

**ANCHORAGE METROPOLITAN AREA TRANSPORTATION SOLUTIONS
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING**

**Planning & Development Center
Main Conference Room, 1st Floor
4700 Elmore Road, Anchorage, AK**

**July 2, 2026
1:00 PM**

Technical Advisory Committee Members Present:

Name	Representing
Brad Coy	MOA Traffic Engineering Department
Brian Lindamood	Alaska Railroad Corporation (ARRC)
Ben White	Alaska Dept. of Transportation & Public Facilities (DOT&PF), Anchorage Field Office
Luke Bowland	DOT&PF
Mélisa Babb	MOA/Planning Department
Melinda Kohlhaas	MOA/Project Management & Engineering Department (PM&E)
Shanna Gamble	MOA/Parks & Recreation Department

Virtual:

Adeyemi Alimi	Alaska Department of Environmental Conservation (ADEC)
Bart Rudolph	MOA/Public Transportation Department
Terry Umatum	Don Young Port of Alaska

Also in attendance:

Name	Representing
Aaron Jongenelen	AMATS
Rhiannon Brown	AMATS
Emily Weiser	AMATS
Leifiloa Felise	AMATS
Taryn Oleson	R&M Consultants
Kate Dueber	ARRC
Lauren Little	DOT&PF
Craig Lyon	
Alexa Dobson	Bike Anchorage
Youme Yai	RSG
Isabella Zamarron	
Donovan Camp	MOA/Traffic Engineering Department
Robert Kinnaird	PM&E
Van Le	R&M Consultants
Chelsea Ward-Waller	PM&E
Kristina Huling	DOT&PF
Sarah Matthews	
Kent Kohlhase*	MOA/Public Works Director
Robert Wertman	RSG
Kathleen McArdle	
Stephen Stone	
James Starzec	DOT&PF
Erin Baldwin Day*	Anchorage Assembly, District 4
Joni Wilm	

Stephanie Mormilo HDL
Judy Chapman

**Policy Committee Member*

***Policy Committee Assembly Designated Alternate*

CALL TO ORDER/ROLL CALL

CHAIR COY called the meeting to order at 1:00 p.m. Shanna Gamble represented the MOA Parks & Recreation Department on behalf of Taylor Keegan. Bart Rudolph with the MOA/Public Transportation Department joined virtually at 1:03 p.m. and Terry Umatum with the Don Young Port of Alaska joined virtually at 1:12 p.m. Mourad Dawoud with the MOA/Health 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.

3. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

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

Hearing no objections, the agenda was approved.

4. APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES – June 11, 2026

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

MS. BABB noted that she was not at the last meeting and will abstain from voting on the minutes.

5. BUSINESS ITEMS

AMATS Funding Program (TIP) Administrative Modification #8

MR. JONGENELEN noted that an administrative modification to the AMATS 2023-2026 Funding Program (TIP) is needed to update Table 5: Congestion Mitigation Air Quality (CMAQ). These changes meet the requirements outlined in the AMATS Operating Agreement, Section 6.6.2 and Policies and Procedures #5.

The committee discussed that there is not enough time to utilize the STBG \$15 million fund in this fiscal year and it will be carried forward since it cannot be spent on anything else. They

discussed the importance of getting these responses in a timely fashion and the changes done before the end of the federal fiscal year.

There were no public comments.

MS. BABB moved to recommend the Policy Committee approve the Administrative Modification #8 for the TIP contingent upon receiving confirmation from DOT&PF about the availability of the funding. MR. BOWLAND seconded.

In response to Ms. Kohlhaas' question about whether this needs to be contingent because it would not be good to move forward regardless, MR. JONGENELEN explained that if the confirmation from DOT&PF is not provided, then it could be up to the Policy Committee to not approve it Administrative Modification #8 and leave it as is, which is fully funded by STBG funding, meaning there would need to be an amendment at a later date.

MR. JONGENELEN asked Ms. Babb for clarification that she wanted the confirmation received prior to the Policy Committee meeting.

MS. BABB revised her motion to include that the information is received before the next meeting. MR. BOWLAND seconded.

