

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

**April 2, 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
Ben White	Alaska Dept. of Transportation & Public Facilities (DOT&PF), Anchorage Field Office
Mélisa Babb	MOA/Planning Department
Melinda Kohlhaas	MOA/Project Management & Engineering Department (PM&E)

Virtual:

Taylor Keegan	MOA/Parks & Recreation Department
Mourad Dawoud	MOA/Health Department
Adeyemi Alimi	Alaska Department of Environmental Conservation (ADEC)
Terry Umatum	Don Young Port of Alaska Interim Director

Also in attendance:

Name	Representing
Aaron Jongenelen	AMATS
Christine Schuette	AMATS
Emily Weiser	AMATS
Leifiloa Felise	AMATS
Kristina Busch	DOT&PF
Andrew Ooms	Kittelson & Associates
Alexa Dobson	Bike Anchorage Executive Director
Craig Lyon	
Connor Eshleman	DOT&PF
Lauren Little	DOT&PF
Katie Peck	DOT&PF
Bob Doehl	MOA/Community & Economic Development
Kent Kohlhas	MOA/Public Works
Julee Trudeau	Jacobs
Chelsea Ward-Waller	PM&E
Michael Robinson	
Romorenzo Marasigan	DOT&PF
Sarah Preskitt	
Travis Holmes	DOT&PF
Katherine Keith*	DOT&PF

Erin Baldwin Day*	MOA/Assembly Member
Brandon Telford	PM&E
Alex Read	DOT&PF
Jackson Fox	FAST Director
Anna Bosin	DOT&PF
Tanya Hong	PM&E
Morgan McCammon	DOWL
Zakary Hartman	Traffic Engineering Department
Mark Eisenman	DOT&PF
Dave Gamez	Lounsbury & Associates
Ryan Harris	DOT&PF

**Policy Committee Member*

***Policy Committee Designated Alternate*

1. CALL TO ORDER/ROLL CALL

CHAIR COY called the meeting to order at 1:01p.m. Kate Dueber represented the Alaska Railroad Corporation on behalf of Brian Lindamood. Bart Rudolph with the MOA Public Transportation Department was excused. 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.

Additionally, due to current changes in the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) and federal requirements, the AMATS agenda and website now include the items in more detail with a slight reorganization of the agenda to enhance accessibility.

3. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

MS. BABB moved to approve the agenda. MR. WHITE seconded.

Hearing no objections, the agenda was approved.

4. APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES – March 5, 2026

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

Hearing no objections, the minutes were approved.

5. BUSINESS ITEMS**a. Alaska Railroad Transit Asset Management Target 2026**

MR. JONGENELEN noted that every year AMATS is required to adopt asset management targets for public transportation providers within the AMATS boundary. As an MPO, AMATS is required to support the targets or adopt its own targets. Historically, AMATS has supported the railroad's targets and does not manage or oversee any of the railroad infrastructure, rolling stock, equipment, facilities, or the track.

There were no comments

MS. DUEBER moved to recommend to the Policy Committee adoption of the 2026 Alaska Railroad Corporation TAM Targets. MR. BOWLAND seconded.

Hearing no objections, the motion passed.

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

MS. WEISER noted that the Policy Committee requested returning the Vision Zero letter to BPAC for some changes. With changes having been made to the letter and it being a highly relevant topic, staff chose to bring it back before this committee. The letter will be addressed to the recipients and signed by BPAC, unless the Policy Committee would rather it be signed by their committee.

There were no comments.

MS. BABB moved to recommend that the Policy Committee approve and adopt the AMATS Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee letter and that it be sent to recipients. MS. KOHLHAAS seconded.

MS. KOHLHAAS asked who the recipients are.

CHAIR COY replied that he and the DOT&PF Central Region Director are the recipients. This did put him in an odd situation, and asked if he should recuse himself. He did not see an issue if it were a unanimous vote, but if it were a voice vote, it would make sense to recuse himself from the vote. Typically, these letters are sent to the Transportation Department with no response required, so he did not see a problem voting to have a letter sent to him.

MR. JONGENELEN commented that Chair Coy did recuse himself from the last action on this item. It is the chair's decision to recuse himself from voting but still control the meeting.

