

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

**February 5, 2026
1:00 PM**

Technical Advisory Committee Members Present:

Name	Representing
Brad Coy	MOA Traffic Engineering Department
Kate Dueber	Alaska Railroad Corporation (ARRC)
Luke Bowland	DOT&PF
Mélisa Babb	MOA/Planning Department
Melinda Kohlhaas	MOA/Project Management & Engineering Department (PM&E)
Taylor Keegan	MOA/Parks & Recreation Department
Terry Umatum	Don Young Port of Alaska Interim Director
Bart Rudolph	MOA/Public Transportation Department

Virtual:

Ben White	Alaska Dept. of Transportation & Public Facilities (DOT&PF), Anchorage Field Office
Mourad Dawoud	MOA/Health Department
Adeyemi Alimi	Alaska Department of Environmental Conservation (ADEC)

Also in attendance:

Name	Representing
Aaron Jongenelen	AMATS
Christine Schuette	AMATS
Rhiannon Brown	AMATS
Rhiannon Brown	AMATS
Emily Weiser	AMATS
Leifiloa Felise	AMATS
Pannapa Puttong	AMATS
Sarah Davenport	
Alex Bell	RSG, Inc.
Alexa Dobson	Bike Anchorage Executive Director
Craig Lyon	
Lindsey Hajduk	Director of Community Engagement & External Affairs & BPAC
Brian Elliott	DOT&PF
Connor Eshleman	DOT&PF
Emily Haynes	Federal Highway Administration (FHWA)
Jeff Frkonja	RSG, Inc.
Joni Wilm	
Chris Hughes	HDR
James Marks	HDR
Alex Read	DOT&PF
Anna Bosin	DOT&PF
Linda Smith	
Zakary Hartman	Traffic Engineering Department

Mark Eisenman DOT&PF
Rob Kinnaird PM&E
Nicolette Dent Parks & Recreation Department

**Policy Committee Member*

***Policy Committee Designated Alternate*

1. CALL TO ORDER/ROLL CALL

CHAIR COY called the meeting to order at 1:00 p.m. Kate Dueber represented the Alaska Railroad Corporation on behalf of Brian Lindamood. 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

MR. BOWLAND moved to approve the agenda. MR. RUDOLPH seconded.

MS. BABB moved to amend to reorder the agenda to hear Item 5.e. before Item 5.b.

Hearing no objections, the amendment passed.

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

4. APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES – January 8, 2026

MS. BABB moved to approve the minutes. MR. RUDOLPH seconded.

Hearing no objections, the minutes were approved.

5. BUSINESS ITEMS

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

MR. JONGENELEN noted that a modification to the AMATS 2023-2026 Funding Program (TIP) is needed to update Table 7: Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP) to reflect the revised HSIP funding plan provided to AMATS by DOT&PF on January 20, 2026. The changes to HSP0009 (*Gambell Street Utility Pole Removal and Increased Lighting*), HSP00010 (*Gambell and Ingra Streets – Overhead Signal Indication Upgrades*), and

HSP00034 (*Street Road Diet*) meet the requirements outlined in the AMATS Operating Agreement, Section 6.6.2., and Policies and Procedures #5 for an administrative modification.

MS. BABB noted the amount of funding that will be coming from AC (Advanced Construction) and asked how much AC was already in place prior to these changes in the AMATS area.

MR. BOWLAND explained that he did not have the AC balance but that, with it being HSIP, it would be to the STIP side of the program.

MR. JONGENELEN added that there was a presentation recently to be sent to house transportation, noting that the AC balance was \$567 million, but he was not sure if that balance was prior to the conversions in FY26.

MS. BABB also asked if there was a plan in place for the conversion for this particular funding and when it will be coming.

MR. BOWLAND replied that one of the benefits of having it as an AC dollar amount is the late-year obligations at the end of FY26 for both the Gambell Street Utility and the Gambell/Ingra Streets. They would not be expending that money quickly at that point in time, so taking advantage of repaying that AC amount makes a lot of sense.

In response to Chair Coy's question as to what projects were potentially going to these and if there was anything that would not get done because that funding was getting used, MR. BOWLAND did not have that information.

There were no public comments.

MR. BOWLAND moved to recommend to the Policy Committee approval of the 2023-2026 Funding Program (TIP) Administrative Modification #5. MS. BABB seconded.

