

**ANCHORAGE METROPOLITAN AREA TRANSPORTATION SOLUTIONS  
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING  
Planning & Development Center  
Main Conference Room, 1st Floor  
4700 Elmore Road**

**June 5, 2025  
1:00 PM**

*Due to the expected absence of Chair Coy, Zakary Hartman acted as Chair.*

**Technical Advisory Committee Members Present:**

Name	Representing
Zakary Hartman	MOA Traffic Engineering Department
James Starzec	Alaska Dept. of Transportation & Public Facilities (DOT&PF), Anchorage Field Office
Kate Dueber	Alaska Railroad Corporation (ARRC)
Luke Bowland	DOT&PF
Mélisa Babb	MOA/Planning Department
Melinda Kohlhaas	MOA/Project Management & Engineering Department (PM&E)
Adeyemi Alimi	Alaska Department of Environmental Conservation (ADEC)
Mourad Dawoud	MOA/Health Department
Steve Ribuffo	MOA/Don Young Port of Alaska
Bart Rudolph	MOA/Public Transportation Department
Taylor Keegan	MOA/Parks & Recreation Department

**Also in attendance:**

Name	Representing
Aaron Jongenelen	AMATS
Christine Schuette	AMATS
Rhiannon Brown	AMATS
Leifi Felise	AMATS
Mook Puttong	AMATS
Emily Weiser	AMATS
Ann Huynh	
Mark Eisenman	DOT&PF
Chris Hughes	
Morgan McCammon	DOWL
Lindsey Hajduk	NeighborWorks Alaska & Spenard Community Council's Task Force
Katie Peck	DOT&PF
Evan Sharp	DOT&PF
Brandon Telford	MOA/PM&E
Tor Anderzen	JBER
Jim Winchester	MOA/Planning & Zoning Commission
Alexa Dobson	BikeAnchorage
Cathy Gleason	Turnagain Community Council
Sean Baski	DOT&PF
Stephanie Mormilo	HDL Engineering Consultants
Julia Hanson	DOT&PF

---

Tanya Hickok	MOA/PM&E
Kim Carpenter	MOA/Traffic Engineering Department
Criag Lyon	DOWL
Travis Holmes	DOT&PF
Dave Gamez	Lounsbury & Associates
Alex Read	DOT&PF

*\*Policy Committee Member*

*\*\*Policy Committee Designated Alternate*

## **1. CALL TO ORDER/ROLL CALL**

ACTING CHAIR HARTMAN called the meeting to order at 1:01 p.m. Kate Dueber represented the Alaska Railroad Corporation on behalf of Brian Lindamood. James Starzec represented the Alaska Dept. of Transportation & Public Facilities on behalf of Ben White. A quorum was established.

## **2. PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT ANNOUNCEMENT**

AARON JONGENELEN encouraged public involvement in this meeting of the AMATS Technical Advisory 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**

MS. BABB moved to approve the agenda. MS. KOHLHAAS seconded.

***Hearing no objections, the agenda was approved.***

## **4. APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES – April 3, 2025**

MR. BOWLAND moved to approve the minutes. MS. KOHLHAAS seconded.

***Hearing no objections, the minutes were approved.***

## **5. BUSINESS ITEMS**

### **a. Performance Measures Update Agreement**

MR. JONGENELEN noted that when the reauthorization bill MAP-21 was approved by Congress, it included provisions for MPOs and states to develop targets for specific performance measures related to transportation. As part of that authorization bill, it directed MPOs and states to work together on the development of those targets. This performance

target requirement was carried forward in subsequent reauthorization bills. In 2017, the Alaska MPOs and Alaska DOT&PF developed and approved an agreement on how these targets are developed, which included the sharing of data, selection of performance targets, reporting of performance targets, and collection of data.

There were no comments

MS. KOHLHAAS moved to recommend to the Policy Committee approval of the Performance Measures Agreement. MS. BABB seconded.

***Hearing no objections, the motion passed.***

#### **b. 2026-2027 Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP) Narrative**

MR. JONGENELEN noted that the 2026/2027 Work Program was released for a 30-day public comment period on April 23, 2025. AMATS received 23 comments on the draft narrative. These comments are in response to the attached Comment Response Summary. The recommended changes based on public comments are outlined in the AMATS staff recommendation column of the comment response form. Since the posting of this budget, DOT&PF provided him with updated numbers that reduced the amount by \$200,000 per year. This budget needed to be reduced, and that has already been done, and AMATS was able to absorb that reduction without impacting any positions, and everything will continue to move forward.

