

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

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

**February 19, 2026
1:00 PM**

*This meeting is available for viewing at
[Transportation Planning / AMATS Meetings \(muni.org\)](http://Transportation Planning / AMATS Meetings (muni.org))*

Policy Committee Members Present:

Name	Representing
Katherine Keith	Acting Director Alaska Dept. of Transportation & Public Facilities, Central Region
Graham Downey	Deputy Chief of Staff, Mayor's Office
Adeyemi Alimi	Alaska Dept. of Environmental Conservation (ADEC), Air Quality
Erin Baldwin Day	MOA/Municipal Assembly
Daniel Volland	MOA/Municipal Assembly

Also in attendance:

Name	Representing
Aaron Jongenelen	AMATS
Christine Schuette	AMATS
Rhiannon Brown	AMATS
Emily Weiser	AMATS
Leifiloa Felise	AMATS
Mook Puttong	AMATS
Kate Dueber	Alaska Railroad Corporation (ARRC)
Mélisa Babb*	MOA/Planning Department
Daniel Mckenna-Foster	MOA/Long-Range Planning Division
James Starzec	DOT&PF
Craig Lyon	
Connor Eshleman	DOT&PF
Noah King	DOT&PF
Luke Bowland*	DOT&PF
Brad Coy*	MOA/Traffic Engineering Department
Lindsey Hajduk	Director of Community Engagement & External Affairs & BPAC
Lauren Little	DOT&PF
Ben White*	DOT&PF
Alexa Dobson	Bike Anchorage Executive Director
Tanya Hong	PM&E
Brian Lindamood*	ARRC
Alex Bell	RSG, Inc.
Jeff Frkonja	RSG, Inc.
Romorenzo Marasign	DOT&PF
Adam Bradway	DOT&PF

Robert Kinnaird	PM&E
Sandra McMahon	
Melinda Kohlhaas*	PM&E
Jeff EasyPark	
Bart Rudolph*	MOA/Public Transportation Department
Sarah Davenport	
Kirk Warren	DOT&PF
Emily Haynes	Federal Highway Administration (FHWA)
Anna Bosin	DOT&PF
Chris Hughes	HDR
William Ashton	
Alex Read	DOT&PF
Jared Goecker	MOA/Municipal Assembly

**AMATS Technical Advisory Committee Member*

***Designated Assembly Alternate*

1. CALL TO ORDER / ROLL CALL

CHAIR KEITH called the meeting to order at 1:01 p.m. Graham Downey represented Mayor LaFrance. Adeyemi Alimi represented ADEC in Morgan Frank's absence. Assembly Member Volland participated virtually. 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.

2. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

ASSEMBLY MEMBER BALDWIN DAY moved to approve the agenda. MR. DOWNEY seconded.

Hearing no objections, the agenda was approved.

4. APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES – January 15, 2026

MR. ALIM moved to approve the minutes. ASSEMBLY MEMBER BALDWIN DAY seconded.

Hearing no objections, the minutes were approved.

5. ACTION ITEMS

a. 2023-2026 Funding Program (TIP) Administrative Modification #5

MR. JONGENELEN noted that a modification to the AMATS 2023-2026 Funding Program (TIP) is needed to update Table 2: Complete Streets to correct the project termini and description from Benson to Lois to read Lois to Minnesota, and Table 7: Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP) to reflect the revised HSIP funding plan provided to AMATS by DOT&PF on January 20, 2026. The changes to HSP0009 (Gambell Street Utility Pole Removal and Increased Lighting), HSP00010 (Gambell and Ingra Streets Overhead Signal Indication Upgrades), and HSP00034 (Street Road Diet) meet the requirements outlined in the AMATS Operating Agreement, Section 6.6.2, and Policies and Procedures #5 for an administrative modification.

The committee briefly discussed that approximately \$16 million of FY26 project funding will be applied to Advanced Construction for the overall program.

CHAIR KEITH opened the floor to public comments.

ALEXA DOBSON

MR. DOWNEY moved to approve the TIP Administrative Modification #5 as recommended by the TAC with the inclusion of the changes to Table 2 and 7, and the name change to the A Street project, and all changes recommended by staff. MR. ALIMI seconded.

MR. DOWNEY was excited this was being done with an administrative modification. These are relatively big numbers, but because of the full cost of the project before us, we are able to do these as an administrative modification due to it being less than 50% of the project cost.

ASSEMBLY MEMBER VOLLAND referred to the dividing walls and the safety projects, noting that it could be argued whether or not that is truly an improvement for pedestrians. With regard to the Minnesota ‘cheese grater,’ it was intended to have a 90% crash reduction as part of the rationale for constructing the dividing wall. Can AMATS work with DOT&PF and the municipality to look at the before and after crash data for the dividing wall on Minnesota? It might be helpful to proceed with more similar interventions and determine if these are actually effective and a positive benefit, and then the committee can move forward with this discussion.