Hearing no objections, the motion passed.

a. Recreational Trails Plan Approval

NICOLETTE DENT with MOA Parks and Recreation Department and TARYN OLESON with R&M Consultants presented the trails plan.

Mr. Lindamood left the meeting at 1:14 p.m. and was represented by Kate Dueber.

The committee discussed the following:

- Having Class 6 trails paved, cleared, and easily groomed.
- This is part two of the non-motorized plan, which did not go before the Assembly for formal adoption as an element of the Comprehensive Plan. Currently, the plan is to continue with the AMATS model. It is not the intent of this plan to supersede any of the trail recommendations and district plans.
- If this were to be adopted internally as an AMATS and Parks Department plan and is intended to replace the Areawide Trails Plan, the Areawide Trails Plan would still be in effect and used as a guiding document for other department projects, which could create a conflict. It was suggested that taking the Areawide Trails Plan out of the Comprehensive Plan and not adding this plan into the Comprehensive Plan could be an option.
- If there is a limit to what could be funded for recreational trails. The federal government no longer recognizes the terminology 'recreation' but considers it the transportation system as a whole, so the funding is flexible enough to cover most everything. There may be some issues with single-track trails, but most of what is in the plan can be funded. AMATS may not have the funding, but partners can provide funding assistance.
- There is an ongoing interest in PM&E to work with the Planning Department to look at what might strengthen the Context Sensitivity Solutions (CSS) process.

CHAIR COY opened the floor to public comments.

STEPHANIE MORMILO referred to page 118, Hyder Street Corridor Improvements Project, noting that it is listed as Non-motorized Project #220, but should be project #222. She added that the references to the Non-motorized Plan on page 115 do not list the year.

ALEXA DOBSON

MS. KOHLHAAS moved to postpone action on this item to the August TAC meeting in order to have a work session for further discussion. MS. BABB seconded.

MS. BABB noted that this project has been in the process for almost 8 years and is reaching its final stages, and would hate to see it postponed indefinitely. The work session will help provide some feedback and suggested edits.

MR. JONGENELEN clarified that this would be a joint PC and TAC work session, or just the TAC. With regard to timelines, if the postponement to holding a work session is just a recommendation to the Policy Committee, the TAC would have to wait for the PC meeting on July 16 for them to determine if a work session would be beneficial. If the PC approves a work session, that means the work session would need to be posted for the week of July 20, if it was scheduled for the week of July 27. If the municipal departments are to be included, the timeline would not be achievable. He suggested postponing action to the TAC meeting on September 3, which would allow a full month to prepare and have that full engagement.

MS. KOHLHAAS offered a friendly amendment to her motion to postpone action to the September TAC meeting with a work session just for the TAC. MS. BABB seconded.

MS. BABB agreed to the friendly amendment.

MS. KOHLHAAS provided overall topics for the work session:

1. When engaging with other departments, whose purview and plan is it, and how does it fit?
2. How does CASA fit into this inter-area between the park service boundary and getting access to trails.
3. Tying the service on maps since there was action recommending expanding the boundary. If they were to do that, how would it overlay with existing population figures and demographics?

Hearing no objections, the motion passed.

b. AMATS Boundary

MR. JONGENELEN referred to the second bullet, noting that the date reads 11/16/2024, but should read, 11/16/2023. The action is asking to give flexibility to the committee members on what they want to do with the boundary. Since the agenda had been posted, staff had the opportunity to look at the maps provided by DOT&PF and found two errors, with one being the small urban area not being shown in Eagle River. This was noted in AMATS' boundary a number of times and should have been included in this map. Secondly, the western side of the

boundary (Beard of the Moose), map shows that as an expansion made as part of the 2024 update but is not accurate. That was actually included as part of the 2010 update because it was one of the changes that needed to be made with the 2010 update because the Census had designated that area as part of the urbanized area of which AMATS was required to include it in their boundary. That was not added this go around but was already in the boundary.

MR. BOWLAND commented that the goal of this meeting was to get something as an action item in order to be able to discuss what is being proposed by DOT&PF, which is to look at where the boundary left roads half-in and half-out, where the boundary included either parkland or refuge land that was never going to be urbanized.

LAUREN LITTLE with DOT&PF was also present and assisted with the presentation.