Hearing no objections, the motion passed.

e. Safer Seward Highway Draft Environmental Assessment

MR. JONGENELEN noted that the Safer Seward Highway project team had released the Draft Environmental Assessment (EA) documents for public review. This EA includes a portion of the AMATS MPA boundary. Staff spent time reviewing the documents and will be providing comments, both the TAC and PC can also provide comments.

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

(MB) She requested Mr. Jongenelen to briefly highlight staff's comments.

(AJ) *A section for overall comments was added to provide a brief description of staff's concerns throughout the document. These included 1) the EA reports that most crashes occur during winter, but the design is primarily for summer traffic volumes and driving behaviors. It does not address the safety purpose of this project; 2) It*

has been framed as a safety project, but this corridor ranks low on the DOT&PF's Safety Improvement Crash Location list that AMATS was provided in 2025, which

is 55th and lower on the list. It is also currently not on the Strategic Highway Safety Plan; 3) some of the non-motorized connections that were discussed as part of the project team meetings have been removed from the design or are not shown in the design (pathway access to trailheads); 4) removal of pullouts could increase parking on the shoulders and pathway, increasing safety issues. For example, the Potter Marsh is heavily used by birders, and if that pullout is eliminated, where will people go? Will they park on one side of the highway and attempt to cross the highway to get to that area? Overall comment #5 notes that while the EA indicates that recreational land lost to this project will be replaced with land elsewhere, it is unclear whether that replacement will be of similar recreational value. It is an important recreational area, so more detail would be appreciated. Overall comment #6 expresses significant concerns about the doubling of lane-miles and the addition of the non-motorized pathway resulting in an increased maintenance burden, with consequences for overall maintenance of DOT&PF roads in the AMATS area, which are not described in the EA. We cannot maintain what we have as is, and now a four-lane divided highway is being added; 6) Projects of this magnitude and cost have been rare in recent decades in Alaska, and we are not sure whether DOT&PF has the capacity or ability to deliver this project without impacting other projects. DOT&PF has yet to deliver on the Cooper Landing Bypass project that they have been working on for quite a number of years, which is also a significant project. AMATS constantly hears that DOT&PF does not have enough staff to keep the AMATS projects moving forward, so what will happen when DOT&PF begins working more diligently on this project? He knows DOT&PF is pulling staff from other regions; will those regions now suffer from the lack of staff to get projects done?

An additional comment that was not included in the list was that this came before the Planning and Zoning Commission, and the commission moved to return the case back to the project management team for additional work due to some concerns with not being entirely sure of the data that was provided. There were also concerns expressed by members of the public that had testified. Some commissioner comments were that it did not meet muster, DOT&PF needs to do better, and respond to the community's concerns with data and math. There were general concerns that it is a hard issue to manage and that some of the alternatives (i.e., the three-lane road diet) may not have been fully evaluated. The Planning Department informed him that it is exceedingly rare for this to happen on a transportation project. It is important to know that whatever the communities' feelings are about AMATS and its staff, it is not just staff that has comments and concerns about this project and its Environmental Assessment.

(MK) Requested clarification on the construction start timeframe or something that says construction is anticipated to begin in Spring 2026.

(CH) Construction is dependent on the environmental document being completed, and selection of the proposed action has to be made, and at that time design can be started. Once they start the design of the first phase of the phased approach, the

construction would happen then. DOT&PF has looked at some different sizes of small pieces that could happen, but they are not sure these would happen as early as 2026. Construction of some added safety benefits is being done this summer prior to the EA being finished that is focused on how we improve safety in the corridor today. For instance, there is already a contractor that will be working on a left turn lane at McHugh Creek to try to fix that safety concern, so some construction is happening in 2026.

(LB) The turn lane that is going in at McHugh Creek is a state-funded safety project.

(MB) Why is this an EA and not an EIS?

(CH) He does not work for the Statewide Environmental Office, but the general process is that an Environmental Assessment is developed to determine if there are significant impacts that cannot be mitigated. If you get to that point, you then upgrade that document to an EIS. This is an existing corridor with an existing transportation road that has been evaluated, and reviewed significantly over the years and because of that, they are able to determine a lot of the mitigation that is needed for the additional impacts they are adding. From that sense, it seems to hit the level of an Environmental Assessment with associated mitigation.

(MK) Appreciated hearing that some mitigation is taking place soon, instead of having to wait 15-20 years to realize some of the safety benefits. She emphasized this as being important. With looking at cross-sections, has an Independent Value Engineering Study been identified as needed for this project? It is a \$1.3 billion Project and in looking at the different tiered approaches and having a better understanding of the footprint, as well as what are the operational benefits that could be had between the different alternatives. If there was a situation of while it is being built using a zipper (for example), how would that play into maintaining traffic and use throughout those different alternatives?