MR. JONGENELEN explained that AMATS does not typically collect data for HSIP projects. They are DOT&PF’s responsibility. He believed the timeframe for data was three years.

ASSEMBLY MEMBER VOLLAND thought this was the first of that type of installation in Anchorage. Because this did have some pushback from the public, and before installing more of these elsewhere, particularly downtown in the urban core where a lot of people are dependent on non-motorized travel, he would like to see how effective the safety data is.

Hearing no objections, the motion passed.

b. AMATS 2026 Safety Targets

MS. WEISER noted that the Safety Performance Targets are federally required (23 CFR 490 Subpart B) for states and can help guide transportation investment and policy decisions. Targets are expressed as five-year rolling averages and are applicable to all public roads in Alaska. Within 180 days of the state submitting their targets to FHWA (in their HSIP Annual Report), MPOs must inform DOT&PF whether they will support state targets or set their own targets. The 2026 deadline for AMATS is February 25. If MPOs choose to set their own targets; there are no federal consequences for exceeding the targets. In 2025, AMATS began setting its own targets. For 2026, AMATS staff prepared targets following a method in line with DOT&PF's method, which would help track progress toward a goal of zero deaths and serious injuries by the year 2050.

The committee discussed how often the traffic management data is updated, why the increase occurred during 1998 and 2003, and what safety interventions have been effective. They also discussed looking at the work plan to determine if the funding is being utilized in such a way to get to fewer pedestrian fatalities and use that as a filter for decision-making.

There were no public comments.

MR. DOWNEY moved to approve the recommended targets. ASSEMBLY MEMBER BALDWIN DAY seconded.

ASSEMBLY MEMBER BALDWIN DAY mentioned that conversations have taken place in the past about the flexibility of ordering or managing projects with respect to DOT&PF's work plan. She asked how much flexibility there is in deploying funding or capacity creatively to address some of these questions, since this is clearly a crisis situation.

CHAIR KEITH explained that while some programs like the HSIP do have fairly strict criteria, DOT&PF has other funding types that allow them to address safety needs that are more flexible and is a strategy that should be looked at here. When finding solutions that are data-driven, they would like to pilot to see how that could increase safety or understand how the public would experience these safety projects and use those funding sources. It would be to navigate project lists both in the TIP and upcoming months that could provide an opportunity by not just looking within that one fund type, but broadening it would help significantly. Whether it be through AMATS' allocation or through other funds that the state has available. She encouraged that these be considered. All of DOT&PF's state-driven completed projects do consider safety enhancements as a part of that, but sometimes it is easier to look within the confines of one program.

ASSEMBLY MEMBER BALDWIN DAY asked if there were other funding sources recommended besides HSIP that would provide more flexible options.

CHAIR KEITH replied that the Surface Transportation Block Grant (STBG) is a flexible fund source that could be used statewide. There are also research funds available through their

Statewide Planning and Research Program. If data is available and innovative strategies that are being used nationwide could be another opportunity to apply towards the AMATS area.

Hearing no objections, the motion passed.

c. 2026 Public Transportation Safety Targets

MR. JONGENELEN noted that the Public Transportation Agency Safety Plan (PTASP) Regulation (49 CFR Part 673) requires covered public transportation providers and states to establish Safety Performance Targets (SPT) to address the Safety Performance Measures (SPM) identified in the National Public Transportation Safety Plan (NSP) (49 CFR § 673.11(a)(3)). An SPT is a quantifiable level of performance or condition expressed as a value for the measure related to safety management activities an agency plans to achieve within a set period (§ 673.5). An SPM is a quantifiable indicator of performance or condition that is used to establish targets related to safety management activities and assess progress toward meeting the established targets (§ 673.5). Transit providers may choose to establish additional targets for Safety Performance Monitoring and Measurement. MPOs have two options when setting their own targets for each measure, which are to either establish a numerical target for each performance measure specific to the MPO planning area or agree to support the transit provider(s) within their area with their adopted targets.

MR. RUDOLPH added that this safety plan is required by the Federal Transit Administration (FTA). The reason it comes to the MPO is because the TIP acts as their program of projects, so they just need to align their projects with the regional perspective, ensuring they are all on the same page.

There were no public comments.

MR. DOWNEY moved to approve the Transit 2026 Safety Targets. MR. ALIMI seconded.

Hearing no objections, the motion passed.

d. AMATS Transportation Climate Action Plan

MS. WEISER briefed the committee, noting that work on the AMATS Transportation Climate Action Plan (TCAP) began in 2024 and now has a public review draft ready for a 45-day public comment period release from March 1 to April 15.

Due to technical difficulties, the meeting recessed at 1:49 p.m. and reconvened at 1:53 p.m.