CHAIR COY agreed that he should recuse himself from participating in the conversation and the vote but will still control the discussion and voting.

MS. KOHLHAAS explained that PM&E has been meeting with DOT&PF routinely regarding Vision Zero. Further hearing more voices from AMATS and BPAC and being informed is beneficial.

MR. BOWLAND appreciated the partnership between DOT&PF and the municipality towards Vision Zero goals. He also thanked BPAC for revisiting the letter.

There were no public comments.

CHAIR COY called for a roll call vote.

AYE

Ms. Babb

Ms. Kohlhaas

Ms. Keegan

Mr. White

Mr. Bowland

Mr. Dawoud

Mr. Alimi

Ms. Dueber

Mr. Umatum

NAY

RECUSED

Chair Coy

Hearing no objections, the motion passed.

c. The 32nd Avenue Project

MR. JONGENELEN stated that during the project team's status presentation before the Policy Committee on March 19, there was discussion about a one-way option being looked at as part of the project. The project team was asked if they would look at the option and a Policy Committee member did recommend they do consider this option as part of this project.

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

(TU) Was this project ready to start construction, and would it be delayed if we voted to extend or have another study done?

(LB) This project is in the preliminary design and environmental phase. DOT&PF is currently working through the NEPA process. The proposal to look at a one-way was not included in the public meeting that took place for the project, so it was not an alternative presented to the public as part of the environmental process. If it is included, there would be some scheduling impacts and additional costs that would go into evaluating the one-way and also presenting that to the public.

(TU) Would it delay it for a year or just one or two months? Would it be a major impact?

(LB) It would be approximately a 6-month timeline. It would involve an amendment to the consultant contract, design time, and the public meeting.

(BC) Does the traffic study impact it?

(LB) That would fit within the timeline. He deferred to members of the project team that are present.

(TH) *Mr. Holmes is the project manager and explained that, with regard to the traffic analysis being the reason for the delay, the amendment to the PSA contract would be the main reason for the delay, and they already have to do that for the public involvement changes regardless of whether the traffic analysis is part of that.*

(MK) Provided some history, noting that PM&E has been involved in this corridor when the Lois Drive and W. 32nd Avenue project was started but was actually a pathway project and focused on non-motorized facilities. Recognizing there was congestion, the Aquarian School, and other factors while wanting a linked pedestrian mode included as well. The most critical piece is the Anchorage Fire Department as a stakeholder consideration for life safety. PM&E spoke with Fire Marshall Brian Dean, noting that Anchorage Sands Apartment complex with a narrow 30-foot right-of-way, is considered a high-risk occupancy because there are no fire alarms or sprinklers. They also have a history of responding to multi-alarm fire events, which includes multiple response unit dispatched. From their perspective, they need a minimum range of 26 feet road width. Also two lanes allow adequate room for one setup and for the other fire apparatus to be able to pass through. PM&E has also consulted with another stakeholder, Street Maintenance, that 32nd is currently on their school route snow haul-out list, which is part of their normal operation. For them to manage their snow hauling needs, they look to having two lane widths to support side-by-sides with a dump truck and a snowblower. Some other things to consider is all the service accommodations that happen on a local roadway that have the highest access needs for maintenance vehicles, delivery, postal, and solid waste vehicles that require corridor maneuverability. Having more room when vehicles are stopped provides movement within that corridor. With regard to the Design Study Report, PM&E with CRW followed the Context Sensitive Solutions process and recognized that it is a challenging road because of the varying right-of-way widths. They also looked at how the Sands Apartment building impacts safety as far as introducing a non-motorized facility right in front of full-frontage driveways that have direct pullout and backing out poses a potential risk or hazard. The alternatives that were looked at; they considered a pathway from the west side, the north side, crossing the street, and then routing along the south side of the roadway from the segment that is in front of the apartment building to avoid that potential conflict. The report also notes that a one-way alternative was considered. One of the biggest factors that MOA Traffic Engineering expressed concern about was compliance for one-way streets in the neighborhood, which was presented to the Planning and Zoning Commission, who noted there was a lot of attention on looking at alternatives considering all the constraints and all the factors in making sure we have adequate roadway configurations. In the planning staff report, the project had initially considered a one-way road option but there were concerns with traffic circulation and compliance. A one-way road option was not analyzed as a cross-section, so it was screened out. The bigger point coming to mind is how the Anchorage Fire Department uses this corridor and needing adequate space for life safety response.