There were no comments.

MS. BABB moved to recommend to the Policy Committee approval of the narrative and the budget as updated with the new estimate from DOT&PF. MS. KEEGAN seconded.

***Hearing no objections, the motion passed.***

#### **c. Minnesota Drive Non-Motorized Pavement Project**

MR. JONGENELEN briefed the committee, noting that the AMATS TIP currently contains two projects for non-motorized pavement work on Minnesota Drive, Hillcrest to Northern Lights Boulevard, and Northern Lights Boulevard to Tudor Road. This project is currently underway and has received some comments on additional work that needs to be reviewed by the TAC and PC.

TRAVIS HOLMES with DOT&PF and DAVE GAMEZ with Lounsbury & Associates provided a PowerPoint presentation.

The committee discussed removing the fence along Minnesota Park, having enough space to add a buffered pathway along the west side of the project, consider placing the crossing at 36th Avenue instead of 33rd Avenue, consider 6-foot wide sidewalks, snow maintenance, potential implications with the Hawk option, and possibly adding a Traffic Impact Analysis.

ACTING CHAIR HARTMAN opened the floor to public comments.

ALEX READ  
LINDSEY HAJDUK  
CATHY GLEASON  
EMILY WEISER

MR. BOWLAND moved to recommend to the Policy Committee approval of the splitting of this project into a named TIP project for consideration of Option #2. MS. BABB seconded.

MR. BOWLAND intends to support the motion for the following reasons:

1. He liked the idea of having a Hawk in this area.
2. His concern would be that not including the Hawk in the proposed motion just delays the project.
3. We are getting a lot of urgency for those additional crosswalk and there is a lot of goodness that we can do in Option #2. Hopefully we can find another project to fit in with some of the other recommendations coming out of the corridor study.

*Acting Chair Hartman passed the gavel to Mr. Starzec.*

ACTING CHAIR HARTMAN stated that he does not intend to support the motion.

*Hearing objections, the committee proceeded with a roll call vote.*

AYE

Ms. Dueber  
Mr. Alimi  
Mr. Ribuffo  
Mr. Bowland  
Mr. Starzec

NAY

Ms. Keegan  
Mr. Dawoud  
Acting Chair Hartman

*Procedurally, when voting has begun, no further discussion can take place. Ms. Kohlhaas requested further clarification on the motion and the reasoning for those who are not supporting the motion. To resolve any misunderstanding, the vote was paused.*

ACTING CHAIR HARTMAN explained that he is in favor of Alternative #2b in terms of the high speed in the arterials in Anchorage on Minnesota Drive between Benson and Spenard as one long stretch without a marked or safe crosswalk. He appreciated Mr. Bowland's comment about moving quickly on the missing crosswalks at Northern Lights and Benson, but we have a real and serious crash history in this mid-block section between Benson and Spenard. If it means a year delay on Northern Lights and Benson's crosswalk, that is unfortunate, but we are making a named project, so we should do mid-block crossings between Benson and Spenard.

MS. KEEGAN explained that she it is difficult to vote against the motion because it is practical and reasonable and sensible, but she used to live in this area, and it is nothing short of treacherous. The distance between the two intersections is a half-mile. There is a school in the area, and 32nd Avenue is going to be improved in the near future.

MR. STARZEC expressed that the concern against this motion is if we do not do the Hawk piece of the project, we might not ever get to it. As AMATS, the Policy Committee does have the ability to program projects. This could easily be programmed into the next TIP. The corridor plan currently being done involves a lot of the public involvement that everyone is talking about needing for this project. A Hawk signal as a separate project is very reasonable to program and could be done in a timely manner after a traffic analysis.

ACTING CHAIR HARTMAN noted that by making this recommendation, it is not guaranteeing that the Hawk will be built, but is giving it the chance to have that analysis. He asked if this effort will be cutting in front of the corridor plan.

