCH AND MS. PEASE supported the letter, emphasizing the importance of prioritizing pedestrian safety and aligning with the municipality's long-range transportation strategy.

MR. CRUICKSHANK shared a procedural perspective, suggesting the CAC should not second-guess the Policy Committee's process but instead focus on constructive collaboration.

b. Public Process for the Four-Year Funding Program (TIP)

PROJECT BACKGROUND

The Funding Program details which projects will take place over the next four years and ensures that they fit the budget. These projects come from or are consistent with the Transportation Plan. All federally funded and regionally significant surface transportation improvements in the AMATS area must be included in the current program.

MEMBER PEASE had requested that this item be placed on the agenda to discuss the best format for collecting community comments.

MS. PEASE raised concerns about the transparency and timing of public input in the TIP process.

MR. JONGENELEN and MS. SCHUETTE clarified the TIP timeline, emphasizing that the most impactful time for public input is during the formal comment period in January and February. They also noted that earlier engagement opportunities included two public work sessions held by AMATS in September, where attendees could listen in, as well as the October Technical Advisory and Policy Committee meetings, during which the draft TIP was released and public comments were accepted.

Committee discussions furthered on how community councils can engage earlier and more effectively in the MTP and TIP processes.

c. Transit Supportive Development Overlay – AMATS Modeling and Data

PROJECT BACKGROUND

A Transit Supportive Development (TSD) Overlay is a land use planning tool designed to encourage development patterns that support and enhance public transit use. The overlay establishes policies and guidelines that promote higher-density, mixed-use development, improved pedestrian and bicycle access, and reduced reliance on single-occupancy vehicles within designated transit corridors. By aligning land use with transit investments, the TSD Overlay aims to increase ridership, improve access to jobs and services,

and support more sustainable and livable communities. The development of the overlay involves coordination with local agencies, stakeholders, and the public to ensure it reflects community needs and goals.

MEMBER PEASE had requested that this item be placed on the agenda to discuss how AMATS could help with the data collection needed to support TSDOs.

MS. PEASE raised concerns about the feasibility of achieving the Transit-Supportive Development Overlay (TSDO) target of 36 dwelling units per acre across the designated area. She noted that reaching this density would require significant infill in concentrated areas, which seems unlikely given the large size of the TSDO boundary and current development trends. Referring to the 2040 Land Use Plan Atlas, LD-7, she pointed out that only a few small areas are projected to reach the target density by 2040.

MS. HARTMAN reminded the committee that zoning codes define what is allowed on a property but do not mandate development. She cautioned against interpreting zoning maps too narrowly or recommending specific areas for development, as doing so could lead to spot zoning, which is illegal. She highlighted the need to consider realistic planning assumptions.

MS. PEASE agreed that spot zoning should be avoided but emphasized the need for zoning policies to be grounded in demographic projections and realistic growth expectations. She emphasized the need for more realistic modeling and data to guide where growth and transportation investments should be focused and asked if AMATS had received any such analyses that maybe the public just has not received yet.

MR. JONGENELEN clarified that the project is on hold within the municipality currently and that AMATS did not receive any additional data analysis. He acknowledged the importance of land use data and noted that AMATS currently lacks the resources to conduct additional modeling but may consider it in the future.

6. PROJECT AND PLAN UPDATES

a. High Crash Injury Network Map

PROJECT BACKGROUND

Several plans and analyses have identified high-crash or high-injury locations on the transportation system in the AMATS area. The presence of multiple sources of information can cause confusion or inefficiencies when planning projects. AMATS staff have compiled these sources into a single map displaying the high-crash network in the AMATS area, with a supporting table to provide further details on crash patterns for each corridor. The map and table could be used to inform project prioritization, scope, or design, and to identify areas where regular data analysis would be useful (for example, trends in crash rates).

MS. WEISER briefed the committee on the new AMATS High Crash Injury Map.

MS. HARTMAN asked how often the map will be updated.