- (TK) She agreed with the fire and snow maintenance concerns. What are the implications if just a traffic study were done? Is there a way to reduce the number of delays in the proposal? If we are going to change the PSA, should we just do both the traffic study and a full exploration of the one-way?
- (LB) *The public meeting would be the long-wait item here. The traffic study would not necessarily hold things up, but it is just that the alternative was not provided as part of the public comment period.*
- (TK) She has heard a lot of what the concerns are and does not believe the one-way is going to come out as the top preferred alternative. In our current environment, there is some distrust in the government at all levels. There is a lot of value in taking a look at this and potentially delaying this project and just making sure we are being responsive to the community who is requesting this. She has had some AMATS non-motorized projects that have come before this committee, which have been delayed sometimes for years due to the same exact reasons. In the end, it has made those projects more defensible, so she thinks there is a balance of whether they are wasting resources pursuing something that, technically, they already know is not the best option. She thinks this is being done, but is the trade-off value and building trust with the local community worth that? She does think it is worth that and will be voting to take a look at this one-way option with the understanding that it is really frustrating from a technical standpoint to have to go through a process when experts in their fields are saying this is not a great option from the very beginning. In the public sector, the committee has a duty to be transparent to the community resulting in stronger projects.
- (BW) Where is the funding coming from for this project?
- (AJ) *It is an AMATS project and the funding is coming from SDBG. Decisions for the project need to come through the AMATS process. It is not a unilateral decision by DOT&PF or the Municipality of Anchorage on what gets or does not get looked at. The Policy Committee is the ultimate authority for AMATS funded projects. This might have been missed at some point because he did not recall anything coming forward that a one-way was not going to be looked at as part of this project, so maybe in the future have better collaboration with the MPO on AMATS-funded projects.*
- (MK) *Believed it was reviewed with AMATS prior to the RFP.*
- (AJ) *It did not come before the TAC and the PC for a decision.*
- (MK) She added that it is not necessarily that it was never looked at and did not mean to confuse when this was a bond-funded project under PM&E's administration because it did start over. With respect to the process, she was only bringing this up for context but looking at what did change, even if it is studied, there will still be the same constraints, the same life safety considerations, and hearing broadly from the Anchorage Fire Department. It is a constrained area. The Sands Apartment building likely has nonconforming

rights since it was built prior to 1970. There are not a lot of new things on how to reallocate that given the footprint that the fire department needs.

- (MB) Appreciated the additional background information on this project. None of these items were heard at the last meeting, and she was hearing a lot of concerns from the public and this committee about pedestrian safety and various reasons that a one-way might be considered for this project. She had asked for this to be added to the agenda allowing the Policy Committee the opportunity to take action one way or the other and provide some solid direction to the project team. This information would also be good for the Policy Committee to have, and she will be asking to forward this discussion to the PC, and the public will be made aware of the decisions made, why they were made, and what the considerations are, including any potential delays in the project because none of us are interested in delaying another project. This was her intent for having this added to the agenda, and she is hoping the members will support forwarding this discussion to the PC for their deliberation.
- (MK) She pointed out that the Planning and Zoning Commission's Resolution 2021-009 might provide additional context. It acknowledged that the petitioner worked closely with the public, including the residents immediately affected by these changes. The petitioner carefully considered and put a lot of thought into the most effective design possible with the parameters of the corridor. There was a lot of recognition of all the constraints, and it did identify in the staff report that the one-way was a consideration, which was screened out because of these other broad affecters.
- (BC) Was a one-way only on the narrower section that was 30 feet in right-of-way considered, or was it one-way the entire length to Lois Drive?
- (MK) The focus from the Traffic Engineering Department was compliance. They felt it would be hard to be assured that people would not just try to get onto Minnesota from 32nd, if it was a one-way coming this way.*
- (BC) The Traffic Engineering Department has one-way streets all the time. The people that live there should know it is a one-way. That is not reason enough for him from a traffic standpoint to have the same opinion. It is different from an emergency standpoint.
- (TK) Is there a way to make the existing language more robust in the current process by describing it more wholly, so that it would not require a full change of consultant effort? Just better communication and more visible information as to how we got to where we are?
- (LB) Will work with the project team and incorporate some of the past decisions that were made into the final version of the environmental document to foster that trust a little bit more and walk through the reasoning why this was not evaluated as an alternative in the NEPA process.*

