

**Tech Memo 1B Screening Staff Comment/Response Summary for TAC Meeting on 8/10/2017
June 1, 2017 to July 14, 2017**

Table	Name	Affiliation	Date	Comment	Staff Response	Recommended Action
2-1; Operational Improvements	Meredith Noble	Citizen	6/8/2017	Why are operational improvements first? This is business as usual of moving cars as quickly as possible – neglecting adjacent land use considerations and other modes of transit.	Criteria are not ranked, and therefore not in order of importance -- all criteria have equal weight. Operational Improvements can be for any mode.	No change.
	Rabbit Creek Community Council	Community Council	6/10/2017	a. The term "Operational Improvements" is too vague for focused comment or conflict resolution. A reasonable observer might conclude that, outside AMATS offices, the term may be construed to mean anything: fewer crashes, higher vehicle speeds, more stoplights, or any other quantifiable factor(s). For example, AMATS may favor higher traffic speed while a neighborhood may favor more intersections and traffic calming. In other words, the public has a clearly vested interest in having a voice on specific factors that constitute "Operational Improvements".	Staff recommends the following FHWA definition of Operations: "The provision of integrated systems and services that make the best use of existing transportation systems in order to preserve and improve customer-related performance. This is done in anticipation of, or in response to, both recurring and non-recurring conditions. Operations includes a range of activities in both urban and rural environments, including: routine traffic and transit operations, public safety responses, incident management, snow and ice management, network/facility management, planned construction disruptions, and traveler/shipper information." Operational Improvements enhance the provision of these types of systems and services, and can be multi-modal.	Administrative edit. Add definition of "Operations" and "Operational Improvements"
	Nancy Pease	Citizen	6/10/2017	1. The term "operational improvements" is too vague to allow meaningful comment. For example, AMATS may consider higher speeds to be an "improvement", but a neighborhood may favor traffic calming. My definition of operational improvements would include the Anchorage 2020 Comp Plan goal of reduced dependency on vehicles, and especially single-occupant vehicles.	Staff recommends the following FHWA definition of Operations: "The provision of integrated systems and services that make the best use of existing transportation systems in order to preserve and improve customer-related performance. This is done in anticipation of, or in response to, both recurring and non-recurring conditions. Operations includes a range of activities in both urban and rural environments, including: routine traffic and transit operations, public safety responses, incident management, snow and ice management, network/facility management, planned construction disruptions, and traveler/shipper information." Operational Improvements enhance the provision of these types of systems and services, and can be multi-modal.	Administrative edit. Add definition of "Operations" and "Operational Improvements"

**Tech Memo 1B Screening Staff Comment/Response Summary for TAC Meeting on 8/10/2017
June 1, 2017 to July 14, 2017**

Table	Name	Affiliation	Date	Comment	Staff Response	Recommended Action
2-1; Regional Connections	Daniel Jacks	Citizen	6/8/2017	About the proposed criteria: Regional Connections Criteria: Using the length of regional connector as a screening criteria doesn't appear to align with any of the goals. Who cares how long a new connector is, as long as it reduces travel time, congestion, and/or crashes? I would make this into a [yes/no/no effect] criteria.	Staff recommends adding new language to criterion.	Administrative edit. -2; Negative impacts to regional connections 0; No effect on regional connections +1; Moderate improvement to regional connections
	Meredith Noble	Citizen	6/8/2017	Added road infrastructure and regional connections is not inherently 'good', especially with our inability to maintain the existing network, high operation and construction costs, and the impact to our community. We propose: o +2: Preservation to the existing network or makes system improvements for non-motorized user; o +1: Full-rehabilitation on the existing network; o 0: No change; o -1: New system infrastructure	Designated MPO's such as AMATS must address national goals and planning factors that include State as well as local planned growth and economic development patterns, and enhance the integration and connectivity of the transportation system, across and between modes, people, and freight. Regional Connectivity addresses these needs, and also addresses Mobility functions within/through the MOA to major activity centers in the region; major planned developments, such as new retail malls, sports complexes, or employment centers; or transportation terminals, and medical facilities. Local connectivity is covered under the next criterion, System Connectivity (Motorized and Non-Motorized).	No change.

**Tech Memo 1B Screening Staff Comment/Response Summary for TAC Meeting on 8/10/2017
June 1, 2017 to July 14, 2017**

Table	Name	Affiliation	Date	Comment	Staff Response	Recommended Action
	Carol Wong	Agency	6/9/2017	What about "Local Connections?" The more people can localize their trips through different travel modes, the less pavement/row required.	Designated MPO's such as AMATS must address national goals and planning factors that include State as well as local planned growth and economic development patterns, and enhance the integration and connectivity of the transportation system, across and between modes, people, and freight. Regional Connectivity addresses these needs, and also addresses Mobility functions within/through the MOA to major activity centers in the region; major planned developments, such as new retail malls, sports complexes, or employment centers; or transportation terminals, and medical facilities. Local connections are covered under the next criterion, "System Connectivity (Motorized and Non-Motorized)".	No change.
	Theede Tobish	Agency	6/9/2017	Either add Local Connections as a measurable factor here, or add it as a new discrete factor following Regional Connections	Local connectivity is covered under the next criterion, "System Connectivity (Motorized and Non-Motorized)"	No change.
	Nancy Pease	Citizen	6/10/2017	9. Regional connectivity. This category favors long-distance commuters. Our Anchorage Comp Plan calls for infill and redevelopment and a compact land use pattern of integrated live-work-play. How do the screening criteria award points for short-distance connectivity?	Local connectivity is covered under the next criterion, "System Connectivity (Motorized and Non-Motorized)"	No change.
2-1; System Connectivity (Motorized and Non-Motorized)	Daniel Jacks	Citizen	6/8/2017	System Connectivity: This can mean different things. Is it new links? Is it holes in medians? Frankly most of the access management projects done in town have negatively affected this measure.	Staff recommends adding the following definition for System Connectivity: "Connectivity is the degree to which the transportation system is integrated to provide access to essential services and places travelers need to go. The highest degree of system connectivity is between modes."	Administrative edit. Add definition for System Connectivity.