(CH) A Value Engineering Study is a requirement and will be done. This is a 20-mile Corridor-wide EA, similar to what was done in town for the Seward Highway between Tudor and Rabbit Creek, that they have been slowly building sections of the Seward Highway in Anchorage. Each project that will get implemented through phase construction is not going to get constructed all at once; each phase will have a value engineering effort done when getting into the specific design phases.

(MB) Why are we hearing this EA before the TAC despite the fact that the Policy Committee voted to remove the project itself from the MTP last April?

(CH) The project, as it moved forward, was removed from both the TIP and the MTP. Not the project, but what is within the AMATS boundary. DOT&PF recognized that it is fine if there is no support for the funding or the development of that phase, within the AMATS boundary, but there is the 20-mile corridor they are still trying to figure out how to improve safety within. From the standpoint of continuing to look at the corridor and recognize that all the same stakeholders are within that entire corridor, such as it being a Beluga Whale habitat, it is Chugach State Park,

and the railroad; they will finish the corridor-wide Environmental Assessment to figure out what the impacts are with the ultimate solution here. As they move forward, if that phase does not want to be funded through the TIP and the MTP that is within the AMATS boundary, they can still start to move forward with the design and construction of projects outside that area. That way they can still find ways to improve safety sooner rather than waiting. That piece might not be able to be funded today but that is okay because they can fund other pieces.

- (MB) She must have misunderstood the intent of both the TAC and the PC of the timing because what she understood at that time was the entirety of the project was being discussed, not just the portion within the AMATS boundary. Based on some of the comments from the meetings, it seemed like they were discussing the removal of the entire project itself.
- (CH) *His understanding has always been that it is just the piece within the AMATS boundary. The original project through FHWA was for the entire corridor, even a project that is without that new boundary list to try to allow federal funding for the section that does have approval to move forward.*
- (TK) She keeps hearing people critique this project in that clearly there is a need to improve safety on the Seward Highway, but it is not a priority as named in this. It is fifty-fifth and lower in the Highway Safety Improvement report for the high-crash location list, and our own internal view of fatalities and serious injuries. It is not coming to the top. She would like some clarification on why this was prioritized over 55 other projects, especially in an environment where we are talking about a scarcity of resources, which is what this really comes down to. It is not that this is a bad project, but there is a lot of competition for the resources that this project is taking up.
- (BC) During the November 2024 TAC meeting, the ask was to have assurance that all the other Anchorage needs and projects would not be displaced by the funding for this one. His understanding was that this was agreed upon as being a reasonable request, but nothing ever showed up. In addition to Ms. Keegan's question, can there be assurances because it is a matter-of-fact that the committee does not like this project, or is it because there are other needs that are higher priorities that are going to make a difference? There are so many other needs in Anchorage that are not happening. This is not the project team's decision; it is for DOT&PF to figure out if they can deliver all of Anchorage's needs, so that the TAC is not making the decision to put money into a much lower priority with having pedestrian fatality issues and so many other AMATS funding needs.
- (MB) Would like to include herself as a third to that question, requesting a response.
- (LB) *The resourcing is something to comment on when it comes to this project. It has been an alternate project delivery approach, and transportation was kind of the category identified for it. It is sourced from different regions. From Central Region, it has had a minimal impact on their project delivery teams, which has been a big benefit in terms of making sure that projects in the Anchorage area continue to move forward. He remembered the previous discussions regarding the desire to make sure this is not impacting the projects within Anchorage. DOT&PF*

has not seen projects removed from Anchorage in the TIP. If anything, they have been seeing HSIP projects in the projects program within the Anchorage area over the past year-and-a-half. He would say that Anchorage is still a priority and they are continuing to move forward with projects within the Bowl. It is a priority for their books and he just had this conversation earlier this week with their highway design crew that these are deliveries needed to be made here this year. When it comes to funding a project of this magnitude, similar to how they are handling Cooper Landing Bypass, it is how to fit it within the annual allocation that DOT&PF gets from the Federal Highway Administration year in and year out, and making sure that it is in usable chunks with individual utility, but also does not take away from the overall program and all the needs to be addressed, both in Anchorage and on a statewide level. Cooper Landing Bypass has been around for a long time with the longest-running environmental document in the nation, which is not a great thing. At the same time, when that moved forward and they did get the record of decision, they have been making incremental improvements on that project without a huge detriment to the overall program. They would be doing the same thing with MM98 to 118. It is chunks of improvement with stretches of the highway that would be individual utility and not detrimental to the overall program.