ALEX BELL with RSG, Inc., presented the plan, noting that TCAP was developed as a transportation-specific Municipal Climate Action Plan. The TCAP serves to flesh out the road-transportation aspect of climate action in the AMATS area, building on the Municipality of Anchorage's 2019 Climate Action Plan that discussed all sectors. The TCAP outlines

strategies that would achieve a 30% reduction in greenhouse gas emissions from on-road transportation (from 2023 levels) by 2050. It is data-driven but is also informed by input from partner agencies and organizations to set the stage for a collaborative approach toward a feasible goal. Two stakeholder meetings and eight one-on-one interviews with partners have been held to inform the development of the plan. An additional stakeholder meeting and a public workshop are planned for February and March 2026 to seek feedback on the draft plan. Any requested edits from the TAC and PC can be incorporated prior to releasing the draft or during the public review period.

The following are comments and questions from the committee with responses noted in *Italic*.

(GD) Did the Policy Committee approve doing a plan like this just over one year ago? Have there been any intermediate reports to the Policy Committee, or is this the first?

(EW) *An introduction to the plan was presented in January 2025. The funding approval would have been one or two years prior to that as part of the TIP.*

(KK) With regard to just setting the regulatory framework for the plan, is this tied to carbon reduction funds, or are projects in this tied to project nominations?

(AJ) *No. It was originally started because of the carbon reduction program, and back then there was a requirement for other organizations. AMATS never had a requirement to develop a plan for any of its programs. At the time, there was discussion to develop something that could build off of the Municipality's Climate Action Plan, specifically for AMATS to focus on as surface transportation and how to help implement the Municipality's Climate Action Plan. The idea is for AMATS to have this plan, and any of our funding sources are eligible to help with some sort of effort in achieving our goals outlined in this plan.*

(GD) When was this previewed with the municipality's team that is working on that plan because there has been flux recently?

(EW) *Representatives from the municipality have been present at the last two or three stakeholder meetings. AMATS has not directly met with the team that is updating the Climate Action Plan, which had just begun after this.*

(KK) Are there actual calculations for the modeling of any of the greenhouse gas emission reductions based on proposed projects in this?

(EW) *For projects, such as road projects, there are not. Upgrades to the system do say to implement the non-motorized plan in the project list. It is not shown on a project-by-project basis.*

(KK) How have the carbon reduction projects been selected, and does AMATS feel they have a full repository of projects ready to be programmed? How can this help if we have precise projects to fill that funding?

- (AJ) *AMATS has not had any specific program developed for the carbon reduction project. A good example is the Transportation Alternative Program (TAP), which has its own set with a separate Call for Nominations. AMATS has just always done it as part of its normal Call for Nominations. There is no such requirement for CRP, so AMATS has used CRP to help fund projects already underway. Transit, non-motorized, and any other projects that would already be eligible. There are a ton of needs, so this Climate Action Plan could help in the future with selecting projects for the carbon reduction program, as long as it continues to be in place. If the committee needs more specificity and more projects called out in the Climate Action Plan, AMATS can always do more. It also might be a good opportunity during the public comment period to engage more.*
- (KK) Is there a schedule or a deadline to meet?
- (EW) *The deadline in place is the contract with the consultant that ends at the end of June. A contract extension, although not ideal, can be done.*
- (EBD) In the implementation matrix for greenhouse gas reduction, one of the most frequently occurring bullet points is to apply policy to TIP/MTP projects systematically. This does place the onus on this body to do that work and not let this be another plan that they put a lot of time and money into crafting and then placed on a shelf and not looked at for three years, then came back to it realizing those were great ideas; we should have done something with that. She would like to state her commitment, once this has been reviewed and hopefully adopted, to making this a regular guiding document on how we consider projects moving forward.
- (KK) Does the project team have a breakout of projects that could be prioritized for impact?
- (EW) *It does not suggest new projects. The focus has been more on advising updates to the MTP prioritization criteria, which are then used to select projects. Staff did not want to fall into the trap of having another project list that somehow has to be pulled into the existing process to select projects. There are specific recommendations in either the plan, or one of the appendices on updating MTP criteria to align with this document, resulting in selected and prioritized projects.*

There were no public comments.

MR. DOWNEY moved to postpone to the May 2026 meeting. ASSEMBLY MEMBER
BALDWIN DAY seconded.

MR. DOWNEY appreciated the work but did not think it was ready for public comment yet. It is out of sync with the municipality's updates. He loved the title of practical, implementable strategies, but a lot of things jump out that these are not in AMATS control and are not practical or implementable strategies. It calls for raising the cost of vehicle ownership by 35% through the state adopting taxes that seem unlikely to happen. He just

wanted to make sure the mix of solutions that we are calibrating to are actually going to happen. He echoed some of Chair Keith's comments of not having plans that tell us to plan to plan. Having more concrete outcomes from this would be more helpful. He would like to have a plan that could be implemented a little more realistically and spend time getting there before releasing it for public comment.