MR. STARZEC did not believe it would. A crossing intervention somewhere in that length will definitely be an outcome. This project is not setup to do that yet, so adding the Hawk becomes a time constraint and delaying the rest of this and things only get more expensive with time. The crosswalk improvements can be put in sooner by making the Hawk a separate project. He sees the benefit with moving forward without the Hawk in terms of time and money. We also have the additional backing of an approved plan.

*The committee resumed the roll call vote.*

AYE

Ms. Dueber

Mr. Alimi

Mr. Ribuffo

Mr. Bowland

Mr. Starzec

Ms. Kohlhaas

Mr. Rudolph

Ms. Babb

NAY

Ms. Keegan

Mr. Dawoud

Acting Chair Hartman

*The motion passed with 8 in favor and 3 against.*

*ACTING CHAIR HARTMAN assumed the gavel.*

**d. Muldoon Road Pavement Project**

MR. JONGENELEN noted that AMATS staff was contacted by DOT&PF about the Muldoon Road Pavement Preservation project and if AMATS could pay for the portion that is listed in Table 6 of the TIP, which is the Glenn Highway to JBER gate.

The DOT&PF-funded portion of Muldoon Road, from Debarr Road to the Glenn Highway, was originally shown in the TIP and STIP. However, as part of the new STIP, the funding for the DOT&PF portion was removed, and subsequently the project was removed from the STIP. This caused the project to be removed from the TIP as part of Amendment #2, and the AMATS portion of the project was also delayed/stopped, as both projects were going to be completed together for cost savings and less overall impact on the driving public. After this change, the funding identified for the AMATS Muldoon Pavement Preservation project was moved into other projects that were moving forward, such as the Spenard Road

Rehabilitation, I/L Pavement Preservation project, and 3rd Avenue Reconstruction. At this time, there is no funding available from AMATS for the Muldoon Pavement Preservation project.

The committee discussed still needing this on the pavement preservation project list as shelf-ready projects.

ACTING CHAIR HARTMAN opened the floor to public comments.

MARK EISENMAN

MS. KOHLHAAS moved to recommend to the Policy Committee that the Muldoon Road Pavement Project, AMATS portion, be moved to the Illustrative list and continue to be identified on the Pavement Rehabilitation List in Table 6. MS. BABB seconded.

MR. BOWLAND asked for clarification that as they are looking at the design with right-of-way hits, these would remain in the TIP to advance the project.

MR. JONGENELEN explained that there is no funding in the TIP for this project.

MR. BOWLAND expressed that this would be an issue if we are not going to continue to advance the project. There was a lower level of investment for that and he can see the challenge with the \$6 million price tag for construction.

MR. BOWLAND offered a friendly amendment to include the Phase 2 and 3 design and right-of-way elements in the TIP as program-funded and construction as illustrative.

MS. KOHLHAAS would support the friendly amendment in order to keep it moving.

MR. JONGENELEN clarified that he did not know if this project or the design had even started at this point because we are waiting for the STIP to be finished for this project to be added in.

SEAN BASKI noted that the project is still trying to get funding for the DOT&PF portions, so south of the interchange to DeBarr lined out. DOT&PF is waiting for an answer as to what all the elements are that are going into it. It is likely that it will advance the southern portion of the project, or the non-AMATS portion of the project, using Pavement of Bridge Preservation funding, which is in the TIP under a large, grouped bucket.

MR. STARZEC is not familiar with the two grant programs, but they look more favorably on projects that have the design portion already taken care of.

MR. BOWLAND believed there are design and construction versions of the grant. For a construction grant, having the design ready to go is preferred and will make it a lot more competitive.

MR. STARZEC believed that the design piece might be an appropriate allocation.

MR. EISENMAN added that the NOFO (Notice of Funding Opportunities) for the defense community infrastructure just came out. He has not reviewed it yet but would have to agree.

It would be a partnership with JBER, as they would have to institute the request for funding. DOT&PF would have to go to JBER with a proposal, and they would have to forward it to the Defense Department for consideration.

ACTING CHAIR HARTMAN restated that the motion made by Ms. Kohlhaas was seconded for keeping this project as illustrative, recommending it get funding should some become available. It sounds as if there is interest in amending the motion to keep design right-of-way funding in the TIP.