(TK) She works for Parks & Recreation and noted in some of AMATS' comments that the non-motorized area, or basically the route, is not continuous?

(CH) *That is not true. The goal was to have a continuous separated pathway for the entire stretch. There is one spot shown in the document where it parallels a frontage road, and, at one point, they were going to just make it part of that little frontage road or long driveway to a trailhead, and they specifically said no that it is separated. There is one crossing of Potter Valley Road side street but otherwise it is a separated pathway for the entire lane. There have been some questions on access points or access to trailheads, and some of the figures in the EA do not show it as well, but some of the description in the 4(f) section does show it as separated access to all the trailhead locations. If there is something amiss there, this is the perfect time to comment. The final location of that trailhead, mountainside and waterside, probably has some ability to get refined during final design making sure it is in the right spot. What they wanted to do was account for the footprint and the separated pathway was included for the entire lane.*

(MB) She is more familiar with the BLM and the National Park Service versions, but there is a section in the Visual Impact Analysis that says something to the effect of visitors who have never been to the area will not understand the significance of the change because they are not familiar with the area, so, therefore, they will not be impacted by the change. The change being the fill and grade activity, and the removal of some of the cliff phase and filling areas, which, in the document, provided the cubic yardage of fill and grade activity that was equivalent to almost 500 football fields. She requested additional information on this and the Scenic Byway aspect as well. This seems to be a very significant change for a Scenic Byway.

(CH) *He did not write that section. The Scenic Byway designation is not going to go away. It is fully intended to remain. With regard to someone that has never been in corridor, is in reference to the fact that the entire roadway right now has a lot of cliff walls that are from blasting and excavation to build the road initially. They are not building a new four-lane facility but are adding on to an existing two-lane facility that has been blasted through the mountainside in many locations. It will a higher component of that, and there might be some higher walls, but there are already existing blasted phases. If there are other thoughts on this, now would be the time to comment on specific areas of this section.*

CHAIR COY opened the floor to public comments.

ALEXA DOBSON

MS. BABB moved to recommend to the Policy Committee to adopt the AMATS staff comments, once they are finalized, as their own Policy Committee comments and forward the comments to the DOT&PF project team, along with a request for an additional response to the issues identified in the staff comments, especially the concern that it is still unclear whether DOT&PF has the ability and capacity to deliver this project without impacting other projects in the future of the state. MR. RUDOLPH seconded.

(CH) *With regard to some of the clarification items, there has been a lot of discussion on designing for summer versus designing for winter, DOT&PF is designing this road for year-round use. It is a very difficult situation with a lot of traffic in the summer and not much in the winter, yet there are a lot of crashes in the winter. The proposed action focuses on dividing northbound and southbound traffic or providing a rockfall area to address some of those crash concerns in the wintertime, but it also looks at ways to keep the roadway open to balance the use of local traffic versus through traffic for the summertime. It is an attempt to address a year-round problem on a year-round road. DOT&PF is not focused on just one season. The non-motorized connections may be tough to find but are in the document. There have been a lot of questions about replacing recreational land, but it does have a whole process that DNR thoroughly looks at the value of different land and they are currently working through that process. DNR has been on their stakeholder working group, making sure it meets all the requirements. Assuming this moves forward, they will be tasked with developing a financial plan to show there is a plan for implementation and to showcase that the maintenance needs can be addressed before FHWA will ever give money to any project. This step will address that but usually after the environmental document has been completed. Any of these major projects will be required to develop a full financial plan.*

(MK) At what point are they going to refine the recommended alternative visit during the EA?

(CH) *They have been refining the alternative for the last two and a half years, since the purpose and need was developed, and looking at different types of options throughout the corridor. They did find the proposed action that solves the problem that was developed through the stakeholder working group. They are before the committee with a draft environmental document with the proposed action that*