ASSEMBLY MEMBER BALDWIN DAY asked Mr. Downey how we are to thread the needle when we do have a lot of different partners and funding strings. We cannot guarantee action at the state level, but without having at least some aspirational direction, it feels as if we continue to circle the same set of suggestions without any real traction. What are you hoping for that would be different than what is currently before the committee?

MR. DOWNEY replied that the tax element of this is unrealistic and needs to be looked at further. It is a significant contribution to the percentage of greenhouse gas reductions. It also mentions things we should do that we are already doing, such as the parking management study being underway as a recommendation, and coordination on this might be more helpful. It also says we should increase public transit service by 50%, which all of us would love, but how do we actually get there with the existing funding? It feels like a significant question. There is more work to be done to make this realistic and implementable.

ASSEMBLY MEMBER BALDWIN DAY noted that if these are audacious goals that we need to have in mind if our actual greenhouse gas reduction target is 30% below 2023 levels by 2050, having some things that are a stretch is important to keep in front of us. It keeps us from being complacent or thinking small. Having aspirational things to reach for is really important. Since this is a guiding document and not a policy document, it makes sense to have some things that are a little bit on the edge. She is less bothered by the horizon that this sets out and more excited to use it as a tool for conversation for what we need to do to accomplish this goal and how far we can push on the way there, rather than playing it safe.

MR. DOWNEY was all for stretching and having big goals, but we should not tell other people to stretch. If the fundamental part of achieving these goals is the state implementing Vehicle Mile Traveled (VMT) taxes, then we are not being ambitious enough because we are assuming that someone else is going to stretch for us and reach our goals, instead of us stretching to reach those goals. For example, the implementation matrix has active transportation network connectivity as a high-difficulty item, which is a really committed goal of this group and is not a high-difficulty item, making him wonder if that was underweighted in terms of the strategies that we could implement here. It was assumed that it would be something that is not achievable when it is something that we have made a big priority. With this being out of sync in terms of the language it is using with the other municipality's plans, this needs a little more time and work.

CHAIR KEITH noted that it sounds like it could be helpful to have it broken out by governing body or agency with a list of their commitments to help this plan be successful. It would clearly call out the municipality's commitments or guidance, and the same for the state. She would like to see a list of actionable projects. The state also has a carbon reduction transportation strategy that lists projects included in it that are fiscally constrained for the years of at least that funding type. It did help the state look at that a bit more objectively

about what is within reach this year, or to look at other funding sources in order to complete it. Given the scope the consultant has, the remainder of the project contract, and the funding available, is there anything that could be done in a short amount of time? If the public can comment on some discreet projects, it might help guide some of the decisions for projects.

MR. JONGENELEN noted that staff had discussed moving away from listing projects in the plans because they are not useful and make it confusing as to which ones we draw from. Everything needs to be done through the MTP, so our goal has been to adjust our plans to be the guiding documents for our MTP. That is where we do the Call for Nominations. That is where people let us know what they want to see for the system. We use these plans to shape it because the problem is that we do not update these on a regular enough basis, so they sit there for a while. If the goal here is to pull back to things that are realistic, we should just not have a Climate Action Plan. This is what needs to be done to make changes to our system. We have looked at it, and if it is too complicated because of taxes, then we are probably not going to achieve that goal and should be reduced to something basic. Then when looking at plans, somewhat consider the climate going forward or with projects. The idea here was to be ambitious, and if you want staff to pull back, there is not enough time or money in the budget to do something like that. That should have been the direction in the beginning. It does put staff in a bit of a bind because of the constraints with the consultant's contract.

ASSEMBLY MEMBER BALDWIN DAY felt this is a useful conversation tool. If we were to take this document to, for example, PeopleMover, telling them we would like to work with them on certain parts of this particular performance measure and implementation, but their response would be absolutely not. At least it would be a tool asking them to participate with us in this specific way and with this specific measurement in mind. She did not think of this as a directive or telling other people what they ought to do, but we do have a lot of leverage in this room, based on the amount of funding that flows through this body and based on the connections we each have in our respective spheres of influence. If we are going to tackle climate action, we ought to do it in such a way that it generates conversation and even some friction and helps us move on these things, as opposed to thinking about what we believe at this moment is practically feasible. That is the perennial pitfall of bureaucracy. It is always reduced to what do we think is feasible now, rather than what do we believe could be possible in the future, if we were going to take some ambitious steps. She appreciated not having any specific projects mentioned here because it means we can take this as a matrix and evaluate projects currently in the pipeline and determine if they actually fit with these performance measures. If not, how could they be shifted or adapted to do so? If we are not willing to take those steps to have those conversations, then she questioned the commitment to doing the work of leveraging this body to take meaningful action on climate change. If that is not something we are willing to do in practice, then she agreed with Mr. Jongenelen to shelve it and not adopt a plan for the purposes of adopting another plan if we have no intention of doing it.

