ANCHORAGE METROPOLITAN AREA TRANSPORTATION SOLUTIONS
POLICY COMMITTEE MEETING

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

April 16, 2026
1:00 PM

This meeting is available for viewing at
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
Erin Baldwin Day	MOA/Municipal Assembly
Daniel Volland	MOA/Municipal Assembly
Virtual	
Morgan Frank	Alaska Dept. of Environmental Conservation (ADEC), Air Quality

Also in attendance:

Name	Representing
Aaron Jongenelen	AMATS
Christine Schuette	AMATS
Rhiannon Brown	AMATS
Emily Weiser	AMATS
Leifiloa Felise	AMATS
Kate Dueber	Alaska Railroad Corporation (ARRC)
Bob Doehl	MOA/Community & Economic Development
Luke Bowland*	DOT&PF
Kristina Busch	DOT&PF
Connor Eshleman	DOT&PF
Danielle Tessen	DOT&PF
Ben White*	DOT&PF
Brandon Telford	MOA/PM&E
Jenna Lowry	DOWL
Mélisa Babb*	MOA/Planning Department
Andrew Ooms	Kittelson & Associates
Mark Eisenman	DOT&PF
Renée Eddy Harvey	
James Starzec	DOT&PF
Sandra McMahon	
Christine Langley	DOT&PF
Randy Warden	Federal Highway Administration (FHWA)
Alexa Dobson	Bike Anchorage Executive Director
Lauren Little	DOT&PF
Jackson Fox	DOT&PF
Adeyemi Alimi*	ADEC

Brad Coy*	MOA/Traffic Engineering Department
Nancy Pease	
Zakary Hartman	MOA/Traffic Engineering Department
Rachel Steer	DOWL
Emily Haynes	FHWA
Joe Taylor	
Taylor Keegan*	MOA/Parks & Recreation Department
Craig Lyon	
Allie Hartman	
Melinda Kohlhaas*	PM&E
Tanya Hong	PM&E
Lindsey Hajduk	Director of Community Engagement & External Affairs & BPAC
Jared Goecker**	MOA/Assembly Member
Kristina Huling	DOT&PF
Julia Hanson	DOT&PF
Ryan Harris	DOT&PF
Mike Robinson	Jacobs

**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. 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.

3. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

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

MR. JONGENELEN noted that the presentation for Informational Item 6.b., HSIP Minnesota Lighting Update, will need to be postponed to May due to staff illness.

CHAIR KEITH requested adding discussion on the committee's meeting time change as Action Item 5.d.
In response to Assembly Member Baldwin Day's question if the committee is prepared to act on this today or just discuss it, CHAIR KEITH replied that an action item in order to update the website for the public would be helpful.

Hearing no objections, the agenda was approved.

4. APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES – March 19, 2026

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

Hearing no objections, the minutes were approved.

5. ACTION ITEMS

a. Alaska Railroad Transit Asset Management 2026 Targets

MR. JONGENELEN noted that the targets are a yearly requirement for AMATS. AMATS, as the MPO, either sets its own targets or supports the railroad's targets. This is to ensure their equipment does not exceed its useful life benchmark, creating a safety hazard. The railroad is doing really well with the rolling stock, equipment is always a challenge, and facilities and infrastructure are also doing well. To date, AMATS has supported the railroad's targets and has not set our own because AMATS does not manage any of these assets.

The committee discussed having a railroad asset management report within the MPA.

There were no public comments.

ASSEMBLY MEMBER BALDWIN DAY moved to adopt the 2026 Alaska Railroad Transit Asset Management Targets as described. ASSEMBLY MEMBER VOLLAND seconded.

Hearing no objections, the motion passed.

b. Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee (BPAC) Vision Zero Letter

MS. WEISER noted that the committee had returned the letter to BPAC last October, requesting revisions be made to clarify action prioritizations, immediate implementation requests, and automated enforcement. Brad Coy, the Technical Advisory Committee's chair, recused himself from participating in their April 2nd meeting, since he is one of the intended recipients of the letter. The TAC did recommend that the Policy Committee adopt and authorize AMATS to endorse the letter, and forward it to the recipients.

The committee discussed autonomy, allowing sub-committees to send out information that has not gone before the PC first for review and approval. There is nothing in the Operating Agreement stating that the sub-committees cannot send information on their own, but the Public Participation Plan process outlines that everything must go before the TAC and the PC.