**Tech Memo 1B Screening Staff Comment/Response Summary for TAC Meeting on 8/10/2017
June 1, 2017 to July 14, 2017**

Table	Name	Affiliation	Date	Comment	Staff Response	Recommended Action
	Meredith Noble	Citizen	6/8/2017	Bicycle Route/Trail connectivity needs to be separated into two categories. Bicycle infrastructure within the road way is significantly different than recreational trails for all user types. Walkers and fast-speed bicyclists are conflicting users. Most utility bicyclists want to be in the road, at minimum with a painted bike lane, and preferably a protected bike lane if only by a small buffer like a curb between vehicle traffic and the bike lane. At the bare minimum – the bicycle route question should give points: o +2: Adds protected bike infrastructure; o +1: Adds painted bike lanes; o 0: No bike lane improvements; o -1: No bicycle route improvements / The trail connectivity could rate: o +2: Completes a trail system disconnect; o +1: Preserves existing trail network; o 0: No trail improvements; o -1: Impedes trail connections or routes for non-motorized users /	Staff recommends adding the following definition for System Connectivity: "Connectivity is the degree to which the transportation system is integrated to provide access to essential services and places travelers need to go. The highest degree of system connectivity is between modes." This detail of information is more appropriately addressed as part of the Bicycle/Pedestrian Plans.	Administrative edit. Add definition for System Connectivity.
	Meredith Noble	Citizen	6/8/2017	Not clear what you mean by measuring transit connections. Should measure how many people the bus network on the project location serves, or could serve at full infill development /	Staff recommends adding the following definition for System Connectivity: "Connectivity is the degree to which the transportation system is integrated to provide access to essential services and places travelers need to go. The highest degree of system connectivity is between modes."	Administrative edit. Add definition for System Connectivity.
	Meredith Noble	Citizen	6/8/2017	Need more info on the quality of sidewalk connections, like does it have a separation between the road if the adjacent road is over 35 mph? Is it planned to account for snow removal and still be operational in the winter? Does it include new trees, or stormwater low-impact development techniques, etc. Does it support economic/commercial development (i.e. wide enough to allow outside seating, bike racks, outside retail displays, etc.) These factors should be considered in the rating criteria	This is design level information and too detailed for the initial screening criteria.	No change.
	Carol Wong	Agency	6/9/2017	This criteria when coupled with regional, bicycle, trail, transit, seems to allow the potential for double scoring of these transportation concepts/modes in comparison to other criteria.	System connectivity is an important stand-alone concept, and is a national planning factor AMATS is required to address.	No change.
	Thede Tobish	Agency	6/9/2017	The final ways to measure this will be important to consider all modes of travel	System Connectivity (Motorized and Non-Motorized) covers all modes.	No change.
	Jon Cecil	Agency	6/9/2017	Suggest splitting the "System Connectivity" for Motorized and Non-motorized modes of travel as they are measured differently	Staff disagrees.	No change.

**Tech Memo 1B Screening Staff Comment/Response Summary for TAC Meeting on 8/10/2017
June 1, 2017 to July 14, 2017**

Table	Name	Affiliation	Date	Comment	Staff Response	Recommended Action
	Kay Sind	Citizen	6/9/2017	1- On bicycle connectivity and sidewalk connectivity: My first concern here is that on a lot of the routes, it seems that if there is any bicycle/sidewalk option, they are often one in the same, which isn't safe. I could ramble on for a long time about all the near misses I've had trying to bike commute, but I would like to make sure that a plan wouldn't be considered sufficiently connecting sidewalk and bike paths with just one pathway, because the two should be separate.	Staff recommends adding the following definition for System Connectivity: "Connectivity is the degree to which the transportation system is integrated to provide access to essential services and places travelers need to go. The highest degree of system connectivity is between modes." This detail of information is more appropriately addressed as part of the Bicycle/Pedestrian Plans.	Administrative edit. Add definition for System Connectivity.
	Kay Sind	Citizen	6/9/2017	My other main comment on the bicycle connectivity criteria is that it specifies +2 if it connects a gap by a 1/2 mile or more. I'm not sure of the intent of using the 1/2 mile; however, I just want to point out that the gaps that are less than a 1/2 mile are also important to address if we want bikers to feel safe and encouraged to bike commute. When commuting, if the rider needs to go through scary traffic or narrow sidewalks or even if the route isn't clear, for even a couple blocks- it could deter many people from riding and cause a lot of accidents. My main point is that it is important for the whole commute to be connected- door to door.	Staff recommends adding new language to criteria.	Administrative Edit. -2; Negative impacts to system connectivity 0; No change +1; New or improved system connectivity +2; New or improved system connectivity between two or more modes
	Rabbit Creek Community Council	Community Council	7/14/2017	The screening criteria for non-motorized connections between neighborhoods should award points for convenient, safe connections, buffered or separated from high-speed traffic.	This is design level information and too detailed for the initial screening criteria.	No change.
2-1; Bicycle Route/ Trail Use	Rabbit Creek Community Council	Community Council	6/10/2017	b. The concept of "impacts bicycle route/trail use" requires clarification. For example, road projects may include safer bike lanes, but inadvertently create hazardous intersections. Officially listed bicycle and trail use rating factors will facilitate productive public input.	This detail of information is more appropriately addressed as part of the Bicycle/Pedestrian Plans.	No change.
	Nancy Pease	Citizen	6/10/2017	2. The category of "impacts [to] bicycle route/trail use" needs further explanation. I'm concerned about the safety vs. speed trade-offs of bike lanes in the roadway vs. separated paths.	This detail of information is more appropriately addressed as part of the Bicycle/Pedestrian Plans.	No change.
2-1; Transit Access					No comments received.	No change.
2-1; Sidewalk Use	Carol Wong	Agency	6/9/2017	+1 rather than "n/a" what about "improves functionality" so projects that are widening or moves a hydrant or light pole out of the middle of a sidewalk are credited.	The current criterion scoring covers all options.	No change.
	Rabbit Creek Community Council	Community Council	6/10/2017	...c. The term "Sidewalk use" requires clarification to include crosswalks and other designated safe crossings.	Sidewalk Use covers designated crossings.	No change.