MR. JONGENELEN pointed out that part of what started this process was that both the state and the municipality had climate action plans that they ended up pulling back on. That left AMATS in kind of a lurch of where we should go. The decision was to have something that guided AMATS on how to move forward with climate action that could be done, regardless of what the municipality and the state do. Recognizing that there will be a lot we need assistance with because there is only so much AMATS can do as the MPO.

CHAIR KEITH asked what the state pulled back on.

MR. JONGENELEN explained that Governor Walker had an actual group for climate that went away with the new administration that was working on a plan because AMATS was working with them on it, and it just stopped. He thought it was a committee that is no longer in place. Under the previous administration, the municipality's Climate Action Plan did not move forward. It was the Policy Committee's desire at that time for something to be here for AMATS.

ASSEMBLY MEMBER BALDWIN DAY was curious about Mr. Downey's comment that this is out of sync with the municipality's process and asked if there was something happening with the municipality that she was not aware of with respect to climate topics.

MR. DOWNEY replied that what was previously called the Climate Action Plan now has a different name. He was not sure if it had been made public yet, but the municipality is attempting to find implementable strategies, resiliency, adaptation, and increasing energy independence. There is work happening at the municipality, and it is inaccurate to say that AMATS has to be alone and the only voice speaking for righteous justice. This should be in coordination with that work. Setting ambitious goals for other people is not ambitious, but it does a disservice to AMATS to say that we have to have a Climate Action Plan that tells other people what to do. There should be a Climate Action Plan that tells AMATS what to do, and whether that is ranking projects that exist in the MTP, or being laser-focused on transit and pedestrians, and creating positive alternatives to single-occupancy vehicles. There is a lot that AMATS can and should do, so this plan should be focused on AMATS, not on what other people should do. We should discuss how we get there.

CHAIR KEITH questioned the resiliency as a climate plan that does impact any of the changing climates on infrastructure, where we are seeing flooding and the need for different culvert sizing. A lot of it has to do with emissions, but is there a component that is focused on infrastructure needs?

MS. WEISER explained that there is a strong resiliency component that looks at what areas and what parts or roads in the AMATS area are most accessible to different hazards. It also includes general recommendations, not project-specific, when looking at redundancy of the system.

CHAIR KEITH commented that this is a very well-written plan involving a lot of time and effort, but what she was hearing was not a request to rewrite it entirely, but more precise accompaniments to the plan to better understand how this coordinates with municipal planning, and similarly with the state. This is also aspirational and is long-range's vision and also has a near-term action that we could be specific on recommendations based on outcomes. It could help this body take action.

ASSEMBLY MEMBER BALDWIN DAY asked if releasing this for a 45-day public comment period precludes further conversation among partners.

MR. DOWNEY does think it is a tacit endorsement of some of the strategies in this, especially the additional tax burden increase of 38% on vehicle ownership. Again, he was not comfortable releasing this to the public at this time.

ASSEMBLY MEMBER VOLLAND wondered if Mr. Downey would unpack the aversion to the tax component in this. If the desire is to have a plan more tailored to what the municipality can do, or what AMATS can effectuate because the mayor brought forward a sales tax proposal with one of the pieces being revenues for infrastructure. It would also be a burden on the community, not just for vehicle operating expenses but for many other purchases as well. The mayor's policy goals of the sales tax, which she has indicated publicly that she will be bringing back, and the aversion to a Vehicle Miles Traveled tax. What do you see in a more local approach in terms of trying to drive mode share away from vehicles toward motorized? What local tools is Mr. Downey envisioning?

MR. DOWNEY would like the plan to give us those tools. The mayor has put the sales tax on hold for now because of the recognition that with inflation and rising costs, now is not the time to be putting an additional burden on Anchorage's families. This is completely consistent with the mayor's approach to the sales tax.

ASSEMBLY MEMBER VOLLAND expressed that that was not his understanding based on what the mayor has stated publicly, which is that the conversation is not done. He also believed she has indicated that she intends to bring it back.

MR. DOWNEY expressed that the conversation is not done, but now is not the right time to be increasing costs for Anchorage families. The other problem is that the Vehicles Miles Traveled tax would be a state legislative action. He would like this document to focus on what AMATS can do because there is so much that is within our control that it seems a shame to focus so much on what is not in our control. An example is Vehicle Mile Travel taxes would be a significant contribution, and incentives for electric vehicles. If everyone was willing to introduce an incentive tomorrow for electric vehicles in the municipal budget, then he could be convinced otherwise, but he was not sure that is on Assembly Member Volland's agenda.

