

**ANCHORAGE METROPOLITAN AREA TRANSPORTATION SOLUTIONS
POLICY COMMITTEE MEETING**

**Mayor's Conference Room, 8th Floor
632 W. 6th Avenue
Anchorage, Alaska**

**November 20, 2025
1:00 PM**

*This meeting is available for viewing at
[Transportation Planning / AMATS Meetings \(muni.org\)](https://www.muni.org/transportation-planning/amats-meetings)*

Policy Committee Members Present:

Name	Representing
Sean Holland	Alaska Dept. of Transportation & Public Facilities (DOT&PF)
Graham Downey	Mayor's Special Assistant for Housing & Transportation
Morgan Frank	Alaska Dept. of Environmental Conservation (ADEC), Air Quality
Daniel Volland	MOA/Municipal Assembly
Erin Baldwin Day	MOA/Municipal Assembly

Also in attendance:

Name	Representing
Aaron Jongenelen	AMATS
Christine Schuette	AMATS
Emily Weiser	AMATS
Leifiloa Felise	AMATS
Kate Dueber	Alaska Railroad Corporation (ARRC)
Brian Lindamood*	ARRC
Laurie Cummings	HDR
Jason Norris	
Mélisa Babb*	MOA/Planning Department
Luke Bowland*	DOT&PF
Lauren Little	DOT&PF
Laura Achee	
Ben White*	DOT&PF
Craig Lyon	
James Starzec	DOT&PF
Mark Eisenman	DOT&PF
Anna Bosin	DOT&PF
Alexa Dobson	Bike Anchorage Executive Director
Adeyemi Alimi	ADEC
Tanya Hong	PM&E
Chris Hughes	HDR
Lindsey Hajduk	Director of Community Engagement & External Affairs & BPAC
John McPherson	HDR
Morgan McCammon	DOWL
Ryan Harris	DOT&PF
Emily Haynes	FHWA
Julee Trudeau	DOT&PF
Daniel McKenna-Foster	MOA/Long-Range Planning Division
Taylor Horne	HDR

Donovan Camp	MOA/Traffic Engineering Department
Sarah Davenport	
Galen Jones	DOT&PF
Connor Eshleman	DOT&PF
Alex Read	DOT&PF

**AMATS Technical Advisory Committee Member*

***Designated Assembly Alternate*

1. CALL TO ORDER / ROLL CALL

CHAIR HOLLAND called the meeting to order at 1:02 p.m. Graham Downey represented Mayor LaFrance. A quorum was established.

2. PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT ANNOUNCEMENT

AARON JONGENELEN encouraged public involvement in this meeting of the AMATS Policy Committee. He explained staff would first make their presentation, followed by any comments from Committee members, and the floor would then be open to public comment.

MR. JONGENELEN added that he was informed by the project team that the TSDO informational item that was to be carried forward from the last committee is currently on hold. It was removed from this month's agenda.

2. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

ASSEMBLY MEMBER VOLLAND moved to approve the agenda. MR. DOWNEY seconded.

MR. DOWNEY moved to amend to hear the informational items before action items.

ASSEMBLY MEMBER VOLLAND seconded.

Hearing no objections, the agenda was approved, as amended.

4. APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES – October 16, 2025

ASSEMBLY MEMBER VOLLAND moved to approve the minutes. MR. DOWNEY seconded.

Hearing on objections, the minutes were approved.

6. Informational Items

a. Northern Lights Boulevard Project Presentation

RYAN HARRIS presented the project.

The committee discussed lane reallocation and when work on the project would begin.

There were no public comments.

b. DOT&PF Lane Reduction Directive Overview

LAUREN LITTLE presented the overview. LUKE BOWLAND was also present and assisted with responding to questions.

The committee discussed safety level of service impacts, further analysis, design team evaluation, and for DOT&PF to provide clarification in writing of what is being presented and what is in the directive.

CHAIR HOLLAND opened the floor to public comments.

ALEXA DOBSON

c. STIP Update by DOT&PF

MS. LITTLE presented the STIP update.

There were no comments.

d. AMATS Video/FCC Local Lens

MS. SCHUETTE presented the Local Lens.

There were no comments.

e. Project Status Report

MR. JONGENELEN presented the status report.

There were no comments.

f. Next PC Items Overview

MR. JONGENELEN noted that next month's action items will include TIP Amendment #4, 2050 MTP Amendment #2, and a BPAC appointment. Informational items will include a presentation by AWWU on their water master plan update, and an update on the Glenn Highway/Hiland Interchange.

There were no comments.

5. ACTION ITEMS

a. State of Alaska Deadline Extension Request Operating Agreement Response

MR. JONGENELEN noted that at the last PC meeting, a response letter was sent to the DOT&PF Commissioner that included the Municipality's legal review of the DOT&PF letter sent to AMATS in February 2025. As part of the response sent to DOT&PF, there was a request to receive a return response from DOT&PF or the state by today's committee meeting. On November 12, 2025, a State of Alaska legal representative sent a letter to AMATS requesting an extension of one month with a deadline of December 16, 2025 (prior to the December 18 Policy Committee meeting). In order to make it on the December agenda, comments need to be submitted by December 10, close of business day.