MR. JONGENELEN recommended that the committee vote on having something written in policy that provides guidance to staff and the sub-committees. As it stands, if the committee does not approve this letter being sent out, it will not be sent because the only thing empowered by this committee allowing the sub-committees to mail out are comments on projects. This is different as it is a policy-level comment, which is above what has normally been sent from the sub-committees.

CHAIR KEITH suggested having a motion in order to hold further discussion and perhaps make a recommendation. The manner in which the documents are received would be with a slightly different approach and perspective.

MR. DOWNEY recommended asking staff to prepare a proposal and schedule it for the next meeting as an action item.

CHAIR KEITH concurred and directed staff to work on a policy and procedure to present at the TAC and the PC meeting as an action item.

CHAIR KEITH opened the floor to public comments.

ALEXA DOBSON

ASSEMBLY MEMBER BALDWIN DAY moved to approve the BPAC letter and send it to the recipients. MR. DOWNEY seconded.

ASSEMBLY MEMBER VOLLAND noted that the recommendation from the TAC was for the PC to approve and adopt the letter and send it to the recipients. Is that a request for the PC also support the subject matter in the letter?

MR. JONGENELEN believed that was the TAC's intent.

CHAIR KEITH suggested, procedurally, that the committee move to approve this letter and then have a second motion to have the letter come from the PC.

MR. JONGENELEN clarified that only one motion on an action item can take place, if it is approved.

ASSEMBLY MEMBER VOLLAND moved to amend to also endorse the letter as the Policy Committee. ASSEMBLY MEMBER BALDWIN DAY seconded.

ASSEMBLY MEMBER VOLLAND expressed that he did not have an issue with any of the recommendations from the BPAC. He supported them and appreciated their responsiveness to the feedback and understood the frustration about the timeliness, but the letter has been improved, allowing the PC to effectively sign onto the letter.

MR. DOWNEY broadly agreed and appreciated the edits. The only caution he had in endorsing the letter as the Policy Committee is creating the expectation as the decision-makers on many of these items that would also create expectations that DOT&PF, or the Assembly, or the mayor would be implementing their recommended actions. He was not sure that there was a clear implementation plan for these actions, and he did not want to create a perception for the public that we were, at this moment, committing the DOT&PF, the mayor, and the Assembly to taking action on these specific items.

CHAIR KEITH noted that on behalf of DOT&PF, it would be helpful for us to have a policy analysis on these items. DOT&PF has their own internal policies and procedures, regulations, and statutes. The MOA has their own code. Not being sure of how these would impact that or what changes may be required, an analysis would be helpful when recommending policy items.

MR. DOWNEY felt confident endorsing this as the Policy Committee because he knows staff has the capacity to complete it on the timeline given. With regard to #4 in the letter, there are some APD concerns in terms of how we release crash data and pedestrian fatalities when there is a criminal investigation that would cause delays. He could support this but, again, would not want to create the expectation that all of those streets identified in that plan are going to get speed limit reductions by October 2026.

ASSEMBLY MEMBER BALDWIN DAY felt that by endorsing or approving this letter the committee is not necessarily making commitments but are saying that, yes, we affirm these recommendations as aspirational and valid follow-ups to the multi-agency report. All of these recommendations are already in the multi-agency report, so she did not have nearly as much heartburn about saying that these were recommended actions, and we should be taking them, and the BPAC is bringing them forward, yet again, wanting to see this happen. To her, it did not seem the committee was agreeing in advance that all of these things were going to happen on these specific timelines, but appreciated the recommendations and the sense of urgency that BPAC is bringing to the process. This letter is a valuable tool saying that members of the community that are represented on the BPAC are still very concerned about the lack of progress that was anticipated in the multi-agency report itself. She is comfortable adopting or endorsing the letter.

Hearing no objections, the amendment passed.

Hearing no objections, the motion passed, as amended.

c. The 32nd Avenue Project

MR. JONGENELEN noted that a presentation by the project team was given last March that included a one-way option to be discussed whether it should be part of the project or not. A member of the TAC had requested having this added to their April agenda, in which they had a significant amount of good information and some additional operational considerations, such as concerns from the Anchorage Fire Department and Street Maintenance. The TAC recommended the PC direct the project team to revise and clarify the draft DSR for the AMATS-funded project.
CHAIR KEITH opened the floor to public comments.