ASSEMBLY MEMBER VOLLAND asked Mr. Downey to provide an example of what is on his agenda that is within AMATS' or the municipality's control that would fit into this plan when it comes to driving mode share toward active transportation.

MR. DOWNEY thinks that driving mode share towards active transportation is exactly what this plan should help us to do.

ASSEMBLY MEMBER VOLLAND stated that his question is what is a concrete example of what that could look like on a local level or something that AMATS could pursue.

MR. DOWNEY commented that what was heard from Mr. Jongenelen was that we should not be having concrete examples in this plan.

MR. JONGENELEN clarified that it was concrete projects. Concrete examples of what AMATS could do are program projects in the TIP that are specifically things like making a missing connection summary. We have been having a hard time getting non-motorized connections in our community. There are a number of projects underway right now that are challenging and have been for years, which is why they are listed as high. There is not a lot AMATS can do because we do not have local control like land use does, which is a big contributor to making changes to the transportation system to enable a reduction in VMT. AMATS can help with projects and electrification of the system, which is called out in this, but that takes additional effort by other users as well because there is a limit to what we can do as AMATS. If our goal is to focus solely on AMATS, we can do that by going back to the consultants and paring it down to just what AMATS is. It would be a pretty small plan.

ASSEMBLY MEMBER BALDWIN DAY noted that having this sort of structure and plan for her as a legislator is quite helpful because it allows her to take a document that is aspirational, that we have done the modeling, the data analysis, and the work, and be able to say this is what is required to reach this level of reduction in greenhouse gases. Also to be able to say that here is the policy that she would like to move that supports implementation of that plan. Having this document as a backstop and as a way to inform the public and undergird a policy decision is extremely helpful, even though it is an AMATS Transportation Climate Action Plan. As someone who is going to be moving transportation and infrastructure-related legislation, this is the tool she needs. If it is only about what AMATS can do, it does not serve her dual role as both a member of this body and as a legislator working to enact a policy. She sees the utility of this differently because it allows her to create policy that makes a difference with the weight of this body behind her as opposed to just sitting on the dais as an individual saying that this is a great idea.

MR. DOWNEY clarified that his action is to postpone this item to the meeting of May 2026.

CHAIR KEITH explained that she would like to see a few deliverables from the project teams, such as the modeling for the projects, because it is useful to be able to apply that criteria to projects more broadly. There are a lot of broad criteria applied here, but we need some projects. It is hard to take action or to encourage commitment from other parties to support this plan without that in place. Because of the level of discourse, we need a little extra time to work through things.

MR. DOWNEY would be committed to working with staff and articulating concerns and identifying a document that would move towards our goals. A work session in advance of the May meeting, or hold individual conversations as Policy Committee members with the teams that are working on this.

ASSEMBLY MEMBER BALDWIN DAY felt that a work session would be helpful, since there is a variety of goals to sort out in order to end up with a plan that meets the goals.

MR. JONGENELEN noted that they can try to schedule a work session, but there is not much time and budget for this. At a certain point, he will have to recommend staff go to other commitments and just leave the plan as is.

CHAIR KEITH commented that we all want to collectively work towards a document that is acceptable to the Policy Committee and within the resources of AMATS staff to be able to move forward with. We also do not want to make a rushed decision at this time.

Hearing no objections, the motion passed.

e. Seward Highway 98.5 to 118 Draft Environmental Assessment

MR. JONGENELEN noted that the TAC reviewed this item and recommended the Policy Committee adopt staff's comments as their own once they are completed. The TAC also requested an official response addressing their concerns. In addition, the ability to deliver this project without impacting other projects in the area and further clarification and justification on the preferred alternative given the safety hazards in the winter, when volumes are lower. The TAC directed staff to provide the High-Crash Network Analysis comparing the Safer Seward Highway with High-Crash Network roads as a link under Number 5 in the Specific Comment Section.

Mr. Downey informed the committee that he will need to leave the meeting at 2:45 p.m.

In response to Assembly Member Baldwin Day's question if this is a time-sensitive matter, MR. JONGENELEN noted that it is, and the comment period ends February 27.

ASSEMBLY MEMBER VOLLAND requested to move to suspend the rules and take up Assembly Member Baldwin Day's amendments immediately due to Mr. Downey having to leave the meeting.

CHAIR KEITH stated that a quorum would still exist without Mr. Downey's presence and directed the committee to maintain procedure. She asked for confirmation that the comments had already been submitted by AMATS' executive director and received by the project team.

MR. JONGENELEN replied that the comments on the memorandum from the TAC have not been submitted to the project team, but staff's comments that were included on the agenda have been submitted. He added that the TAC requested to adopt staff's comments as their own and receive an official response.