MS. WEISER stated that the high crash and injury network map is based on four existing safety plans and cannot be updated independently. A full update is planned as part of the next AMATS Safety Plan, expected within the next one to two years. That update will reassess crash data, prioritize the most critical areas, and may include collaboration with the Municipality's Traffic Department. For now, the map serves as an interim tool to highlight key safety concerns.

MR. CRUICKSHANK asked if we could see any of the details of the crashes on the map.

MS. WEISER stated that the interactive map itself does not display detailed data, but a separate table provides crash statistics and road characteristics for identified corridors (not hotspots). The table is also on the AMATS website. Since hotspots, like those in Chugiak–Eagle River, are point locations, they are harder to summarize. The table covers data from 2013 to 2024 and highlights areas with high pedestrian fatalities, helping to identify priority corridors for safety improvements.

MR. HOMAN asked what metrics go into categorizing an area as a high crash corridor.

MS. WEISER state that the criteria for identifying high-crash corridors vary across the four data sources used. Some focus solely on pedestrian and bicyclist crashes, while others include all crash types. For example, the HSIP list designates entire corridors like Tudor and Muldoon as high-risk. Specific segments, such as the Tudor–Muldoon curve, are treated separately due to their unique characteristics. These inconsistencies highlight the need for deeper analysis during the next safety plan update to better define and prioritize critical locations.

b. AMATS Household Travel Survey

PROJECT BACKGROUND

Regional and state transportation planners need detailed information on how people travel to make good decisions. This data includes information like who is traveling, when they travel, where they're going, why they're going there, and how they get there. A household travel survey helps gather all of this information so that planners can better understand travel behavior in the area. AMATS uses a travel demand model to plan for transportation needs, and household travel survey data helps build and adjust these models. Planners can also use this data outside of the models to create general statistics about travel in the region and look at changes in travel patterns over time.

MS. SCHUETTE provided an update on the AMATS Household Travel Survey, which is conducted approximately every 10 years. Over 78,000 invitations were sent to randomly selected households, with 754 completed surveys received so far. The goal is to collect at least 1,325 completed responses.

MR. CRUICKSHANK asked how AMATS will use the data.

MS. SCHUETTE stated the Household Travel Survey data will be used to update the travel demand model and inform future planning efforts. It provides valuable demographic insights and includes questions on policy priorities, making it one of the most diverse and widely participated surveys AMATS conducts. Staff will use the results to guide planning decisions across various projects.

MR. CRUCKSHANK asked if the data will be shared with the public.

MS. SCHUETTE responded that yes, AMATS will produce a end of survey report for the public.

8. Committee Comments

MS. HARTMAN stated that she was going to monitor the position that DOT&PF has taken in saying that AMATS does not have the authority to program highway projects. If advisory action seems appropriate, she might the issue to the committee in a future meeting.

MR. CRUCKSHANK asked staff for a brief update on the status of what Ms. Hartman brought up.

MR. JONGENELEN clarified that in early 2025, DOT sent a letter to AMATS requesting changes to the operating agreement as a condition for approving the updated boundary. One key issue was DOT's position that AMATS lacks authority over National Highway System (NHS) projects and should only include them

in the TIP as directed. This was disputed by Policy Committee members, who submitted five legal questions to the Municipal Attorney for review. The attorney's response was discussed at the October Policy Committee meeting, where it was decided to forward the legal opinion to the DOT Commissioner for comment. If no response or agreement is received by the November Policy Committee meeting, the committee will proceed using the Municipal Attorney's interpretation as its working position on decision-making authority within the MPO boundary.

8. Public Comments

LINDSAY HAJDUK chair of the AMATS Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee, expressed concern about the ongoing pedestrian fatality crisis in Anchorage. She emphasized the need for urgency, accountability, and collaboration through the Vision Zero working group and encouraged the CAC to continue discussing and supporting efforts to improve safety for all road users.

10. ADJOURNMENT

Hearing no objections, the meeting adjourned at 6:19 p.m.