-
- addresses the purpose and need developed for the project. The other option on the table is no action. The decision will be whether to move forward with the proposed action from a phased construction standpoint, or do we move forward with no action?*
- (MK) The cross sections change throughout the corridor and sometimes have a vertical shift or are sometimes in line. Is that what is proposed, or are they alternatives?
- (CH) *As far as the elements of the typical section, it is consistent in the sense that it is two lanes north and two lanes south, it is consistent in that it is separated northbound and southbound and whether that is with a median or a barrier eliminating head-on collisions. It is consistent from a pathway standpoint. What does change throughout, if there are certain areas where they can use a lower topography to their advantage and come up a little bit, which reduces their footprint making it shorter. Near Bird and Indian is a wide highway more consistent with a normal typical section. Some elements are definitely consistent throughout, and how those elements are placed within the surrounding topography changes within the twenty miles.*
- (TK) Most of the trailhead access is on the land side. If people are heading out of town and are trying to get a trailhead, what is the normal opportunity for them to get on the opposite side of the road if it is a separated roadway? Is it the 20-mile corridor or is it every five miles, or at the trailheads typically?
- (CH) *They worked with Chugach State Park to find out what are the major ones, and even looked at turning movements. The major locations would all have left or right turn full access, which is McHugh, Rainbow, Beluga Point, Windy Corner, Bird, and the Indian communities. The two major ones that do not have that are Falls Creek and Indian House Mountain. Those two trailheads would require you to a little further to Indian to turn around and come back, since they are right in and right out. Another one is the Section House off of Potter Valley Road, which is a southbound right in and right out. They also focused on what is in the Chugach State Park planning document as their major trailhead locations and areas and align with where they want to eventually charge for parking and development.*
- (TK) With regard to the 6(f) plan, she thought the swap is not only of equal value, but there is also a proximity requirement. Are they looking at protecting this?
- (CH) *Right now, Chugach State Park is on both sides of the roadway. As they make adjustments widening this roadway, they will take almost another sliver in areas of that park. It is sort of impossible to find a sliver of replacement land that is on the water side. The park looks at two things: what is an overall benefit to all recreational users of their park. One is a component of proximity, which is cost. A formal process is done to appraise the land that is being taken to come up with a dollar value and then find land that has that same dollar value, and they have been looking at properties in Stuckagain Heights that would provide an opportunity for an additional access point to the park. It is not in the same exact spot as the water side. It is the park's decision to accept that property if it provides benefit to the park as a whole for all their recreational users. If the park approves it, then it*

goes to the National Park Service because it is within that LWCF (Land and Water Conservation Fund) to determine that it meets the grant funding requirement for the park. They are currently looking at an area over there that has the opportunity to provide more access.

(MK) Her concern is the timing of the value engineering process and effort and if that process could help inform the preferred alternative and would happen after all of this is wrapped up. What is the opportunity to go back and explore new alternatives? Is it accurate to have the traffic volumes doubled, or could there also be more emphasis on mitigating what is the actual safety problem with winter safety measures? If we were to look at that earlier with the valued engineering effort for a smaller footprint and what is really going to enhance safety with a targeted problem, instead of waiting too late?

(CH) *He suggested to really review the alternative section because they spent the last two-and-a-half years looking at those other alternatives to find out how they address the problem, and the problem being that purpose and need. When they got to the four-lane selection, a lot of effort was put into how those other alternatives do not solve the problem, or not as well. It also outlines some large benefits of the four-lane that do not have any additional safety benefits or additional traffic benefits from the standpoint of emergency access and reliability. Reliability was a component within the purpose and need. When there is a large incident, the ability for traffic to continue moving is a major benefit after talking to the police about what they had seen on the Glenn Highway, so it does not close down. There was a lot of concern about maintaining the road during construction, and the four-lane allows you to have cars on one side and build two lanes, and then move cars to the other side and build two lanes. The ability to maintain traffic during construction is a major advantage of that. Lastly, a lot of questions concerning the three-lane. When you have a barrier in that three-lane and you are in that section with one lane, if anyone were to hit that barrier, or you need to restripe or perform maintenance is a closure. Any long-term or ongoing maintenance in the future, even becomes more difficult in those scenarios. Valued engineering has a place and is really focused on where money can be saved by changing the material or by making a small adjustment because they only look at it for one week.*

MS. BABB spoke to her motion, thanking the project team and DOT&PF for responding to the committee's questions, and supports safety improvements in this corridor. It is definitely needed and is a dangerous roadway in some ways, and she appreciated all the changes DOT&PF has already made in that area. However, she still has concerns about this project and would appreciate more information on the concerns raised by the TAC previously, the PC previously, the Planning and Zoning Commission, and public and staff comments. She is hoping to encourage DOT&PF to take advantage of this as a chance to provide written answers to those comments in an official format. Especially with the focus on why this project, in the context of other projects in the municipality that show a much higher need for safety, deserves \$1.5 billion worth of investment.

MS. KOHLHAAS moved to amend with emphasizing an early enough valued engineering effort prior to the final selection. MS. KEEGAN seconded.