**Tech Memo 1B Screening Staff Comment/Response Summary for TAC Meeting on 8/10/2017
June 1, 2017 to July 14, 2017**

Table	Name	Affiliation	Date	Comment	Staff Response	Recommended Action
	Nancy Pease	Citizen	6/10/2017	3. "Sidewalk use" needs further definition. Sidewalk rating factors should include the degree of sidewalk separation relative to the vehicle speed. Back-of-curb sidewalks along a highspeed road are not safe or pleasant for pedestrians. Sidewalk ratings should also include crosswalks or other safe crossings.	This is design level information and too detailed for the initial screening criteria.	No change.
2-1; Level of Environmental Impacts	Meredith Noble	Citizen	6/8/2017	Environmental Impacts should weight positive environmental considerations: o +2: Positive impact with reduced congestion (air quality), LID management of stormwater; o +1: No impacts anticipated	Staff recommends leaving ratings as they are and not weighting various types of impacts.	No change.
	Carol Wong	Agency	6/9/2017	air and noise should be included as consideration	Concur.	Administrative edit. Add air quality and noise impacts.
	Kay Sind	Citizen	6/9/2017	2- on environmental impact. I thought it was interesting that the +2 category here was defined as having no impact, instead of having the potential for having a positive impact on the environment. I understand that everything impacts the environment, but I think if we think about the environmental impact as being relative to the transportation status quo, then we might be able to have a criteria that could encourage forward thought. This comment applies to community impact as well. I certainly think transportation could positively impact a community, and I think we should be thinking about enhancing instead of doing the least amount of harm.	Clarification. The +2 category (Good) is defined as Significant positive impacts or no negative impacts anticipated.	No change.
	Rabbit Creek Community Council	Community Council	6/10/2017	...f. RCCC requests that "Air Quality" be included in these rankings in accordance with "Anchorage Bowl Comprehensive Plan 2020", Policy 30: "Transportation and land-use programs shall (emphasis added) include: ...f) minimization of individual and cumulative air quality impacts."	Staff recommends adding "air quality" to the definition to the Level of Environmental Impacts.	Administrative edit. Add air quality impacts.
	Rabbit Creek Community Council	Community Council	6/14/2017	MTP 2040 should list impacts to air quality and water quality as specific environmental factors in the environmental screening criteria. • Regarding air quality, Anchorage 2020 calls for transportation and land use policies to "minimize individual and cumulative air quality impacts" (Policy 30); and to monitor, assess and mitigate air quality impacts of major transportation decisions (Policies 39 and 40). MTP 2040 should incorporate goals and screening criteria to favor projects that minimize air quality impacts, including greenhouse gas emissions. • In terms of water quality, the goals and screening criteria should include specific language regarding the direct impacts on wetlands or watershed disturbance, as well as road corridor detritus and storm water and run-off. The Anchorage 2020 plan uses the specific words "preserve and protect" water resources (Policy 64, 66, 67, 68, 69). This is consistent with the MAP-21 (Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21st Century Act) and FAST (Fixing America's Surface Transportation Act) criteria. Measurable water quality criteria are especially important for the Hillside, much of whose runoff goes into the state's Anchorage Coastal Wildlife Refuge.	Staff recommends adding "air quality" to the definition of Level of Environmental Impacts. Staff recommends adding "storm water run-off" to the definition of Level of Environmental Impacts.	Administrative edit. Add air quality impacts and storm water run off.

**Tech Memo 1B Screening Staff Comment/Response Summary for TAC Meeting on 8/10/2017
June 1, 2017 to July 14, 2017**

Table	Name	Affiliation	Date	Comment	Staff Response	Recommended Action
2-1; Level of Community Impacts	Meredith Noble	Citizen	6/8/2017	What does level of community impact mean? Anything above zero points should be positive impact. The current rating criteria implies that transportation projects have a negative impact when a well-designed complete street and multi-modal solution can have a positive impact on a community. A benefit cost analysis would help quantify this information.	Scores above zero are positive or no negative impacts.	No change.
	Carol Wong	Agency	6/9/2017	The footnote should include consideration of CPTED [Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design] concepts, as well as the project lends itself to place making and fulfilling street typology goals.	Staff does not concur. These are design level considerations.	No change.
	Jon Cecil	Agency	6/9/2017	Footnote #3 to this Category regarding neighborhood cohesion includes reference to "the quality of interactions among neighbors)." How is this measured? Wouldn't a more compelling measure be the physical state or the amount of poverty prevalent the neighborhood?	The following change to footnote #3 was presented to the TAC on 6-8-17 to agree with FHWA definition: "Level of Community Impacts - Consider factors such as impacts to educational facilities, negative visual impacts, impacts to recreational facilities, neighborhood division, and impacts to livability factors."	Administrative edit: Use definition proposed to TAC on 6-8-17 to agree with FHWA definition of Community Impacts.
	Jon Cecil	Agency	6/9/2017	Suggest adding rewording to state: "Moderate positive or negative impacts anticipated" under #1 Fair element consistent with 0 Neutral element.	Staff does not concur. Adding negative impacts to moderate would create confusion as to the difference between a 0 or +1 score.	No change.
	Nancy Pease	Citizen	6/10/2017	4. Air and water quality should be added to these rankings. Water quality is impacted not just by changes to drainage, but by plowed snow and other detritus from roadways.	Staff recommends adding "air quality" to the definition to the Level of Environmental Impacts. Water quality impacts are already addressed.	Administrative edit. Add air quality impacts.
	Rabbit Creek Community Council	Community Council	7/14/2017	MTP 2040 models and project screening criteria should assess, and award negative points for, high-speed and cut-through traffic in residential areas.	This is covered under the criterion Level of Community Impacts.	No change.
	2-1; Environmental Justice	Carol Wong	Agency	6/9/2017	...[L]anguage (not everyone can read written signage, either due to language or for those visually impaired, to be able to navigate the various transp. modes) needs need to included	Staff recommends adding limited English proficient populations to the definition of EJ.
Jon Cecil		Agency	6/9/2017	Assuming that EJ and ADA requirements are separate provisions found under Federal regulation then they should be considered as separate elements. Why are two of the screening criteria cells blank for the Neutral and Fair categories?	Environmental Justice and ADA were separated in the latest TAC Review Draft.	Administrative edit (Completed).
Rabbit Creek Community Council		Community Council	6/10/2017	d. The term "community impacts" is well-defined in the footnote. This level of definition allows the public to offer relevant comments. e. RCCC supports the definition of community impacts as "neighborhood livability (the quality of the local environment as experienced by people who live, work or visit there) as a consequence of changes in noise, views, walking environment, land use mix and community cohesion (the quality of interactions among neighbors). "	The following change to footnote #3 was presented to the TAC on 6-8-17 to agree with FHWA definition: "Level of Community Impacts - Consider factors such as impacts to educational facilities, negative visual impacts, impacts to recreational facilities, neighborhood division, and impacts to livability factors."	Administrative edit: Use definition proposed to TAC on 6-8-17 to agree with FHWA definition of Community Impacts.
2-1; ADA	Meredith Noble	Citizen	6/8/2017	Environmental Justice and ADA should not be combined.	Environmental Justice and ADA were separated in the latest TAC Review Draft.	Administrative edit (Completed).