ASSEMBLY MEMBER BALDWIN DAY pointed out that the month the letter was sent for legal analysis was in August, not March.

The commission discussed the DOT&PF commissioner having requested additional meetings amongst the legal teams that may delay this another month, if a delay would impact any AMATS operations, and the State of Alaska Open Meetings Act compliance regarding how many Policy Committee members would be attending the meeting. It was noted that the DOT&PF Commissioner is the Policy Committee chairperson but has an appointed designee.

There were no public comments.

ASSEMBLY MEMBER VOLLAND moved to affirm that the Policy Committee will continue to operate under that working agreement. MR. DOWNEY seconded.

ASSEMBLY MEMBER VOLLAND noted that there has been some pressure from DOT&PF to have more of this conversation. The municipal deputy attorney had conversations with the Federal Highway Administration during the work session.

MR. DOWNEY understood the municipality's legal interpretation to be that Mr. Busa's letter is not a new interpretation but rather the status quo. It does not feel particularly important to affirm it or postpone it, but rather neutral. He agreed with Mr. Busa that there has been no change to the Operating Agreement and it is not a new situation, just the way the law has always been. Procedurally, he was not sure if this motion was necessary since this motion was also at the last meeting. The intention of this meeting is to have a good-faith conversation to come to a shared understanding and to move forward on the STIP and the TIP in a cooperative way.

ASSEMBLY MEMBER VOLLAND expressed that he is deeply uncomfortable with Mr. Downey and Assembly representatives not being included in that type of conversation, but he would be okay with just the attorneys participating in the meeting and bringing back the findings to the committee. For the record, it is not appropriate for the mayor and the DOT&PF Central Region Director to be having these types of private conversations about something this big.

CHAIR HOLLAND agreed and said that his initial understanding was that it would just be the two attorneys involved and that they would bring whatever the outcome was back to the committee. As chair, he would not ask Mr. Downey to recuse himself from a Seward Highway project regardless but would include him in the conversation. The disagreements are on the citations in the Operating Agreement, and it took a very long time to respond to the letter that was received last February. On one hand, a one-month delay would be okay, but on the other hand, moving forward without that extension would not make a practical difference anyway.

MR. DOWNEY stated that it is outrageous and ridiculous to say that the mayor cannot meet with the DOT&PF commissioner to discuss AMATS.

In response to Assembly Member Baldwin Day's request for clarification that the committee needs to take action on this, MR. JONGENELEN stated that action is not required at this time.

ASSEMBLY MEMBER VOLLAND withdrew his motion.

There was no further discussion.

b. Seward to Glenn PEL Comments – Seward to Glenn Highway Draft PEL – Level 2 Screening and Recommendations – AMATS Staff Comments

MR. JONGENELEN noted that DOT&PF had been working on the Seward Highway to Glenn Highway Planning and Environmental Linkages (PEL) project and recently released a Draft PEL Report and Level 2 Screening and Recommendations. These documents are before the PC for review and comments, which are due by November 21, 2025. Additionally, AMATS staff will be providing comments to the project team. The TAC had an in-depth discussion with a significant number of points, which have been provided, with the exception of 6 points that the TAC requested to be brought before the PC for consideration. He pointed out an error in the memorandum, noting that the TAC did not recommend supporting AMATS' staff comments but did recommend supporting AMATS' staff in sending the staff comments to the project team.

The committee clarified that the AMATS model was used as a base for vehicular traffic assumptions.

CHAIR HOLLAND opened the floor to public comments.

ALEXA DOBSON

ASSEMBLY MEMBER BALDWIN DAY moved that the Policy Committee support the comments that AMATS staff sent to the project team along with the comments from the Technical Advisory Committee and request that the project team provide substantive responses to the Policy Committee with respect to the questions raised. ASSEMBLY MEMBER VOLLAND seconded.

MR. DOWNEY noted that the public comment period is wrapping up in the near term and the Technical Advisory Committee chose not to endorse staff's comments because they had not had adequate time to review them. The next TAC meeting is not until December and would likely be after comments were useful to the project team. He asked a member of the project team if that were true or if it would still be useful to get these comments in December.

GALEN JONES with DOT&PF replied that they will gladly accept comments after the public comment deadline, especially from governmental agencies, because they will be critical with getting this PEL right and determining the future for transportation safety and mobility in the region.

CHAIR HOLLAND does not intend to vote for the Policy Committee supporting the comments, since the project team has already seen the comments. He would recommend a work session with the TAC to resolve some of their concerns. However, he would support forwarding the comments.