CHAIR KEITH commented that DOT&PF would have a difficult time endorsing Technical Advisory Committee Chair Coy's remarks that the Seward Highway project is not key to the safety improvements of the traveling public, but if there are further comments from this committee, then we will progress to those later.

ASSEMBLY MEMBER BALDWIN DAY concurred with Chair Coy, particularly given the breakdown that provided the safety needs of this corridor relative to other areas within our purview. In many ways, this environmental assessment does not feel like it is truly the result of how rigorous and objective it is compared to the analysis of alternatives. It reads much more like a rubber stamp of a foregone political conclusion that a four-lane highway project is the

preferred alternative at all costs. The fact that this project was initiated with comments from the governor, its benefit, is enough to make her question the presentation of the data that is contained in this report. It is difficult to read data that is presented in percentages other than real numbers and to take that data seriously when it is compared with data from the urban core of Anchorage. She is in support of staff's comments and the additional notes from the TAC and reflects her feelings as well.

CHAIR KEITH noted for the record that Mr. Downey left the meeting at 2:45 p.m.

CHAIR KEITH appreciated Assembly Member Baldwin Day's comments, noting that there are apples and oranges with some of the comparisons, but what we are focusing on with the Safer Seward Highway is a national highway system project using national highway performance program dollars, which are not funds that are flexible and able to be used in other parts of municipal projects. Some of the issues with the comments have a bit to do with the fact that it is not choosing one or the other. It certainly does not negate any of the other projects that have been selected in the city area. National Highway System funds can be used on highway and interstate projects, such as the Seward Highway and Parks Highway.

ASSEMBLY MEMBER BALDWIN DAY noted that it does not change the billing of this project as a safety project. That is what feels questionable and perhaps even disingenuous.

CHAIR KEITH believed DOT&PF had presented at length some of the safety data on the Safer Seward Highway Corridor and improvements to the project. She pointed out that the project team is present and asked if they would like to add anything regarding safety data.

CHRIS HUGHES with HDR noted that they were consulted to develop the EA. Chapter 2 of the EA lists many of the alternatives, including some appendices that have traffic and safety reports and an analysis, in addition to another appendix that reviews and evaluates all the alternatives. In regard to the effort done, this is a voluminous document.

ASSEMBLY MEMBER BALDWIN DAY agreed the document is voluminous with over 1,200 pages and made the following comments:

- She referred to the top of page 3 of the executive summary in Appendix D that shows total crash reduction percentages and then cross-referenced these with the traffic and safety analysis in Appendix G and pulled the crash numbers.
- When working this out on an annual basis, the per-year anticipated percent reduction between the three- and four-lane divided highway option delta is less than one crash per year, which does not feel like a significant difference.
- When you catch it in terms of percentages (42 to 68 percent), it looks significant. When you actually work it out based on the real data from that corridor and based on the data provided within this document, it is only 2.4 fatality/injury (FI) crashes per year. Even if it is rounded up to three, a 42% reduction is somewhere between 1.4 and 1.74 crashes per year for the three-lane divided highway. It is 0.8 to 0.96 crashes per year for the four-lane divided highway.
- A delta of less than one is difficult to justify that a four-lane divided highway is absolutely necessary based on safety and crash data when the delta is so small. The FI per mile is 0.12.

- When it is up against other safety corridors that we have in Anchorage, it is difficult to take those numbers seriously. Particularly when the price tag is \$1.5 billion of taxpayer money.
- She appreciated the amount of work that has gone into this document and did not question the labor or the commitment to putting forward a great product. It feels like a foregone conclusion and a self-referencing document that does not do a lot to engender real confidence that much beyond what was already desired has been taken into account.

At approximately 2:43 p.m., technical and audio difficulties were experienced, and the committee briefly recessed. Secretary Blake was able to access the audio for the remainder of the meeting.

CHAIR KEITH noted that the comments made by Assembly Member Baldwin Day regarding the project's legitimacy and safety improvements were captured on a backup recorder and will also be included in the meeting minutes.

ASSEMBLY MEMBER BALDWIN DAY continued with her comments:

- She questioned the use of percentages rather than hard numbers when it comes to crash data and the relative merit of those numbers based on what is seen elsewhere in this particular area and within this MPO.
- With a project of this magnitude, a decision-making rubric that clearly outlines the metrics used to choose alternatives feels really important and appropriate for public transparency purposes.
- She was quite disappointed with the material in Appendix D. It seemed to take into account certain project criteria for certain options and not all options.
- The fact that there is no real scoring rubric that balances project costs, long- and short-term environmental impacts, disruption during construction, multi-modal access, and all of these different things alongside the safety and resilience questions feels like a real mess. It does not allow the public to see or have a window into how exactly these decisions were made without wading through blocks of text. The text also does not give clarity on how these decisions were made and how options were evaluated.