- (TK) That sounds good, and this could be revisited with a larger analysis as necessary based on how robust the information is in the current phase.
- (MB) With future projects it sounds like we have some work to do on the clarity of the process itself related to projects that might start with the municipality and then move to AMATS and decision points on those projects if a project does switch from one funding source to another. She felt there was some muddiness in where those decisions were made, and that could be a conversation for PM&E and AMATS to have separate from this project entirely. That we do not find ourselves in this situation again.
- (LB) *In terms of decision-making by AMATS, the timing of this one is unfortunate. This had been a good discussion for these types of scope elements for the project. Lots of different small to large-scope element changes can be made in the development of any project. There is a balance of how often scope elements are revisited as a committee and then through policy.*
- (MB) She agreed, noting that it is important to know when it is appropriate to make those changes. It feels that at this stage in the project, it is better to take these questions into consideration now rather than at 65% or later. It is better to address these questions, eliminating any questions after an alternative has been selected.
- (BC) With regard to the traffic study, 32nd Avenue is a low-volume local street that does have a school, which is currently directing their pickup/drop-off to be a one-way westbound activity. It has cleared up some of the concerns. Looking at Minnesota Drive, there is a left turn lane to head westbound, so if a one-way was to be looked at his department would have no issues with a one-way westbound. A one-way traffic study would not be needed, and his department could write a one-page reason why this would work. Anyone turning right, an eastbound right turn is the only route at Minnesota that could go one block south to 33rd with minimal out-of-direction travel and is not sending a lot of traffic to 33rd. The Traffic Department does not consider there to be unreconcilable issues with a westbound one-way on this project. It is not a traffic safety issue. There are some concerns with having a narrow sidewalk being the only thing provided along this segment.
- (MK) *Anchorage Fire Department commented that it is not so much being a one-way, but it is all about the space and the width needed. If it was a one-way, they would do anything during the response, including going backwards in a one-way.*
- (MB) Would any paved surface that is constructed to support the stance for a firetruck work, or is it that they specifically need 26 feet of roadway?
- (MK) *She did ask the fire department that question, and they explained that it would be a roadway because if there was a side path, they would not view that as the adequate space they need. They also said they would need it, not just for passing another unit, but for maneuverability and turnaround space.*

(MB) In her mind, that means any roadway in the municipality is going to need to be 26 feet in width. It almost eliminates that one-lane, one-way road from our inventory just due to fire safety.

(MK) *When looking at the design study report, the Official Streets & Highways Plan (OS&HP), and all the different informing documents, one of the items listed was that the local road has two lanes.*

(MB) It is important for the community to understand that this is a limitation and how narrow the roads might get. Her three main concerns for requesting this to be added to the agenda was 1) no direction was provided to the project team, leaving them uncertain as to how to receive the input given at the Policy Committee, 2) the concerns she was hearing from traffic about pedestrian and other safety issues with the two-way in that particular piece of the roadway, and 3) if this were added as an alternative, it might delay design, but will it also push the construction timeline out? Most of these have been addressed with the exception of the timeline. It does sound as if it would have an impact on the construction timeline or just finalizing the design.

(LB) *It would be delayed to late 2028, and it does sound as if they are on the verge of missing that construction as it is.*

CHAIR COY opened the floor to public comments.

KENT KOHLHASE
BRANDON TELFORD
SARAH PRESKITT
ALEX READ
BOB DOEHL

MS. BABB moved to recommend to the Policy Committee that they request of the project team to include a one-way as part of the study for the 32nd Avenue project. MS. KEEGAN seconded.

MS. BABB added that, after the information was provided during discussion, she felt this information is important for the public to understand what the considerations are regarding the timeline, the safety, potential fire issues, snow storage, etc. She would still like this to be under consideration at the Policy Committee but she has serious reservations about the potential delay.

MS. BABB moved to amend that if this is considered being added as part of the study they take into consideration the potential delay of up to a year.