**Tech Memo 1B Screening Staff Comment/Response Summary for TAC Meeting on 8/10/2017
June 1, 2017 to July 14, 2017**

Table	Name	Affiliation	Date	Comment	Staff Response	Recommended Action
2-1; Addresses Safety Issue	Meredith Noble	Citizen	6/8/2017	Safety is a big topic! It's tough to just give this one category, but perhaps consider rewording the rating criteria to more specifically define a safe transportation project: o +2: documented accidents/fatalities at this project location and the project is designed to mitigate it; o +1: Project has technology and/or design elements in it to improve safety	This is design level information and too detailed for the initial screening criteria.	No change.
	Carol Wong	Agency	6/9/2017	Age (not everyone walks at the same speed nor can navigate over certain types of pavements or surface treatments)	The Americans with Disabilities Act covers ability.	No change.
2-1; Improve the existing transportation system efficiency through the implementation of effective and innovative transportation system management (TSM), transportation demand management (TDM), and Intelligent Transportation System (ITS) strategies.	Jon Cecil	Agency	6/9/2017	The Municipality has a Vision Zero policy to reduce (eliminate) pedestrian fatalities within the MOA. Perhaps that policy direction can be woven into the evaluation criteria?	The criteria does not directly address specific policies. Policies will be addressed in the MTP Implementation chapter.	No change.
	Carol Wong	Agency	6/9/2017	This criteria as worded doesn't actually get to an actual improvement, perhaps it should be "Improves the existing transportation system by implementing an adopted TSM, TDM, ITS or TOD plan." This city has not seen any of these tools actually put into place, but by ranking a project that is a product of these tools, we may see more done and those that are in place will be ranked higher. I added TOD to the list because of the changes we see happening by Public Transportation as well as the designated TOD corridors will have in shaping the built environment to foster and encourage multimodal travel.	Staff recommends adding TOD to the TSM, TDM, and ITS criteria.	Administrative edit. Add Transit Oriented Development (TOD) to the criteria.
	Thede Tobish	Agency	6/9/2017	Where applicable, please add Transit Oriented (or Supportive) Development	Staff recommends adding TOD to the TSM, TDM, and ITS criteria.	Administrative edit. Add Transit Oriented Development (TOD) to the criteria.
	Jon Cecil	Agency	6/9/2017	Recommend inclusion of Transit Oriented Development as another tool in the transportation system efficiency category.	Staff recommends adding TOD to the TSM, TDM, and ITS criteria.	Administrative edit. Add Transit Oriented Development (TOD) to the criteria.
2-1; Level of consistency with other adopted plans or studies	Meredith Noble	Citizen	6/8/2017	Really happy to see TSM, TDM, and ITS in there. It could be better embedded into a safety rating criteria and a congestion management criteria.	While TDM, TSM and ITS are related to safety and congestion, these are given direct consideration as an individual criteria.	No change.

**Tech Memo 1B Screening Staff Comment/Response Summary for TAC Meeting on 8/10/2017
June 1, 2017 to July 14, 2017**

Table	Name	Affiliation	Date	Comment	Staff Response	Recommended Action
	Meredith Noble	Citizen	6/8/2017	The criteria should be much more specific (comments below) {see individual criteria}, specifically how the project aligns with Anchorage's forthcoming Land Use Plan and its emphasis on infill and redevelopment, walking, biking and transit; Specifically articulate the plans a project should align with, then points go to the project base on how well it supports criteria in each specific plan.	Staff recommends adding new language to criteria.	Administrative edit. -2: No consistency with adopted plans or studies 0; Mixed consistency with adopted plans or studies +1; Marginal consistency with adopted plans or studies +2; Strong consistency with adopted plans or studies
	Carol Wong	Agency	6/9/2017	The Muni adopted plans and studies have been vetted through public and commission and assembly process, and should be weighted with a +5 score when the project lines up with these plans.	The initial screening criteria are not weighted.	No change.
	Jon Cecil	Agency	6/9/2017	Rephrase this to read "Consistency with adopted land use plans and studies"	The criteria is broadly written to include all types of plans and studies.	No change.
	Rabbit Creek Community Council	Community Council	6/10/2017	The scoring category "level of consistency with other adopted plans or studies" apparently does not allow for scoring with negative "points". RCCC's concern is the risk of inaccurately scoring project proposals which are inconsistent with adopted plans.	Staff recommends adding new language to criteria.	Administrative edit. -2: No consistency with adopted plans or studies 0; Mixed consistency with adopted plans or studies +1; Marginal consistency with adopted plans or studies +2; Strong consistency with adopted plans or studies
2-1; Economic Benefits	Meredith Noble	Citizen	6/8/2017	Economic benefits – Is the project economically viable or supports surrounding economic development? Not clear, so this may need to be two categories. The BCA would make this an easier issue to measure to account for economic considerations like future land value, reduced deaths/accidents, job creation, etc	A footnote was added to the version posted 6-1-17 that defines Economic Benefits.	Administrative edit (Completed).
	Carol Wong	Agency	6/9/2017	A footnote should be added to explain what is meant by "economic benefit", is it a project that will spur new or redevelopment? Does it capitalize on other public dollars already invested in the project? Does it help to bring tourists or other users not normally found in the area? Does it increase property value and hence property tax?	A footnote was added to the version posted 6-1-17 that defines Economic Benefits.	Administrative Edit (Completed).