The committee discussed the following:

- If anything requires boundary justification in between the urbanized areas and our maximum according to federal limits.
- DNR was not aware of the MPO boundary or what that might mean in terms of their accepting federal funds. That lack of awareness leads to risks. There is coordination and confirmation that parkland being in the boundary is not going to create compliance risks for DOT&PF or an unnecessary burden on DNR in terms of their ability to do their work.
- What has changed that is raising so many questions about the boundary since the PC agreed to and approved it in 2024?
- Is the Safer Seward Highway project of regional significance?
- Is the boundary supposed to capture what is happening just on federally-funded projects or are they tied together?
- Why the Thunderbird Falls parking lot was removed from the boundary.
- Why the creek in Eagle River was removed from the boundary.
- Why the Seward Highway proposed area for DOT&PF is separate from the Seward Highway project itself. AMATS boundary has included Potter Marsh for decades and that section of road north and south of Potter Marsh actually connects two pieces of our urbanized area. It is difficult to get to the southern piece of the urbanized area without accessing the Seward Highway along there. Why was it removed the boundary, especially since it had been established that a portion of the Safer Seward Highway project in our boundary one way or another?

There were no public comments.

MR. BOWLAND moved to recommend to the Policy Committee to schedule a work session on the proposed DOT&PF boundary for discussion. MS. BABB seconded.

MS. BABB offered a friendly amendment to name the parties that will be part of that work session.

MR. BOWLAND agreed to the friendly amendment and restated his motion to read, "Recommend to the Policy Committee to schedule a work session for both the TAC and the PC within the next month and be an action item on September's agenda."

CHAIR COY would like to figure out what questions can be identified that everyone could agree on and what questions or any additional diving in to could be prepared now so that everyone could respond to them.

MS. BABB asked, with regard to the boundary, if the Glenn Highway between the Bowl and Eagle River part of the DOT&PF recommended boundary, or is it excluded.

MR. JONGENELEN replied that it is included. DOT&PF concurred with AMATS' updated boundary. Most of the changes center around the parkland and the southern portion of the Seward Highway, south of the DeBarr and the Potter Marsh area.

MR. JONGENELEN pointed out an error they found on their map in the Eklutna area on the way out of Anchorage at the very eastern edge of the boundary to the north. It is in the layer and staff has no justification for why that changed, because it was not recommended, and it was not DOT&PF. It should align with the previous boundary and staff is recommending it be moved back to where it was on the 2014 boundary. He added that if DOT&PF provide their GIS layer on their recommended boundary, staff can enter it for everyone to view. It will need to be divided into segments and staff can look at the two boundaries to determine the agreements and disagreements. A satellite view will also be used to identify what is there and what it is we are looking at.

In response to Ms. Kohlhaas' question if the GIS layer of the CASA boundary could be added to see how it interplays, MR. JONGENELEN stated, yes, it could be.

MR. JONGENELEN clarified that the recommendation to the PC is to establish a joint work session to show the proposed boundary by DOT&PF and discuss an overview of what is agreed upon, what appears to be agreed upon, and the additional points that are not agreed upon. Have the 2014 boundary, the new 2024 Policy Committee approved boundary, the DOT&PF boundary, the satellite view, and the CASA boundary. This will all be completed in a work session and have everything ready to come back by September.

Hearing no objections, the motion passed.

6. INFORMATIONAL ITEMS

a. Your Daily Journey

BOBBY WERTMAN and YOUME YAI with RSG provided the presentation.

Ms. Babb left the meeting at 2:49 p.m.

The committee discussed some of the trip rates might be different because of the different methodologies, and the area where 15% were identified as having zero vehicle households.

There were no public comments.

b. Roadmap for AMATS - None

7. COMMITTEE COMMENTS

MR. BOWLAND noted that STIP Amendment #6 opened today for public review and comment through August 2.

CHAIR COY expressed a happy 250 years. Drive safely due to holidays often being more dangerous times on the road. Exercise caution and be mindful of others around you.

MS. KOHLHAAS noted that PM&E has a new project administrator supporting the federally funded projects, Keyonna Bundridge.

8. PUBLIC COMMENTS - None

9. ADJOURNMENT

Hearing no objections, the meeting adjourned at 2:59 p.m.