MR. JONGENELEN clarified that AMATS is currently in FY25, which ends in a few months. If we wanted to make sure there is funding available for this, we would need to do it pretty quickly because we are fully programmed in the TIP based on the last TIP amendment. Right now, there is no money available in 2025 to put toward the design of this project.

ACTING CHAIR HARTMAN pointed out that something would need to be deprogrammed to keep this in the TIP.

MR. JONGENELEN added that it is at a small enough level that we could do it as an administrative modification. He would just need to bring it back next month to figure out what it is, but we would not be able to submit it until the STIP is approved with TIP Amendment #3, and we do not know when that will happen. An administrative modification could not be done until September; missing our fiscal year.

MR. STARZEC it would be better off being programmed for 2026. The direction should be for staff to come up with a recommendation for how to program this into 2026. Something will have to give since 2026 is programmed. Where does this \$800,000 come from would be a reasonable ask and direction to recommend that the Policy Committee get an opinion from staff as to how the design portion of this could be programmed into 2026.

MS. KOHLHAAS declined the friendly amendment.

MR. BOWLAND moved to amend the motion that we move the construction to Illustrative and look at funding design and right-of-way as programmed funds in the next feasible fiscal year. MS. KEEGAN seconded.

MR. JONGENELEN restated that the amendment reads, "Move the construction to Illustrative and look at programming the design funding in the next feasible fiscal year."

***Hearing no objections, the amendment passed.***

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

**e. Letter of Support for the NOAA Restoring Tribal Priority Fish Passage Grant**

MR. JONGENELEN noted that this is a program for which DOT&PF is looking at helping to put in a grant application in partnership with the Native Village of Eklutna for the North Fork Campbell Creek Fish Passage Improvement Project. AMATS has already submitted a letter of support for this project through another grant program that was for the Culvert AOP

last September 2024. DOT&PF is trying to get funding for this, and it is a good idea for staff to support this.

There were no comments.

MS. KEEGAN moved to recommend to the Policy Committee support the signing and sending of this letter. MR. STARZEC seconded.

*Hearing no objections, the motion passed.*

## **6. INFORMATIONAL ITEMS**

### **a. Academy/Vanguard Drive Project Update**

STEPHANIE MORMILO with HDL Engineering Consultants provided a PowerPoint presentation.

The committee discussed Brayton Drive being needed due to the volume of east/west movement and drainage, if any of the community's showed an interest in having a marked bike lane, right-of-way widths, DSR phase alternative evaluations, and if any design elements were contingent upon the Academy connection.

There were no public comments.

### **b. 2027-2030 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP)**

MR. JONGENELEN briefed the committee, noting there is a significant change to the TIP process, such as no longer requiring a Call for Nominations. Instead, we will just draw from the projects that are already in the approved MTP because they have already gone through a Call for Nominations and scoring and ranking. Because they are ranked in the MTP, our idea is just to go from the last funded project to the next one and on down the list. This will shorten the TIP timeline by not having to do separate criteria, a separate Call for Nominations, etcetera. There is one caveat in that we may have to do a Call for Nominations for TAP. He is working with DOT&PF to determine if our process qualifies, making the TAP okay. TAP is a specific funding that has a requirement to do its own Call for Nominations. We did a robust job for the 2050 MTP, so we may not have to do a separate Call for Nominations for TAP and scoring and ranking. An internal draft of the TIP, interagency consultation, and an air quality conformity demonstration development will all be brought back by December 2025 for the committees to release for a 45-day public comment period in January and February 2026 followed by bringing it before the Assembly. Hopefully, it will be approved in March or April 2026, and then we can send it to DOT&PF Headquarters, FHWA, and FTA for final approval. This should give us enough time to get it approved before the end of the fiscal year.

There were no comments.



**c. Next TAC Meeting Overview**

MR. JONGENELEN noted that the next meeting will include the HSIP nominations and the Hawk signal on Minnesota and 32nd Avenue as action items. One member for the Community Advisory Committee, District 3 seat, will also be on the agenda.

**7. COMMITTEE COMMENTS - None****8. PUBLIC COMMENTS - None****9. ADJOURNMENT**

MS. BABB moved to adjourn. MR. BOWLAND seconded.

*Hearing no objections, the meeting adjourned at 2:39\* p.m.*