**Tech Memo 1B Screening Staff Comment/Response Summary for TAC Meeting on 8/10/2017
June 1, 2017 to July 14, 2017**

Table	Name	Affiliation	Date	Comment	Staff Response	Recommended Action
	Jon Cecil	Agency	6/9/2017	Perhaps add consideration of wetlands, wildlife values	Staff recommends a change to the footnote for Level of Environmental Impacts to include wildlife. Wetlands is already included in the definition for Level of Environmental Impacts.	Administrative edit. Add "wildlife" to Footnote #2.
	Nancy Pease	Citizen	6/10/2017	5. A proposed project that is inconsistent with adopted plans should get negative points. Or, it perhaps it should be disqualified.	Staff recommends adding new language to criteria.	Administrative edit. -2: No consistency with adopted plans or studies 0; Mixed consistency with adopted plans or studies +1; Marginal consistency with adopted plans or studies +2; Strong consistency with adopted plans or studies
	Rabbit Creek Community Council	Community Council	6/10/2017	...h.The term "economic benefits" appears to omit long-term net economic benefits. RCCC requests large-scale projects include a long-term cost-benefit analysis of potential citywide impacts including, for example, loss of taxable land, diminished property values, loss of wetlands, increased traffic volume, etc. versus potential benefits such as increased freight-movement capacity, potential accident reduction, etc.	This is design level information and too detailed for the initial screening criteria.	No change.

**Tech Memo 1B Screening Staff Comment/Response Summary for TAC Meeting on 8/10/2017
June 1, 2017 to July 14, 2017**

Table	Name	Affiliation	Date	Comment	Staff Response	Recommended Action
2-1; Preservation of Existing System	Carol Wong	Agency	6/9/2017	What is meant by this? Is this for historic trails, bridges, and to provide that acknowledgement? Or is this another "economic benefit" because it's not a new facility?	This is not for historic facilities, but for the preservation of the existing transportation system.	No change.
	Nancy Pease	Citizen	6/10/2017	6. The definition of economic benefits should be expanded to consider net economic benefits over the long term. This includes the loss of developable land occupied by wide road corridors and interchanges.	This is design level information and too detailed for the initial screening criteria.	No change.
2-1; Deliverability	Meredith Noble	Citizen	6/8/2017	More points should be given to system preservation!! [See also comment for Regional Connections and System Connectivity]	The initial screening criteria are not weighted.	No change.
	Carol Wong	Agency	6/9/2017	With little to no State grants expected, if a project is in a neighborhood that is willing to pass a road/sidewalk/trails improvement district bond, is this the criteria that provides for that outside "match"?	This is included with the Community Support part of the Deliverability criteria.	No change.
	Rabbit Creek Community Council	Community Council	6/10/2017	j. The term "Deliverability" is too vague for focused comment. RCCC's concern is that "Deliverability" may overlap with "community impacts" and "economic benefits" categories. RCCC requests clarification of the term "financial impacts" to include who or what may be impacted.	This level of information is too detailed for the initial screening criteria.	No change.
2-1; Regional Connections and System Connectivity	Nancy Pease	Citizen	6/10/2017	8. Financial impacts is too vague for the public to comment on. Financial impacts to whom? Over what time period?	This level of information is too detailed for the initial screening criteria.	No change.
2-3	Bart Rudolph	Agency	7/14/2017	It is unclear how the alternatives evaluation will take into consideration all the different modes. How will projects across different modes with competing interests be scored and ranked? For example, it is clear that the model will be used to help identify congestion relief projects, but there are areas of town where bike/ped/transit projects should be prioritized over congestion projects. How will AMATS build consensus on those areas and what criteria will be used to identify those projects? There seems to be a section or process missing between the "Model Run Evaluation" and "Project Prioritization" as identified in Figure 2-1. A more detailed section should be added to this memo describing the multi-modal alternatives evaluation process.	This is addressed as part of the scenario development process outlined in Tech Memo 1B section 2.2	No change.
2-5	Meredith Noble	Citizen	6/8/2017	Should include public support category	Public support is addressed as part of the Initial Screening criteria.	No change.

**Tech Memo 1B Screening Staff Comment/Response Summary for TAC Meeting on 8/10/2017
June 1, 2017 to July 14, 2017**

Table	Name	Affiliation	Date	Comment	Staff Response	Recommended Action
	Meredith Noble	Citizen	6/8/2017	Specific language on how it supports high density development	Staff commends adding criterion for Transit Supportive Corridor/Transit Oriented Development implementation.	Administrative Edit. Transit Supportive Corridor(TSC)/Transit Oriented Development(TOD) (-2) N/A (0) Not located along a TSC or within a TOD area (1) N/A (3) N/A (5) Located along a TSC identified in the Land Use Plan or within a TOD area identified in a plan.
	Bart Rudolph	Agency	7/14/2017	Add criteria for system reliability.	Staff recommends adding criterion for System Reliability.	Administrative Edit. System Reliability (-2) Reduces System Reliability (0) No Change (1) Helps to maintain system reliability (3) Moderate improvement in system reliability (5) Substantial improvement in system reliability