LINDSEY HAJDUK

MR. DOWNEY <u>moved the TAC's recommendation to direct the Policy Committee to revise and clarify the draft DSR to more thoroughly explain why a one-way alternative was not included in the analysis</u>. ASSEMBLY MEMBER VOLLAND <u>seconded</u>.

MR. DOWNEY mentioned the project team's comment made during the last meeting that listening to public feedback would delay the project. He believed it might have been a slight miscommunication because we need to ensure that the projects being delivered are aligned with the needs of the neighborhoods and communities.

ASSEMBLY MEMBER BALDWIN DAY expressed that she had similar feedback from constituents regarding the bifurcation of the Lois project that public engagement is equally important in that bifurcation. What was done in that initial study was not sufficient to inform the second project, which has now been raised to the level of AMATS. At the TAC meeting there was a lot of tension around this question, so she reviewed the Lois Drive and 32nd Avenue DSR, but did not find that an analysis of a one-way option had been done. There was just a paragraph noting some concern around the feasibility of studying a one-way option given the realities of the pandemic. Ultimately, that analysis was not undertaken under the direction of MOA staff. We need to be careful what we refer to as an analysis or what is an evaluation, or what is a policy call that is made when having these situations before us. As a result of that analysis not being done, it was dismissed as being really difficult, so they were not going to evaluate a one-way option. The Planning and Zoning Commission did not opine on a one-way option because there was nothing for them to opine on. It is a reasonable request to go back to the project team asking them to clarify, so that the public understands what the conditions were that prevented the one-way alternative from being analyzed in its entirety. As policymakers, it ought to be our due diligence.

ASSEMBLY MEMBER VOLLAND echoed the previous comments. The current explanation makes it sound like there was an alternative that was dismissed out-of-hand before going through a full analysis. The MOA Traffic Engineering Department expressed concern with compliance for one-way streets in this neighborhood, which has adjacent major one-way streets, and in 2021 directed the project team to not pursue the option any further. He asked Mr. Coy if compliance issues are still being seen for one-way streets.

MR. COY replied that he was not aware of any situation. It is not something that has been raised since 2021 in this location because it is a housing complex that he would expect more consistent users. It is not a comment he would have made if it had been asked of him.

ASSEMBLY MEMBER VOLLAND clarified that non-compliance is going the wrong way down a one-way street.

CHAIR KEITH appreciated Assembly Member Baldwin Day reviewing the initial Lois and 32nd one-way option and the analysis that is being referenced is not in there. It is known how easy it is to take assumptions and make decisions on those assumptions when they have not been verified. She would also like to see that analysis. The recommendation from TAC was not to do the analysis or to summarize the analysis, it was to explain why it was not included. The committee may just want to make an amendment to not only update the DSR to explain why the one-way alternative does not work, but to summarize that analysis if it was complete. It would be good to know if it was not because it might change a decision.

MR. GRAHAM expressed that his understanding from the TAC was that there was unanimity at that level and the motion suggested was a good compromise. He was comfortable with the language in the motion to thoroughly explain why a one-way alternative was not included. He hoped the project team would use that as an opportunity to explain the concerns they had and include them in the DSR>

ASSEMBLY MEMBER BALDWIN DAY noted that the TAC had a real concern that if we were to request an actual analysis of a one-way option that it would delay the project beyond the current construction season and what is planned. She is hesitant because her concern is that it would be adding additional months to the project's scope.

Hearing no objections, the motion passed.

d. Policy Committee meeting room schedule conflicts

MR. JONGENELEN informed the committee that the Assembly's pre-agenda meeting is scheduled in the Mayor's Conference Room immediately following the PC meeting at 3:00 p.m. almost every month, and cannot be moved to another location. The committee needs to be out of the room before 3:00 p.m. The following are some options:

1. Could change to an earlier meeting time, but he is reluctant due to staff's work load and continuing their lunchtime from 11:30a-12:30p. Moving it to start at 12:30p start would be difficult for staff.
2. The meeting could be moved to another location, but start later to allow for travel time.
3. The change needs to be good for the public and would also require changing the TAC meeting schedule as well to maintain consistency.