MS. KOLHAAS noted that it sounds like the project team has already looked at a lot of those things and could be explained during the process.

MR. JONGENELEN restated the amendment to read, “moved to add on valued engineering effort prior to the preferred alternative selection or explain what has already been done that could address that.”

MR. BOWLAND noted that there are two formal processes. One is the NEPA Alternatives Analysis and the Valued Engineering Study, which occur at different points within a project’s development. It is really the alternative analysis that Ms. Kohlhaas would like more clarification on, not necessarily the valued engineering study.

MS. KOHLHAAS replied that is probably correct. Winter safety is when the hazards are occurring and the four-lane alternative is the solution, and why that is the solution. Hearing that other things were considered regarding the benefits with emergency services and constructability. Mr. Jongenelen’s restatement was more correct.

MR. BOWLAND explained that valued engineering is more of a detailed approach as they get further into the final design, which is not started until the NEPA document is completed. The analysis is captured in the amended motion requesting more clarification as to why they did not look at some of the other alternatives. If they were to move forward with a valued engineering study, it would be an independent engineering firm, so they would have an RFP to procure those services. It would be looked at during a condensed one- or two-week timeline, based on design-level plans, which we have more preliminary design for at this point and time.

MS. KOHLHAAS revised her amendment to request further clarification and justification of the preferred alternative, given the safety hazards in the winter when volumes are lower. MS KEEGAN seconded.

1st Amendment

Hearing no objections, the amendment passed.

MS. KEEGAN moved to include in the comments the data regarding AMATS' High-Crash Network Corridors with the AEDT and crash information compared within Anchorage to support staff's overall comment bullet point 2 about rankings of highway safety projects. MS. BABB seconded.

CHAIR COY expressed that the critical part is just the recognition that there are so many safety needs not getting addressed in a way he and many others felt was adequate. Seeing so much effort put into the Seward Highway, when there are so many other urgent needs that he is spending so much time on, even though it is not his system, is very challenging and draining. He emphasized that there needs to be more motion, more effort, and more prioritization of all the other safety needs, rather than a stumbling block, such as a lane drop directive and other things that further slow projects. There is only so much the municipality can do to improve safety in what we view as our jurisdiction because they are DOT&PF streets. DOT&PF restructuring, not having a Central Region, feels like it is moving away

from us, as the municipality, to be able to improve the safety that we are feeling heavily with all that is going on. Something outside of AMATS gaining billions of dollars is really challenging. He understood that DOT&PF is trying to make project improvements and deliver Anchorage projects, but we also continually hear about DOT&PF not having enough staff to move AMATS projects forward. All the other projects listed above are not ones that can be fixed by adding capacity and by expanding the roadways, which is what the Safer Seward Highway project is looking at proposing. It seems so much easier to move forward with big projects that are expansions than it does to move forward with projects that are targeting safety and reallocating space. It just seems there is a huge discrepancy between these types of projects and those types of projects. It is hard when he sees curb-type sidewalks and roads that have excess capacity that can increase speeding and operate at a level of service that is at so much excess capacity.

He added that 85% of the major streets in Anchorage are DOT&PF streets.

MS. BABB mentioned that from the Planning Department's point of view on these sorts of projects, and especially based on the Planning & Zoning Commission's reaction to this project, she concurred with Chair Coy. Our community is consistently asking for walkable streets and non-motorized transportation, but we are consistently not able to deliver that in town.

2nd Amendment

Hearing no objections, the amendment passed.

CHAIR COY called for a roll call vote on the main motion, as amended.

AYE

Mr. Dawoud
Mr. Umatum
Ms. Duber
Chair Coy
Ms. Keegan
Ms. Kohlhaas
Mr. Rudolph
Ms. Babb

NAY

Mr. Alimi
Mr. White

ABSTAIN

Mr. Bowland

The main motion, as amended, passed with 8 votes in favor, 2 votes against, and 1 abstention.

b. AMATS 2026 Safety Targets

MS. WEISER noted that the Safety Performance Targets are federally required (23 CFR 490 Subpart B) for states and can help guide transportation investment and policy decisions. Targets are expressed as five-year rolling averages and are applicable to all public roads in Alaska. Within 180 days of the state submitting their targets to FHWA (in their HSIP Annual Report), MPOs must inform DOT&PF whether they will support state targets or set their own targets. The 2026 deadline for AMATS is February 25. If MPOs choose to set their

own targets; there are no federal consequences for exceeding the targets. In 2025, AMATS began setting its own targets. For 2026, AMATS staff prepared targets following a method in line with DOT&PF's method, which would help track progress toward a goal of zero deaths and serious injuries by the year 2050.