**Tech Memo 1B Screening Staff Comment/Response Summary for TAC Meeting on 8/10/2017
June 1, 2017 to July 14, 2017**

Table	Name	Affiliation	Date	Comment	Staff Response	Recommended Action
	Bart Rudolph	Agency	7/14/2017	Add criteria for Transit Supportive Development areas. Projects in those areas should be given priority.	Staff commends adding criterion for Transit Supportive Corridor/Transit Oriented Development implementation.	Administrative Edit. Transit Supportive Corridor(TSC)/Transit Oriented Development(TOD) (-2) N/A (0) Not located along a TSC or within a TOD area (1) N/A (3) N/A (5) Located along a TSC identified in the Land Use Plan or within a TOD area identified in a plan.
2-6	Meredith Noble	Citizen	6/8/2017	Positive public support should be worth 5 pts, some known outreach worth 3.	Staff recommends removing Community Support criterion. This is addressed as part of the Initial Screening criteria.	Administrative Edit.
	Meredith Noble	Citizen	6/8/2017	Inclusion in plans needs to be more specific.	Staff recommends removing Inclusion in Plans criterion. This is addressed as part of the Initial Screening criteria.	Administrative Edit.
2-4 through 2-6	Bart Rudolph	Agency	7/14/2017	The project prioritization criteria (tables 2-4 through 2-6) should include a land use connection component. For example, does the proposed project support the goals of the land use plan and sounding land use?	This is addressed as part of the Scenario Development and Evaluation phase, section 2.2 of Tech Memo 1B.	No change.
General Comment on Tech Memo 1B	Bart Rudolph	Agency	7/14/2017	When tables are spread over multiple pages, it would be helpful to have "continued" in the title of the subsequent pages. Example, "Table 2-1 Continued. Draft 2040 MTP Initial Screen Criteria"	Staff concurs.	Administrative Edit. Add "continued" to title of tables to spread over multiple pages.
General Initial Screening Criteria Comments	Steve Heimel	Citizen	6/7/2017	Table 2-1 seems to continue encouraging existing practices, building more high capacity roads that are difficult to cross with non motorized methods. Under "regional connections" I particularly consider the high rating for new arterial expressway or freeway to be unwise. We already have too many of those. Our city is infilling and needs to look toward more density, better mass transit and increased options for non motorized use. The T2 rating for that is bad weighting. When it comes to the "roadway connectivity" criterion, I see a similar problem. If we are infilling toward residential and employment centers, do we really want to encourage breaking these centers up with new roads and more traffic? So it seems to me to be a bad idea to give the greatest weight to "new connection," and even greater weight to "closing a gap of 1/2 mile or more." Sometimes a 1/2 mile gap can be a good thing.	Regional Connections criteria has been revised to include all modes. System Connectivity criteria has been revised to include all modes.	Administrative edit (Completed).

**Tech Memo 1B Screening Staff Comment/Response Summary for TAC Meeting on 8/10/2017
June 1, 2017 to July 14, 2017**

Table	Name	Affiliation	Date	Comment	Staff Response	Recommended Action
	Cheryl Richardson	Anchorage Citizen's Coalition	6/7/2017	<p>on AMATS proposed Project Screening Criteria.</p> <p>Please note that we find it a breach in the public's right to meaningful, timely participation in decision-making to release AMATS' screening criteria in such a dense, technical format on May 11, with virtually no context in terms of how the MTP affects Anchorage's growth and development twenty years from now.</p> <p>We submit these comments today because we understand that while comments are officially due at 5pm, June 10, 2017, AMATS' initial vote to accept or modify the criteria will be held June 8, with a follow up telephone vote before Monday, June 12.</p> <p>BEGIN: Anchorage is finally in a position to reshape its transportation systems to build a great winter city. Hopefully, this is the year we can get beyond "business as usual" and use the hundreds of millions we spend on transportation to bring positive changes to our community.</p> <p>At the same time Anchorage is rewriting its 20 year Metropolitan Transportation Plan, People Mover will shift its routes to concentrate on the city's urban core with buses coming every 15 minutes. Anchorage's forthcoming Land Use Plan strongly emphasizes infill and redevelopment, walking, biking and transit, as well as "placemaking" to bring in more homeowners through infill and redevelopment, while making the urban core more attractive to families and visitors.</p> <p>AMATS' transportation resources must be used wisely to make Anchorage a better place to live - - a great winter city. We need to move beyond stand alone transportation projects that bypass or ignore community values found in Anchorage 2020.</p> <p>Now is the time for Anchorage's overarching community values to determine transportation thinking, planning and spending.</p> <p>The MTP needs a strong purpose statement beyond "this updates AMATS Metropolitan Transportation Plan."</p> <p>ACC recommends: The MTP will integrate transportation and land use efforts to improve Anchorage's economic competitiveness and prosperity, protect open spaces and natural areas, promote vibrant communities, provide safe and reliable travel choices, decrease reliance on car travel and enhance our quality of life.</p> <p>Community resources, including transportation, are expected to pursue policies and projects that contribute to that vision.</p> <p>This purpose statement must be followed by consistent policies and practices, that have been noticeably absent in Anchorage's transportation planning and spending.</p>	<p>The initial screening criteria were released within the context of Tech Memo 1B for public review June 14th through July 14th along with Tech Memo 1A Goals, Objectives, and Performance Measures.</p>	<p>No change.</p>