MR. DOWNEY suggested either City Hall's Room 155, or a room at the Permit Center.

ASSEMBLY MEMBER VOLLAND noted that he would be fine with the earlier time but did not want to put staff in a tough situation. He did believe there is an Assembly committee that meets in Room 155 at our current start time, but it may be subject to change due to the reorganization occurring April 28 and committee scheduling.

ASSEMBLY MEMBER BALDWIN DAY pointed out that Room 155 does not have the capacity to utilize Teams. She does come to this meeting directly after the IEOC meeting, which has been a consistent pattern. She would frequently be late if this meeting were moved to an earlier time. Her preference would be to move to the Permit Center.

MR. JONGENELEN recommended holding the meeting in the Training Room at the Permit Center and could be moved to an earlier starting time of 1:30 p.m. He made it clear that AMATS is not a subcommittee of the Assembly.

ASSEMBLY MEMBER ALTERNATE GOECKER recommended holding off for another month.

ASSEMBLY MEMBER BALDWIN DAY noted that the majority of the public currently in the room normally reside in the Permit Center, so it would be kind to meet there and keep a reasonably similar time. She would not be opposed to moving to the Permit Center and keeping the 1:00 p.m. starting time.

There were no public comments.

MR. JONGENELEN commented that the Training Room in the Permit Center is often full of large-scale trainings and next month does have a large-scale abate training that will take the entire day, so it is not available for the PC.

MR. DOWNEY moved to postpone this to the next meeting. ASSEMBLY MEMBER VOLLAND seconded.

MR. JONGENELEN added that staff will provide recommendations on meeting locations and times.

Hearing no objections, the motion passed.

6. Informational Items

a. DOT&PF Tribal Consultation Policy Update

MR. JONGENELEN briefed the committee, noting that it is currently out for public comment. This will be on both the TAC and PC agendas in May to give the committee members the opportunity to comment.

DANIELLE TESSEN with DOT&PF presented the update.

The committee discussed public input using the portal, a formal agreement with Eklutna for consultation to be included in future discussions, and AMATS has a formal policy for travel engagement through the Municipality of Anchorage, and an informational item on next month's agenda as to how AMATS staff engages with the Native Village of Eklutna on projects.

There were no public comments.

b. Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP) Minnesota Lighting Update Presentation

This item was postponed to May 2026.

c. Seward Highway: Dimond to O'Malley Presentation

RYAN HARRIS with DOT&PF provided the presentation. MIKE ROBINSON with Jacobs, ANDREW OOMS with Kittelson & Associates, and JENNA LOWRY with DOWL were also present.

The committee discussed a stakeholder group survey results, cost estimates, new concepts, identify funding, being in the TIP as proposed Amendment #4, transparency. They also discussed the two-way traffic on Brayton Drive, and the southbound traffic on Tulia exiting east through the neighborhood.

CHAIR KEITH opened the floor to public comments.

ALEXA DOBSON

d. Letters on MPO Authority

MR. JONGENELEN briefed the committee, noting that a Policy Committee member had requested to include this on the agenda for information.

ASSEMBLY MEMBER BALDWIN DAY noted that she had requested for these to be on the agenda just as a way to keep everyone apprised of what the communication looks like on this particular issue.

CHAIR KEITH mentioned that there was an additional letter recently received from FHWA back to DOT&PF, and she will make sure it gets added to the next agenda.

There were no public comments.

e. Metropolitan Planning Area (MPA) Boundary Discussion

LAUREN LITTLE with DOT&PF presented the MPA boundary.

The committee recessed briefly due to technical difficulties and resumed at 2:27 p.m.

The committee discussed the following:

1. The request for visual maps and the GIS site.
2. Justification behind the expansions or changes
3. Follow-up conversations with the MOA and DNR on the expansions into Chugach State Park regarding concerns about AMATS, MOA, or DOT&PF being able to do a project within the park boundary without consulting the park.
4. Segmented roads in the park area.
5. FHWA pointing out a correction to a portion of the Wildlife Refuge Area having not been included in AMATS' 2014 boundary but being required to be.
6. The previously requested official letter outlining the boundary areas of concern, which are 1) the expansion into lands that are not able to be populated at Chugach State Park; 2) the National Highway System expansion, particularly south along the Seward Highway and north along the Glenn Highway; and 3) expansion into the Port of Alaska in the railroad area. Having the letter list what agencies or entities are expressing those concerns.
7. The difference between a regulation decision versus a policy decision.
8. The language being used in the legend and at the top of the maps is "Draft legally acceptable AMATS boundary," making presuppositions and not being an accurate description. AMATS already has a legally separated boundary.
9. The goal is to not have the organizations and committees use law as a pretext for disagreements.
10. Having the committee develop a procedure for future boundary updates.