ASSEMBLY MEMBER BALDWIN DAY commented that it is appropriate as policy makers to affirm the work of AMATS staff and the TAC, in which there was a conversation about supporting staff's comments. The only reason the TAC did not say that they also supported staff's comments was because of hesitation on the part of one or two TAC members of that entire body who felt they had not had an opportunity to review them with a fine-tooth comb the work that staff had done. The general consensus at the TAC was that the staff comments were valid and worthy and deserved to be taken into consideration quite seriously. As a member of the Policy Committee, it says to her that we are well within our rights and are within the realm of our purview to support the comments that staff had put together and to request a substantive response to those comments.

MR. DOWNEY added that the collaboration between staff and AMATS is fruitful, but the fact that the TAC did not do a full analysis and recommend the comments does make him hesitant to put the PC stamp on them. The comments make sense to him and do not say they have to be done a certain way; they just say that the TAC had questions. For that reason, he could support the motion.

CHAIR HOLLAND thinks that without the responses to the comments, the Policy Committee is only seeing half of the information and will not support the motion.

CHAIR HOLLAND called for a roll call vote.

AYE

Assembly Member Baldwin Day

Mr. Downey

Assembly Member Volland

NAY

Ms. Frank

Chair Holland

The motion passed with 3 votes in favor and 2 votes against.

c. Seward Highway: O'Malley to Dimond Purpose and Need Comments

MR. JONGENELEN noted that the Seward Highway: O'Malley to Dimond project is being reevaluated. The Alaska DOT&PF has been directed to step back and "take a fresh look at the scope and identify projects that meet the community's needs within the available funding." As part of that effort, the project team gathered stakeholders to participate. AMATS is a stakeholder, with AMATS staff attending the meetings. At the last meeting, stakeholders were asked to report back to their groups and gather feedback on the purpose and need of this project. The Policy Committee updated the project scope in the 2027-2030 TIP.

ASSEMBLY MEMBER VOLLAND asked for clarification to be put on record that the purpose and need are actually going to be reevaluated.

MR. BOWLAND noted that he was not at the initial stakeholder meeting but recalled that Mr. Jongenelen was at the meeting and had stated that the purpose and need were up for discussion.

CHAIR HOLLAND opened the floor to public comments.

ALEXA DOBSON

ASSEMBLY MEMBER BALDWIN DAY moved to approve. ASSEMBLY MEMBER VOLLAND seconded.

MR. DOWNEY noted that it seems these four items are very similar to the scope this committee established at the last meeting, with the exception of winter maintenance, which is novel to the points made in the scope. Is it the case that the project team was confused or had follow-up questions about this scope? If so, do these four bullet points answer that confusion?

MR. HARRIS replied that there was no confusion with the project team but did identify areas of concern that the TAC had within the corridor and asked for data. The project team is working on providing all the data the TAC had requested. The issues or concerns will then be used to help formulate the purpose and need. The project team will meet one week later to begin drafting different alternatives and solutions addressing the concerns.

MR. JONGENELEN added that AMATS staff was asked to come back to the stakeholder group to get comments on the purpose and need. The Policy Committee had not commented on the purpose and need when editing the scope in the TIP. This is giving the PC an opportunity to flesh out anything they would like more information on for the project team to consider as part of the purpose and need. Staff is trying to do its due diligence by making sure the PC has had the opportunity to participate in the development of the purpose and need, at least by providing comments to the project team.

MR. DOWNEY expressed that the two things he would like to add or memorialize are to emphasize cost and to make sure it is as cost-effective a project as possible. That is always our goal but is important especially to the points about these types of projects taking away from other potential projects and competing for priority. Also, the purpose and need should not exceed the scope determined by the PC and the TAC.

MR. DOWNEY moved to amend to include two additional comments. One is to emphasize cost savings, and the second would be that the purpose and need should not exceed the scope in the TIP. ASSEMBLY MEMBER BALDWIN DAY seconded.

CHAIR HOLLAND added that if the project team came up with a scope other than what the PC has now in the TIP, it can always be revisited.

Hearing no objections, the amendment passed.

Hearing no objections, the main motion, as amended, passed.

7. COMMITTEE COMMENTS

CHAIR HOLLAND recently looked at an Old Midtown PEL for some highway-to-highway data. The origin-to-destination studies had become more accurate with the increase in technology. When those origin-to-destination studies were done, there was less than 2% of the traffic that passes Muldoon and passes Rabbit Creek going out of town. For Midtown, they were dependent on the peak, and the a.m. was a little heavier, but 30-35% of traffic passed through Midtown. In the evening, it was only 15-30%. For the most part, the destination is Midtown, which makes sense with the employment center. He received a list of all the vacant buildings in Midtown, which is massive with hundreds of thousands of square feet.

8. PUBLIC COMMENTS - None

9. ADJOURNMENT

MR. DOWNEY moved to adjourn. ASSEMBLY MEMBER VOLLAND seconded.

Hearing no objections, the meeting adjourned at 2:45p p.m.