**Tech Memo 1B Screening Staff Comment/Response Summary for TAC Meeting on 8/10/2017
June 1, 2017 to July 14, 2017**

Table	Name	Affiliation	Date	Comment	Staff Response	Recommended Action
	Steve Heimel	Citizen	6/7/2017	I am informed that AMATS will act to approve screening criteria for projects. I appreciate the opportunity to comment about these criteria. I have been attending the public meetings put on by Alaska Common Ground. After reading through them, I support the criteria for transit and non motorized projects. Safety, connectivity and encouraging increased use are good criteria... Thank you for any consideration given to my concerns. We all need to look toward spending our federal transportation money more wisely, with an eye toward a sustainable future for our community. I would be pleased to be more involved in open and transparent AMATS proceedings in the future.	Thank you for your comments.	No change.
	Christin Anderson	Citizen	6/8/2017	I won't be able to make the public planning meeting, but I am in full support of this project! Anchorage has potential to reduce our carbon footprint. We need to maintain and connect bike paths and greenways throughout the city. Thank you.	Thank you for your comment.	No change.
	Daniel Jacks	Citizen	6/8/2017	Consider: Since emission reduction is part of the proposed 2040 MTP goals, perhaps an emissions per mile traveled MOE would be useful. Note this is NOT per vehicle-mile traveled. This would support projects that reduce delay and/or increase non-automobile travel.	This is covered under the criteria Level of Environmental Impacts. Staff recommends adding "air quality" to the definition of Level of Environmental Impacts.	Administrative edit. Add "air quality" to definition of Level of Environmental Impacts.
	Daniel Jacks	Citizen	6/8/2017	Hello, I'd like to comment on the proposed AMATS project screening criteria. Please excuse my ignorance about the topic, but the matrix appears to be a method by which qualitative project outcomes can be converted to quantitative scores. It seems like a blunt instrument with a lot of room for subjectivity to come into play.(maybe that's the point - the website is not clear about that). Wouldn't it be worthwhile to be a little more thorough on estimating the impacts of a project and derive some sort of cost/benefit score, so projects can be objectively ranked? It would be rough, but using a consistent methodology to estimate the numbers (using planning level construction costs, travel demand model outputs, crash modification factors, etc) would provide a more accurate measure by which to compare the merits of projects. In other words, maybe we should spend a little more up front on better screening criteria to ensure the projects we're approving actually further the MTP's goals.	The MTP is a higher level planning document that is unable to do a Benefit Cost Analysis for each project. An MTP considers factors beyond a formula driven approach. Project costs will be considered as part of the fiscal constraint analysis.	No change.
	Meredith Noble	Citizen	6/8/2017	A benefit-cost analysis (BCA) should be required for each project (and we suspect adding this could help shorten the matrix). The methodology for conducting the BCA should be described by AMATS so you can clearly compare project to project with measurable outputs...Please add a BCA to the decision making process. Thank you so much!	The MTP is a higher level planning document that is unable to do a Benefit Cost Analysis for each project. An MTP considers factors beyond a formula driven approach. Project costs will be considered as part of the fiscal constraint analysis.	No change.

**Tech Memo 1B Screening Staff Comment/Response Summary for TAC Meeting on 8/10/2017
June 1, 2017 to July 14, 2017**

Table	Name	Affiliation	Date	Comment	Staff Response	Recommended Action
	Meredith Noble	Citizen	6/8/2017	Should include a category for consideration to O&M costs and payment.	O&M costs are part of the fiscal constraint analysis.	No change.
	Meredith Noble	Citizen	6/8/2017	Our main concerns are:• All transportation projects should be planned for multi-modal use and therefore, all three project types should be considered together into a singular matrix (i.e. Tables 2.1, 2.3, 2.4, and 2.5)...[see individual criteria, process, new criteria needed]...Please combine all tables into a singular matrix so projects are compared against each other and multi-modal projects are encouraged.	Later screening will involve criteria which utilize separate processes into different modes to avoid unfairly prioritizing one mode over another. Some federal funding (Transportation Alternative Program funding for example) can only be used on non-motorized projects. The multi-phase screening and evaluation process is described in Technical Memo 1B.	No change.
	Daniel Jacks	Citizen	6/8/2017	I also want to add that I don't appreciate the fact that you're "conditionally approving" the screening criteria at today's TAC meeting before the end of the comment period. This stuff is already difficult for the public to comprehend and is not well advertised. This voting shenanigans makes the public involvement seem even less relevant to your process.	The criteria were provisionally approved, <u>pending consideration</u> of any additional comment received through the end of the 30-day formal comment period, June 10. The comment period was extended to July 14th.	No change.
	Meredith Noble	Citizen	6/8/2017	Summary: Please consider delaying approval of the screening criteria (referenced in Attachment 1 – 5B) on Monday, June 12th. The screening criteria is not refined enough to adequately rank projects and outreach was unsatisfactory for feedback...If you are willing to delay approval, we vow to work hard to help you with outreach and participation in refining the screening criteria. We would ask that you consider delaying until late July at the earliest...With such short notice, we didn't have time to give more thorough comments, but hope you will consider delaying final approval of the project screening process for another 4-6 weeks.	The comment period was extended to July 14th.	No change.

**Tech Memo 1B Screening Staff Comment/Response Summary for TAC Meeting on 8/10/2017
June 1, 2017 to July 14, 2017**

Table	Name	Affiliation	Date	Comment	Staff Response	Recommended Action
	Frank Rast	Citizen	6/9/2017	Impacts to Right-of-Way should be a screening criteria. Too many projects in Anchorage take private property when other alternatives are available.	Property impacts are covered under the Level of Environmental Impacts criteria.	No change.
	Kay Sind	Citizen	6/9/2017	I very recently became aware that there is a public comment period for the Project Screening Criteria. I'm excited that there is a lot of thought being put into the transportation projects that will shape Anchorage in the coming years. Without having worked a project specific to a MTP or with AMAT, I can't say with too much certainty what will make for a fair and useful screening criteria system. However, since I live in Anchorage and need to commute, I will provide a couple comments to speak to my concerns...[see individual criteria]...Finally, I am okay with the scale, because I understand that the work neutral is just intended to mean no change, which is normal. However, when I think about Anchorage spending more money and making changes to our transportation, it seems like no change is actually worse than neutral, because it seems like there should be an expected continuous improvement. For example, if we are spending money on a new road, then yes- the situation is neutral; however, if we are putting in new roads, then it feels worse than neutral if the roads aren't improved if there are pre-identified issues. Thank you for listening to my concerns. I appreciate all the effort being put into the MTP. I intend to stay involved and look forward to the transportation changes coming.	Thank you for your comments.	No change.
	Rabbit Creek Community Council	Community Council	6/10/2017	At the June 8 meeting, Rabbit Creek Community Council (RCCC) voted to forward the following comments on the Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP) 2040: 1. RCCC requests written clarification of the draft screening criteria, extension of public comment period and postponement of Technical Advisory Committee's vote for final approval. RCCC's concern is that the public process created to evaluate goals, objectives, and screening criteria may be perceived as irrelevant if the public is not allowed reasonable time for objective, persuasive input.	Please see responses to comments by RCCC for specific screening criteria regarding written clarification. The comment period was extended to July 14th.	No change.
	Rabbit Creek Community Council	Community Council	6/10/2017	2. Certain draft screening criteria posted on the municipality website appear too ambiguous for the public to analyze objectively. For example, the impact of "Operational Improvements" seems open to numerous debatable interpretations if the public is provided no clarification on what the term means to municipal	The entire Draft Technical Memo 1B, which describes the proposed screening criteria and process, was being edited based on comments from the TAC and thus wasn't	No change.
	Rabbit Creek Community Council	Community Council	6/10/2017	3. Public-comment-period schedule does not provide reasonable time for public comment. June 8 Technical Advisory Committee voted to approve screening criteria preliminarily June 10 Public comments are due at 5 pm June 11 (Sunday, non-work day) June 12 TAC votes on final approval of screening criteria RCCC's concern is that, from the public's perspective: (a) TAC will see all public comments, evaluate them, and vote on final screening criteria, all on the same day, June 12, which suggests a decision made in advance to allow no opportunity for staff analysis or discussion of particularly relevant public input before TAC's final vote on the basic building blocks of a 20-year plan; and (b) an unnecessarily abbreviated comment schedule relegates, and sets precedent for relegating, public comment to an irrelevant pro forma exercise, what may be reasonably perceived as a waste of citizens' time.	The comment period was extended to July 14th.	No change.