MS. KEEGAN requested of staff to incorporate a map next year and include something that says, "We could hypothetically reduce all fatalities in just this region and it would put us closer to our target in this way."

There were no comments.

MS. BABB moved to recommend to the Policy Committee approval of the AMATS 2026 Safety Performance Measures and Targets, as recommended by staff. MS. KEEGAN seconded.

Hearing no objections, the motion passed.

c. 2026 Public Transportation Safety Targets

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

In response to Ms. Kohlhaas' question if the data is only collected on the bus passengers that were at the bus stop, or how far beyond the stop the data is collected, MR. RUDOLPH explained that data is collected on both riders and employees on the bus or users at a transit stop.

There were no public comments.

MS. KEEGAN moved to recommend to the Policy Committee to support the MOA Public Transportation Department Safety Targets for 2026. MS. KOHLHAAS seconded.

Hearing no objections, the motion passed.

MS. KEEGAN moved to extend the meeting to 3:15 p.m. MS. KOHLHAAS seconded.

Hearing no objections, the motion passed.

MR. RUDOLPH informed the committee that he will need to leave the meeting at 3:00 p.m.

d. AMATS Climate Action Plan

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

ALEX BELL with RSG, Inc., presented the plan, noting that TCAP was developed as a transportation-specific Municipal Climate Action Plan. The TCAP serves to flesh out the road-transportation aspect of climate action in the AMATS area, building on the Municipality of Anchorage's 2019 Climate Action Plan that discussed all sectors. The TCAP outlines strategies that would achieve a 30% reduction in greenhouse gas emissions from on-road transportation (from 2023 levels) by 2050. It is data-driven but is also informed by input from partner agencies and organizations to set the stage for a collaborative approach toward a feasible goal. Two stakeholder meetings and eight one-on-one interviews with partners have been held to inform the development of the plan. An additional stakeholder meeting and a public workshop are planned for February and March 2026 to seek feedback on the draft plan. Any requested edits from the TAC and PC can be incorporated prior to releasing the draft or during the public review period.

JEFF FRKONJA with RSG, Inc., was also present and assisted with responding to questions.

MS. KEEGAN commented that she would like to see this plan in a story mat form, if there is time and capacity.

MR. RUDOLPH referred to the greenhouse gas by source, noting that it did not list the Alaska Railroad. Do they not produce greenhouse gas emissions?

MR. BELL will need to look at the greenhouse gas inventory details. He did know of some challenges with the specific contributions from every source being quite small.

MR. FRKONJA added that there was both a municipal effort and this inventory effort that tried to account for sources.

MR. RUDOLPH pointed out that if snowmachine greenhouse gas emissions are to be included, then the Alaska Railroad should be listed too. He also mentioned that the document recommends vehicle fleets going electric by 2050, including transit fleets. His concern is locking them into that alternative fuel when looking at hydrogen, or CNG, or maybe a hybrid bus. Was there a reason why the document says specifically they have to go to electric vehicles?

MR. BELL said it can be characterized as interest in alternative fuels, broadly. He pointed out that the influx of electric vehicles or other low-emission alternatives is assumed to only comprise 17%, or so, of the total vehicle fleet in the future. The plan still envisions a large portion of the fleet being internal combustion engine powered, and that will be the expanding market share for EVs and substantially so to reduce the greenhouse gas emissions. To the point about other alternative fuels, he did not think the plan necessarily wants to lock into one versus the other.

CHAIR COY commented that winter in Alaska has a different impact on batteries than other parts of the country. Was that factored in when thinking about the reliability of EVs in Alaska, especially for large vehicles like transit and other fleet vehicles?

MR. BELL replied that, unfortunately, for modeling purposes they do not have a specific mechanism for dealing with the impacts of the heat conditions on the viability of those vehicles, so it does assume prevailing adoption trends.

MS. KOHLHAAS asked, with respect to user fees, were there any corridors identified or higher zones of greenhouse gas pollutants? Denser cities have green areas that have certain restrictions and user fees. Has anything been identified for Anchorage?

MR. BELL explained that there are two levels to the geographic specificity of where there might be intensive emissions. One has to do with the locations of VMT and associated emissions generated by households residing in those areas. Typically, areas that are going to have longer commute times and distances on a per capita basis are going to have higher VMT per household. The second is attributed to households and does not necessarily mean that the emissions occur right around the home. The corridors where they see the highest levels of travel demand were called out, which included the Glenn and Seward Highways and arterials in the Anchorage Bowl. There is not a specific congestion-based intersection level of detail to get at some of that hyper-granular specificity of interest.