MS. KEEGAN would rather the amendment include something along the lines of reasonably exploring the one-way alternative in a way that also mitigates the exorbitant delays to the project.

MS. BABB accepted the friendly amendment to read, "Recommend the Policy Committee request that the 32nd Avenue project team add a one-way alternative to the study."

MS. KEEGAN suggested additional language that consideration and the project team make the materials associated with the preferred alternatives more robust. If there is a way to justify the one-way option in a way that it does not require a full exploration but brings along all the information discussed today to help shed light on why it was not included, that would also be acceptable. What would be the next best thing would be further clarifying why the one-way option did not make it to the current stage of consideration.

The amendment died for lack of a second.

MS. BABB withdrew her motion.

MS. BABB moved that the Policy Committee recommend the project team include more information about the potential of a one-way alternative and the considerations for not including that as one of the alternatives, and include some information about the previous project that went to the Planning and Zoning Commission and any additional supportive material that is relevant to the one-way alternative.

The amendment died for lack of a second.

MS. KOHLHAAS noted that the design team and DOT&PF leadership are present and could reference all of the background planning and documents they had used to inform the project to be part of their work. It is important to document why these constraints are still there and why it would be screened out as a result.

MS. KEEGAN moved to recommend that the Policy Committee direct that the project team revise and clarify the environmental document to more thoroughly explain why a one-way alternative was not included in the preferred analysis. MS. BABB seconded.

MR. BOWLAND did not think this would end up being the top alternative but deferred to the project team if they had any concerns with the motion.

MR. GAMEZ noted that this would be included in the design study report.

MR. READ added that the design study report is more appropriate than their environmental document because they have not assessed all the impacts. They can review all the concerns in the design study report as to why it was not included early on.

MS. KEEGAN accepted the project team's information as a friendly amendment. MS. BABB seconded.

MR. JONGENELEN asked Ms. Kohlhaas to send him the link to the Planning and Zoning Commission meeting with the information and the final design study report in order to provide it to the Policy Committee.

MS. KOHLHAAS noted that the information from the fire department is not included in that information but has been gathered by PM&E more recently.

MR. JONGENELEN will work with Ms. Kohlhaas to create a bullet-point memorandum for the Policy Committee.

Hearing no objections, the motion passed.

6. INFORMATIONAL ITEMS**a. Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP) Minnesota Lighting Update Presentation**

MR. JONGENELEN briefed the committee and MR. WHITE presented the update.

There were no comments.

b. Seward Highway: Dimond to O'Malley Presentation

RYAN HARRIS with DOT&PF and JULEE TRUDEAU with Jacobs provided the presentation.

The committee discussed where the project team is at with the stakeholders.

CHAIR COY opened the floor to public comments.

ALEXA DOBSON

c. Letters from the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and the Department of Transportation & Public Facilities (DOT&PF) on Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) Authority

MR. JONGENELEN clarified that the letter is from the Department of Law, not Alaska DOT&PF

CHAIR COY opened the floor to public comments.

LAUREN LITTLE

d. Metropolitan Planning Area (MPA) Boundary Discussion

MR. JONGENELEN briefed the committee, noting that a Policy Committee member requested to have this item added to the agenda. policy committee asked to have this on agenda.

MS. LITTLE with DOT&PF presented.

MS. BABB moved to extend the meeting to 3:15 p.m. MR. BOWLAND seconded.

Hearing no objections, the motion passed.

The committee discussed changing designations, dedicated parklands, and the definition of urbanized areas.

e. AMATS Roadmap or Boundary, Operating Agreement, Transportation Improvement Program (TIP), Statewide Transportation Improvement Program (STIP), and National Highway System (NHS) projects

MR. JONGENELEN noted that the Policy Committee Chairperson requested this item to be included on the agenda.

MS. LITTLE presented.

There were no public comments.

f. Next TAC Meeting Overview

MR. JONGENELEN noted that the Complete Streets Street Typology might possibly be available for public release. For possible informational items, presentations on the Academy/VanGuard Drive project and the Tudor Road Interchange.

7. COMMITTEE COMMENTS

8. PUBLIC COMMENTS

Having reached the extended meeting time deadline, committee and public comments were not addressed. CHAIR COY adjourned the meeting at 3:15 p.m.