**Tech Memo 1B Screening Staff Comment/Response Summary for TAC Meeting on 8/10/2017
June 1, 2017 to July 14, 2017**

Table	Name	Affiliation	Date	Comment	Staff Response	Recommended Action
	Rabbit Creek Community Council	Community Council	6/10/2017	4. While approved criteria may not appear as final screening criteria, the AMATS Senior Planner indicated criteria, as approved on June 12, will be applied near-term to evaluate proposed transportation projects, effectively shaping the remainder of the draft MTP. RCCC's concern is that, from the public's perspective, public comment at this stage is essential to refining and revising screening criteria.	The comment period was extended to July 14th.	No change.
	Rabbit Creek Community Council	Community Council	6/10/2017	According to "Anchorage Bowl Comprehensive Plan 2020", Policy 30: "Transportation and land-use programs shall (emphasis added) include: ... e) optimal use of parking". However, AMATS goals, objectives, and draft screening criteria, are silent on parking.	Options for parking are covered under the TDM, TSM, and ITS criteria.	No change.
	Rabbit Creek Community Council	Community Council	6/10/2017	6. RCCC requests the opportunity to submit specific comments when specific screening criteria are provided. RCCC's concern is that unavailability of clarified screening criteria arbitrarily limits specific comments to the following: [see individual criteria for items a-j].	See comment responses for items A-J for specific criteria.	No change.
	Rabbit Creek Community Council	Community Council	6/10/2017	Thank you for the opportunity to comment. Again, it is respectfully requested that the AMATS public-involvement process allow TAC and staff to evaluate and include public comments before proceeding to the next stage of the plan.	The comment period was extended to July 14th.	No change.
	Rabbit Creek Community Council	Community Council	6/10/2017	...i. Parking is a significant land use created by a road-focused transportation plan. RCCC requests induced-parking demands be specified and added to the rating system. RCCC suggests reviewing other municipalities' processes for evaluating changes in parking requirements, with the possibility of including parking either in the economic cost-benefit category, or in the land-use plan-consistency category.	Options for parking are covered under the TDM, TSM, and ITS criteria.	No change.
	Nancy Pease	Citizen	6/10/2017	7. Parking is a major land use. A transportation plan that favors road expansion creates further parking demand and sprawl, which is contrary to our comprehensive plan. Therefore, induced parking demands should be evaluated under the screening criteria.	Options for parking are covered under the TDM, TSM, and ITS criteria.	No change.
	Nancy Pease	Citizen	6/10/2017	General Comments: I'm requesting further written explanation of the draft screening criteria, as well as an extension of the public comment period. The TAC is scheduled to vote on final approval for the screening criteria the same working day that it will receive public comments (June 12). That allows no time for staff analysis and follow-up with the public. It implies no serious intent to revise the screening criteria. Given that these screening criteria will be used to shape the rest of the draft MTP, informed public comment is important at this stage. In addition, the goals and objectives have not incorporated public concerns. A conversation with Vivian indicated that the TAC is determined to "keep moving ahead" and not become involved in public debate over goals and objectives. This intent contradicts the MTP website intent to encourage high public involvement. If AMATS crafts the evaluation framework (goals, objectives, screening criteria) without meaningful public input, the MTP will emerge as a bureaucratic vision and not a community plan that reflects community values. Specific comments on screening criteria: Given lack of specifics on the screening criteria, I consider these comments to be incomplete. [See individual criteria comments]	Please see responses to comments by RCCC for specific screening criteria regarding written clarification. The comment period was extended to July 14th.	No change.

**Tech Memo 1B Screening Staff Comment/Response Summary for TAC Meeting on 8/10/2017
June 1, 2017 to July 14, 2017**

Table	Name	Affiliation	Date	Comment	Staff Response	Recommended Action
	Rabbit Creek Community Council	Community Council	7/14/2017	RCCC supports project screening criteria that require integration of non-motorized connections and facilities into proposed road projects. This includes safe road crossings, which are noticeably absent on the main roads in our Council area and across the Bowl. Multi-modal design is consistent with Anchorage 2020 Policies, 30, 37, and 38.	AMATS is currently developing a Complete Streets policy that will address integration of non-motorized facilities projects where appropriate.	No change.
	Rabbit Creek Community Council	Community Council	7/14/2017	As an efficiency objective, as well as a project screening criterion, the MTP 2040 should include language to the effect of “avoid piecemeal road improvements that create new bottlenecks or traffic impact zones.” The secondary effects of new or increased traffic from a proposed road project must be considered. For example, Policy 9E of the Hillside District Plan states: “Prior to the establishment of the Hillside Road Management Entity, avoid new public projects that increase problems on substandard parts of the existing road system.”	This is addressed with the Logical Sequencing criterion on Table 2-4.	No change.
	Rabbit Creek Community Council	Community Council	7/14/2017	RCCC supports project screening criteria that consider the effects on neighborhood livability, through <u>measurable factors</u> such as noise, cut-through traffic, and traffic speeds in residential areas.	Neighborhood livability is covered under criterion Level of Community Impacts. Noise is covered under criterion Level of Environmental Impacts. Cut-through traffic and traffic speed in residential areas are covered under criterion Level of Community Impacts.	No change.