MS. BABB referred to page 35, asking if the **TU** considered the Municipality's Long-Range Transportation Strategy as one of the items to add under the partners and their plans section. If not, might they be willing to take a look at that and perhaps add it in.

MR. BELL replied that the LRTS was a favorite reference in terms of setting expectations for multi-modal travel in particular. He did not know that it was necessarily called out as the key synergy or partnership, but that could be made more explicit.

MR. FRKONJA emphasized that the substance of the strategy definitely informed the CAP, so perhaps they do need to make the dues owed there in the strategy more clear in the document.

MR. RUDOLPH noted that it does not look like the transit plan was included in this. Was that taken into consideration?

MR. BELL replied, "Yes, there is a concerted effort, and the key recommendation of the plan is investing in the transit system. The plan, specifically, envisions a 50% increase in revenue service miles provided by the transit system. One of the double-edged features is that we are not getting down to routes and where exactly that service is provided. They can provide a ' little bit of geographic specificity to that that they ultimately decided did not really yield any additional benefits, so they are representing plans like Transit on the Move in the form of that recommendation to invest in transit generally and to increase the revenue service miles that are provided region-wide. That will take specific expression through the implementation of those other agency plans and actions downstream.

MR. FRKONJA added that the TCAP's recommendations include Transit on the Move and more.

MR. RUDOLPH referred to the Implementation Matrix that shows a difficulty graphic. One that says they will have all electric vehicles for the transit fleet is the easiest on the graphic. How is that matrix determined because he did not think it should be quite so easy, since it is a lot of money and double the number of buses they have right now, and is charging infrastructure? It is not something that can be turned on overnight, which maybe this graphic implies.

MS. WILM added that they worked on the Implementation Matrix, and it was asked by their advisory committee overseeing the plan development to include a graphic of how difficult these implementation action items were to be implemented. Those were just based on looking overall at the whole system of agencies working together and how difficult it would be to implement these. If something does not look right, this is great input, and this is the time to make an adjustment to reflect the level of difficulty this committee, the Policy Committee, and the public feel is adequate.

There were no public comments.

MS. KOHLHAAS moved to recommend to the Policy Committee that the AMATS Transportation Climate Action Plan is released for a 45-day public comment period. MS. BABB seconded.

Hearing no objections, the motion passed.

6. INFORMATIONAL ITEMS -

a. Recreational Trails Plan Presentation

NICOLETTE DENT presented the trails plan.

The committee discussed the ability to do trail striping and the Class 6.b. showing the parallel path with skiing on one side and walking/biking on the other.

There were no public comments.

MS. KEEGAN moved to extend the meeting to 3:30 p.m. MR. BOWLAND seconded.

Hearing no objections, the motion passed.

b. Q1 2026 Obligation Report

MR. JONGENELEN presented the report.

There were no comments.

c. Project Status Report

MR. JONGENELEN presented the report.

There were no comments.

d. Next TAC Meeting Overview

MR. JONGENELEN noted that there will be a March meeting that will include as action items the 2023-2026 TIP Amendment #4, the 2027-2030 TIP, and the MTP Amendment #2. There will also be a People Mover update on Totem and a 32nd Avenue project presentation. Both TIP items received approval by the Assembly and did not comment on either of the edits.

There were no comments.

7. COMMITTEE COMMENTS

MS. BABB had been hearing rumors about a reorganization within DOT&PF. When there is more information, she asked if DOT&PF could provide a presentation to the TAC explaining what the new structure looks like and how it will impact the municipality's relationship with DOT&PF.

MR. BOWLAND replied that it could be arranged. There was a transportation meeting earlier this week that went through some of the details. What he is hearing, internally, is a lot of reorganization on the regional level, so the relationship between the municipality and the Central Region and AMATS will not change. Instead of having regional directors in the three different regions, DOT&PF will have a director of maintenance and operations that oversees the three different maintenance & operation regions, and a director of project delivery construction would oversee the three pre-construction engineers and the three construction engineers. Possibly a little bit of blurring of regional lines to help with resourcing where needed. Hopefully not a massive change.

MR. BOWLAND announced that Director Sean Holland recently retired, and Deputy Director Katherine Keith will be acting as the Anchorage interim regional director.

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

Hearing no objections, the meeting adjourned at 3:28 p.m.