CHAIR KEITH expressed that these were excellent comments and would like to have them included in the project record, if not already. The comments in what was provided are a bit more broad, such as DOT&PF's reorganization, and will no longer have a Central Region, which is factually incorrect and not related to the project being discussed. She will have a difficult time endorsing these comments per the Policy Committee's perspective.

Due to technical difficulties, the committee briefly recessed.

ASSEMBLY MEMBER BALDWIN DAY moved to extend the meeting to 3:10 p.m. MR. ALIMI seconded.

Hearing no objections, the motion passed.

CHAIR KEITH opened the floor to public comments.

WILLIAM ASHTON

ALEXA DOBSON

ASSEMBLY MEMBER BALDWIN DAY moved to adopt AMATS' staff comments as Policy Committee comments as part of that request and official and comprehensive response from the project team. ASSEMBLY MEMBER VOLLAND seconded.

CHAIR KEITH restated that the motion is to accept the comments along with requesting a comprehensive response.

ASSEMBLY MEMBER BALDWIN DAY clarified that her motion was for staff comments and to append the TAC comments. She asked for clarification if the phrase "with DOT&PF restructuring" not having a central region was stricken from those comments; would Chair Keith feel comfortable supporting moving this forward as the Policy Committee comments on this project?

CHAIR KEITH replied that she would be more comfortable including these comments and making it more specific to the project.

ASSEMBLY MEMBER BALDWIN DAY revised her motion to read, "Move to adopt AMATS's staff comments as Policy Committee comments as part of that request and official and comprehensive response from the project team; and append the TAC comments, striking Mr. Coy's comment in the second paragraph, second sentence of the memorandum, that reads, "not having a Central Region." ASSEMBLY MEMBER VOLLAND seconded.

CHAIR KEITH pointed out that these comments are critical to the project and thanked everyone for putting them together. The comments are taken seriously, whether it is through staff or the policy board itself.

ASSEMBLY MEMBER BALDWIN DAY moved to amend the motion with the following:

1. Appendix D (Alternatives Development) sections describing the Stacked Structure (1.1) and Tunneling Through Curves (1.2) alternatives include a discussion of projected costs per linear foot, impact on scenic quality, and environmental considerations. These metrics are entirely absent from the section on Intermittent Passing Lanes (Three-Lane) Divided Highway (1.3). Please explain why critical metrics such as project cost, long- and short-term wildlife and environmental impacts, Section 4(f) considerations, traffic disruption during construction, multimodal access & safety, recreation access, and compatibility with existing state planning documents were not transparently evaluated and scored for all proposed alternatives and weighted alongside crash rates & severity, reliability, and mobility for all users. If such a rubric was utilized, please produce it for public review.
2. Appendix G (Traffic & Safety Analysis) states that DOT&PF approved the future safety performance analysis methodology. Please explain why alternative C2-M was eliminated because it did not "sufficiently reduce crash rates and severity" compared

to the four-lane divided highway option when the actual delta on fatal and serious injury crashes is less than one incident per year between C2-M and C7n-T. Further explain how alternative C7/7-T does more to prevent single vehicle run-off-the-road crashes, which account for nearly 50% of all crash types and over 40% of F1 crashes.

ASSEMBLY MEMBER VOLLAND seconded.

CHAIR KEITH restated that the amendment is to include Assembly Member Baldwin Day's amendment to the comments.

ASSEMBLY MEMBER VOLLAND moved to extend the meeting to 3:15 p.m. ASSEMBLY MEMBER BALDWIN DAY seconded.

Hearing no objections, the motion passed.

Amendment

Hearing no objections, the amendment passed.

Main Motion, As Amended

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

6. Informational Items

MR. JONGENELEN noted that Item 6.a. Recreational Trails Plan Presentation and Item 6.b. Project Status Report will be deferred to the March meeting.

a. Recreational Trails Plan Presentation (POSTPONED TO MARCH 19)

b. Q1 Obligation Report

MR. JONGENELEN presented the report.

CHAIR KEITH noted that due to the interest of time, any discussion will be taken up at the next meeting.

c. Project Status Report (POSTPONED TO MARCH 19)

d. Next PC Items Overview

MR. JONGENELEN noted that there will be a March meeting with the 2023-2026 TIP Amendment #4, the 2027-2030 TIP document, and the MTP Amendment #2 as action items for approval.

7. COMMITTEE COMMENTS

ASSEMBLY MEMBER VOLLAND welcomed Chair Keith to the Policy Committee.

8. PUBLIC COMMENTS

WILLIAM ASHTON noted that he was still unclear as to whether the Community Advisory Committee comments will be submitted to DOT&PF.

MR. JONGENELEN replied that once staff has edited and compiled the comments, they will be submitted to the project team, with a copy provided to the Policy Committee.

9. ADJOURNMENT

Hearing no objections, the meeting adjourned at 3:14 p.m.