There were no public comments.

f. AMATS Roadmap for Boundary, Operating Agreement, TIP/STIP Alignment, and NHS Projects

CHAIR KEITH noted that she had requested this be added to the agenda, noting that the object of this was to be able to talk through the outstanding items and identify ways to move them forward and provide a process for staff to document boundary change justifications and document an administrative record. There will be subsequent meetings, to include one with DNR on the parks, one specifically with NHS, and some other areas. In addition to the boundary, being able to look again at the first component of the Operating Agreement, which is in DOT&PF's statute and Policy Committee structure. DOT&PF is short a couple of members and some advisory members, so this is one item that would be great to get the Policy Committee in compliance with statute and a roadmap.

The committee discussed the following:

1. Part of the MTP conversation would be a solution for Fairview and how the TIP, STIP, and NHS with the PEL and Alternative 5. Looking at ways to access statewide funding.
2. With regard to the Operating Agreement, it would be good to have the specifics in writing and to distinguish the legal from the policy concerns. The Department of Law understanding is that a 2008 court ruling says that statute does not require AMATS to change its Policy Committee. If there are good practical or legal reasons to change the Operating Agreement, having a memorandum outlining what needs to be changed would be helpful.

3. Schedule a work session on the TIP, STIP, NHS, and Fairview to discuss alignment.
4. A work session on the MTP is scheduled for early May.
5. Information that continues to come back from FHWA is that MPO authority for NHS projects does override the department's oversight requirements for those routes. The State of Alaska does not agree with the interpretation of the regulations, but that is how FHWA is currently interpreting it, so they need to find a way for projects that have route concerns to move forward, and to better communicate with the municipality and AMATS. NHS routes could be called out that they are struggling with, which is the Safer Seward Highway Corridor being at risk of having that project be non-participating meaning the state will have to pay that back once a federal project is initiated. FHWA determinations do come back very clear, so they have to move forward with that expectation of how to plan and program the STIPs, TIPs, and MTPs.

MR. DOWNEY moved to extend the meeting to 3:05 p.m. ASSEMBLY MEMBER BALDWIN DAY seconded.

Hearing no objections, the motion passed.

CHAIR KEITH added that she can take the feedback from this meeting and provide a draft for Mr. Jongenelen for distribution and provide some items for the TAC and then back to the PC on the Chugach MPA and the NHS.

MR. JONGENELEN requested clarification with adding these as information or action items. Agenda items are not typically requested via email but during the meeting itself. He suggested having these as an information item in May to discuss and lay out what the committee would like as action items.

CHAIR KEITH felt that if the TAC had a sufficient recommendation for the PC to either maintain the boundaries as is, or have a boundary of our for one portion of the park.

MR. DOWNEY added that the takeaway from his comment is that DNR is going to bring back a proposal of what their needs are so there could be an action item for the PC if there was a policy and procedure about a consultation with DNR.

In response to Assembly Member Baldwin Day's question about whether there is a letter outlining the specific boundary questions, CHAIR KEITH explained that there is a letter, but it has not yet been sent to Mr. Jongenelen for distribution. The letter could also be an information item for the TAC to weigh in on if it is received in time for public notice.

MR. DOWNEY suggested that a placeholder for a decision on the DNR request should be added as an action item. If it is unable to be done in time for the meeting, then it could be postponed to the next meeting.

g. Next PC Meeting Overview

MR. JONGENELEN announced that next week is the Transportation Fair that DOT&PF hosts and is being held at the Alaska Airlines Center at 3:00 p.m. AMATS will be there celebrating 50 years with a variety of swag items.

7. COMMITTEE COMMENTS - None

8. PUBLIC COMMENTS - None

9. ADJOURNMENT

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

Hearing no objections, the meeting adjourned at 3:04 p.m.